

Received: 22 December 2023, Accepted: 16 January 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33282/rr.vx9il.86>

US-Cuba Relations: Security Implications for the Region In 21st Century

1. Jazab-ur-Rehman, M.Phil. Scholar, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.
2. Dr. Tayba Anwar, Lecturer, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Government College Women University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.
3. Dr. Imran Wakil, Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.
4. Muhammad Mohsin Arshad, BS International Relations, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.
5. Dr. Ghulam Mustafa, Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, Government College University Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.

Correspondence: ghulammustafa@gcuf.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This article examines the US-Cuba relations and the security implication it has on the region in the 21st century. Both nations hold key positions in the world in their own domains. Cuban transition of ideology has become major security threat to USA and the region. Where Cuba cannot deny its world power neighbour, USA can also not deny the amount of strategic importance its small Island neighbour only 90 miles away from it has. Ever since these stained relations have become more crucial for the rest of Americas. This cold wave between USA and Cuba continued all through the cold war era and even in the post-cold war era, until little breaking of ice happened when Obama assumed the office. Despite efforts from the region and the world, the relations are still far from normal even in the 21st century. When we combine the geopolitical importance of Cuba with the United States' national policy of global power, it follows that the control of Cuba was of fundamental strategic significance for the United States in the beginning of the twenty-first century, just as it was in the early 20th century. This is one of the most important corollaries that can be drawn from studying the history and fundamental documents and doctrines of American foreign policy while studying the security implications of the relations. This served as the foundation for the United States' core strategic objective regarding Cuba Policy of restoring authority over the

country through a change in regime. Here in this article factors that involve in US-Cuban relations and their implications for the region have been discussed.

Keywords: USA, Cuba, Security Implications, Regional Security, Caribbean region

Introduction

The trajectory of kingdoms and rivalries for power, which have been crucial to the development of the contemporary world, has an intricate connection with the history of Cuba. The island's culture is essentially a combination of an extensive variety of elements originating from various backgrounds that intermingled to develop evolving features, to form complex images, and to define a certain rhythm for its transformation as a consequence of vast movements of populace, trade, and impacts in terms of culture.

This course of history, or more specifically, the procedure of establishing a nation-state, creating its fundamental structures, achieving freedom from other countries, and defending its sovereignty, has been the tale of Cuban nationhood from the second half of the nineteenth century. The primacy of Cuban independence has been a feature of all political movements and significant political events, either as a goal of the actors involved or as a bargaining chip in a deal for a local power status subservient to a foreign dominating state. The United States of America has had a significant role as an outside force in Cuban history for more than a century now. Long before the Cuban independence conflicts started, the North American nation, which dominated the Western Hemisphere at the time, started to appear large in the economy of the island. After 1880, the island's economic centre moved to the United States of America or in other words USA became Cuban trade hub (Perez, 1983). As the outcome of what was the Cuban-Spanish-American War of the year 1898, it ultimately came to dominate Cuba's political matters and dealing and seized power.

This served as the earliest and most fundamental component of its regional power order, which later served as a major pillar of its position as a major actor on the world stage. Similar to all past revolutionary movements, the Cuban Revolution of 1959 sought to establish sovereignty of Cuba while also fundamentally altering its economic, social and political structures. In this regard, the accumulating data is unambiguous: Cuban history was thoroughly intertwined with its socio-political structure and dependence-

independence contradiction, making it impossible to have autonomy without transformation in society. In contrast, all subsequent efforts by the United States to regain control over the nation have unavoidably aimed to establish a social and political structure in Cuba that is comparable to the less powerful party in an imbalanced relationship (Dominguez Lopez & Yaffe, 2017).

It persists to be with regard to each ongoing attempt to have it under control and efforts that are being made even today in the 21st century. The fact that USA's policy towards Cuba has an impact on the economy, politics, society, and culture of Cuba makes it clear that it must play a significant role in any theoretical framework we may use to study the history of the country. Therefore, it is interesting to investigate the factors that influence USA's policy towards Cuba and what implications it has on the American region from a realist perspective.

The main goal of this research is to comprehend the outcome of US-Cuba relations on the region. Thus, not only is this crucial to comprehending history of Cuba, in fact, it is also a crucial topic in American political history and current politics that ought not to be undervalued. This research aims to describe the United States government's stance towards Cuba at the beginning of the start of relations to twenty-first century, specifically between George bush and Joe Biden's first years in the oval office. The research focusses on the US policies and strategies towards Cuba and its impacts on the relations and security of the American region. A collection of decisions taken by governments and other organizations of that state about other nations and non-state actors of that state is known as foreign policy.

Factors involved security implications in the 21st Century

From the history briefed above, it implies that the elements that influence making of policy are interrelated, complex dynamic systems, and how much they weigh change over the course of time. The identical thing applies to USA's policy towards Cuba. Three distinct categories of factors have been discovered.

Structural Factors

The initial category is made up of structural factors, values of which last for a longer time and help to provide a framework that is reasonably stable for actual programmes. Because of their extremely slow shifts, these serve as parameters for a specific time frame. They serve as the primary inspiration for the state's policies. The United States national

project and Cuba's geopolitical significance are the two core elements of this collection of factors. The first is essentially the framework for how the United States wants to be perceived on the global stage.

If we take into account the nature and role of the elites in the policy-making process (López & Rodríguez, 2020), it implies that the national endeavour is determined by a broad agreement of the wealthy and powerful (Gilens & Page, 2014). They were able to insert that project into the public's imagination through their control of the processes for reproducing consensus and the development of public opinion, which produced legal authority (Max, 1971) for the replication of the structures of society and politics. The Monroe Doctrine 1823, and its application in the Roosevelt Corollary, provide a clear understanding of reality (Roosevelt, 1904). Both of these sources demonstrate how American authorities have emphasised the value and significance of creating a strong foundation and a strong power system in the continent since the founding of the nation. This was especially true for the entire Caribbean region, which is made up of the coupled basins of the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea, which did not permit the presence of outside forces. When we compare this with Manifest Destiny by John L. O'Sullivan (1845), a book with overtly apocalyptic overtones, it becomes evident that this approach was in line with an ideological concept that saw the United States playing a predetermined dominant position (Engdahl, 2018).

In order to govern the new republics in the Great Caribbean Basin, this effort culminated in a protracted series of direct military operations, including invasions of Haiti, Nicaragua, and Cuba based over the years (Torreon & Plagakis, 2020). The United States also started the Pan-American initiative in the 1880s, which was the initial effort to establish an institutional framework of the region within its authority (Connell-Smith, 1966). These activities were linked to policies related to economy, business operations, and the structure of unfair agreements, isolated economic growth, as well as affiliations with the region's economic and political authorities (Prieto Rozos, 2014). Following World War II, the international system underwent significant change, which provided the United States with a fresh opportunity to enhance its authority internationally.

The national interest of the USA was, thus, to create a force that might extend dominance outside its territorial boundaries via the Great Caribbean Basin, and finally establish itself as the hegemonic global power, as shown by the evidence from history and

important sources. It shows the process of a country expanding its influence across the world and also across the continent that is frequently justified as the United States right and/or obligation to lead the globe, a phrase that frequently appears in the media and even in the vocabulary of ordinary people.

Cuba's geographic significance as the geographical core of the Great Caribbean Basin is what gives it its geopolitical significance and importance especially for the USA. A key element of power expansion of European nations, which fuelled the rise of capitalism, was the establishment of empires of colonies in the Americas and the Caribbean. A developing system with the Atlantic system linking Europe, Africa, and the Americas, included Cuba as a hub (Burnard, 2010). This in turn was a zone of contention among major powers, as the hemisphere was in fact a hub connecting trade routes and distant parts of the emerging world-system (Yun-Casalilla, 2022). Since the beginning of the twentieth century, the expansion of the economy of the United States, the opening of the Panama Canal, the inclusion of a number of crucial strategic resources in South and Central America, and the fact that the majority of the world's trade in commodities continued to be conducted by ocean and along pathways similar to those that had been established since early modern times all contributed to this development in history. Therefore, Cuba occupies a location of geoeconomic and geostrategic significance at the centre of an extensive system of pathways and important junctions.

An additional layer was created by the rise of the United States of America as an international and regional power. The Great Caribbean Basin was an important part of Washington's national security sector as well as a border. It is evident from their national security plans that the USA's leaders saw national security as involving not just the nation's land and people, but also their own interests at a global level. However, the Caribbean area successfully blends both its territorial objectives and its more general concerns. As a result, Cuba became one of the United States top foreign policy priorities.

The acquisition of supremacy over the island was viewed as an essential requirement for the long-term survival of the United States of America and a right that stemmed from politics, nature, and predestination, according to speeches and documents written by a number of the founding fathers, as well as additional sources and conducts (Pérez Jr, 2016). Cuba's geopolitical importance persisted despite the introduction of new elements and

nuances by events in the two nations, region and especially the world. The 1959 Cuban Revolution, which freed the island nation from the USA's rule, caused a rift in the power structure of the hemisphere. The competitor states surfaced to have a chance, and revolutionary groups across the hemisphere looked to have support from this. Experts from the United States continued to stress Cuba's geopolitical importance in the twenty-first century even only a few short years ago (Fonseca, Polga-Hecimovich&Feinberg, 2020).

Contextual Factors

Contextual factors can be called as second set. These elements define the boundary circumstances that have an impact on how policymakers of the United States act towards Cuba. These can be divided in 3 elements:

- The distribution of power in the global framework,
- the circumstances in Latin America and Caribbean,
- and finally, the circumstances in Cuba.

The opinion of experts, public figures, and professionals group limit the impact of these characteristics. The international framework experienced the United States of America's fall in its hegemony, also known as the United States leadership crisis, throughout the first 20 years of the twenty-first century (Bulmer-Thomas, 2018). After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the war on terrorism, the financial crisis of 2008, and China's emergence as an economic rival, the discussion of this loss gained prominence. This series of incidents coincided with concurrent political and social crises that included populism of the right-wing on ascendance and increased political polarisation, rapidly rising disparities, and the demise of the middle class (Dominguez-López & Rodriguez, 2018).

The combined effect of three interconnected factors made the boundaries of American dominance increasingly apparent. The resurgence of Russia as a significant global player comes at first. Following the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia sought to establish itself in the post-Cold War international order by first attempting to form a partnership with the United States of America. This attempt was unsuccessful for a number of factors, especially the position of the United States towards the state of Eurasia. Vladimir Putin's election to the office, the strengthening of economy of Russia, and an all-encompassing programme of nation-building have given it a new lease on life as a major participant in the world. As a

result, there were growing tensions that finally escalated to an open conflict when Russia demonstrated its ability and willingness to pursue its own objectives despite the fact that they went opposite to those of the USA (López & Pías, 2016).

The second is China's rise and its ability to rival and even outperform the United States in terms of technology and the economy. The Asian superpower is positioned to overtake the United States as the dominant force in the world economy thanks to the expansion of its GDP and its advancements in key technologies including AI, fusion of nuclear, energy from renewable sources, and telecommunication. With the launch of the Belt and Road Initiative, its bolstered military capabilities, and the strengthening of its stance in a number of international issues, China also made clear that it intended to be more involved in the world's affairs (Hayton, 2018).

Lastly, the creation of a mutually beneficial relationship between China and Russia. These two nations had substantial human and natural resources, as well as significant scientific potential. They were also the second and third largest military powers, important nuclear powers, and leaders in various sectors. Their organisation was obviously designed to equalize the impact that the United States has on the global order. When the Shanghai cooperation Organization was founded, it captured a number of significant global players, including Kazakhstan, Iran, India, and, Pakistan: countries with regional influence in their own right, some of which had a hostile relationship with the United States. This added another layer to the alliance (Gorodetsky, 2004).

The present shift in world power politics was acknowledged as one of the primary issues facing the US governing leaders in terms of foreign policy. Regardless of the difference of opinions, both sides and all governments during that time were concerned that the rising power of nations like Russia and China would result in a pattern that may undermine hegemonic position of the United States by reshaping the international framework. As a result, they worked to maintain the status quo and reframe the conflict to serve their interests as the presumed hegemon, based on American exceptionalism and the notion that an international system led by the USA is necessary for peace and prosperity. Any attempt to overturn the system therefore resulted in a response. The peculiarities of the particular government and the privileged segments that they represented determined whether or not it was a clever smart-power response or a cruder hard-power response.

At the end of the twentieth century, the Western Hemisphere had adopted the logic of structural adjustment policies of neoliberal reforms to the market, which were backed by the Inter-American system's organisational structure and fostered by the global banking systems under consensus of the United States of America. Despite the fact that Cuba existed beyond of its control, the power structure that revolved around the United States appeared to be sustainable. But as the 20th century gave way to the twenty-first, Hugo Chavez's electoral triumph in Venezuela and the growth of the Bolivarian revolution sparked an upsurge to the political left in several States of south America. The election of more moderate but still politically progressive administrations in Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil coincided with the victories of leftist politicians and fundamental changes in Bolivia and Ecuador. Power in Nicaragua was taken back by the Sandinistas, and other, albeit generally moderate, left-leaning political forces gained power and won elections throughout the region of Caribbean and Central America. As a result, the political environment of the hemisphere underwent a significant upheaval in the initial years of the twenty-first century.

The Bolivarian Alternative for the Peoples of Our America - Peoples' Trade Agreement (ALBA-TCP) was at the centre of the turn to the left. It established the sole regional cooperation initiative in the region Caribbean and of Latin America aiming for a deep integration that goes beyond just economic cooperation. It rejected neoliberal ideology and intended to impose a different epistemology that aimed to undermine the colonial framework that neo-colonial and post-colonial nations were supporting. In order to balance out inequalities among member nations, it put an emphasis on global as well as local solidarity and fostered complementarity-based relationships, emphasising collaboration in education and health care. By putting up a development strategy that was based on South-South cooperation, ALBA-TCP challenged the widespread notion that only Western systems of knowledge can result in social and economic growth. This foundation of this counterhegemonic project was the partnership between Venezuela and Cuba (Fonseca, Polga-Hecimovich&Feinberg 2020).

Relations of Cuba with other nations in the region gradually strengthened as a result of its pivotal role in the political transformation. An extended procedure of diplomatic recognition and reintegration in the area had culminated in the restoration of connections with El Salvador by 2009. The USA's continued non-recognition of Cuba subsequently turned into

a significant barrier to in betterment of relations of the United States with Latin America (Campos & Prevost, 2017).

The global and regional hegemony of the United States of America was put to the test by this approach. Among its most noticeable effects was the plan of the United States and Canada for a comprehensive hemispheric free trading areas and its complete failure in 2005. A hub-and-spoke system consisting of numerous bilateral agreements on free trade between countries and groups of countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and between Canada and the United States could only partially replace this idea. The earliest signs of the leftist wave ebbing were a military takeover in Honduras and a parliamentary revolution in Paraguay in 2009. These two nations were in the early stages of relatively mild leftward movements (López & Rodríguez, 2022).

It was accompanied by the demise of organisations like the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) and the rise of right-wing government-backed organisations such as forum for South American Progress and Integration (PROSUR) and the Lima Group. The integration of regions did not completely vanish, but it was oriented to the goals of foreign policy of the United States and the viewpoints of conservative governments. Nevertheless, as a result of a worldwide structural dilemma and the effects of both ongoing and freshly enacted sanctions on the economy, the scenario has recently gotten severe. The declining health of the Cuban political establishment was another aspect that attracted special attention because the United States was thought to have an opportunity to advance its interests once the most senior people retired. Nevertheless, regardless of Fidel Castro's retirement, stability in politics persisted towards the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century. The generational changeover started in 2008 and had concluded in 2018.

The COVID-19 epidemic struck the nation in 2020, causing an outbreak of public health concern as well as affecting several of the key economic sectors, particularly tourism, and placing significant pressure on the resources of the nation. It implied further limitations on the population's freedom of movement because of public health regulations, a shortage of consumable commodities, and the possibility of serious sickness. The United States administration appeared to have seen this as setting the stage for a dramatic decline in public sentiment towards the government of Cuba.

In that particular setting, on July 11, 2021, there were significant actions of protest, the largest since 1994, which coincided with violence, assaults on law authorities, and vandalism. In the subsequent weeks and months that followed, there were enormous protests in support of the government. Cuba's political system's detractors said it had reached its lowest point and therefore susceptible because of the country's obviously flux and intricate circumstances.

Domestic Factors

The domestic factors make up the third set of factors we looked at. Any area of policymaking in the United States requires an amalgamation of these elements, and policy for Cuba is no anomaly. This group is composed of three basic parts. The first is the distribution of power among the organisations, and how interested they are in Cuba or how much impact the diaspora of Cuban lobby and those who support it has on them is a crucial aspect of this element. Here, it's important to comprehend Florida's importance and its unique characteristics in playing key role in US-Cuba relations. 80 to 85% of the 538 electoral votes in an American presidential election go to the side that the voter previously supported, making them regarded as safe candidates. As of 2020, Florida received 29 electoral votes, or 5.4% of the 538 total electoral votes for the presidency (López & Rodríguez, 2022).

With the smallest average gaps between the candidates in the nation, the Sunshine State has served as the biggest of the swing states for more than 20 years. In the 15 to 20% of the actually contested electoral votes for President, it therefore carries five to six times that weight. That is where Florida's disproportionate political importance comes from. As a result, a relatively small group of voters with the power encourage people and control the procedure effectively can make a difference (Dominguez López, 2020).

The existence, expansion, and political participation of the Cuban Diaspora, which formed a political coalition with the Republicans, played a significant role in Florida's transformation from a Democratic bastion to a swing state. In the contentious victory of George Bush in 2000, the vote of the Cuban diaspora was of utmost importance, but it had less of an impact in 2008. It almost divided in two in 2012 when Barack Obama won the state two times without the help of the affluent Cuban Americans. Despite the fact that its actual influence on the result was greatly exaggerated in the days following the 2016 election, it

shifted back to the Republican side in 2016 with an enormous campaign in favor of Donald Trump (Krogstad & Flores, 2016).

The growth of the system of politics of Cuban Diaspora, which is governed by the authorities of the community and has strong ties to the national political class, especially within the party of Republicans, is more significant. In addition to supporting presidential campaigns in Florida and other states, channelling funding for their preferred candidates across the nation, and generally using the political system to further their interests, they have created a variety of organisations that lobby the president and the congress. Two of these are especially important. The neoconservative new right movement and administration of Ronald Reagan both had a significant role in the establishment of the venerable Cuban American National Foundation in the 1980s (Haney & Vanderbush, 1999). Lately, the Inspire America Foundation was established by the leaders of Cuban diaspora and their friends. This organisation brought together numerous politicians, which include members of Congress and senators, both sitting and the previous ones (Inspire America Foundation, 2019). Both of these organisations fiercely opposed the government of Cuba and any efforts to normalise relations between the two nations without first bringing about a change in regime in Cuba. They were both endorsed by businesses and businessmen who had a stake in the development of these kinds of regulations as their top goal.

These groups were able to expand their representation in the Federal the House of Representatives turning them into a disproportionately represented minority. The relative influence of the parties participating, balanced by the importance given to the Cuban strategy, determined how non-governmental players' effects were distributed. It was the primary or nearly the primary policy objective for the sectors and organisations opposed to the government of Cuba. It appeared to be a different situation for the vast majority of the groups in favour of a policy shift.

Their primary objectives were obviously the promotion of their particular economic objectives, and much of the time, entering this particular market segment was not a top priority relative with different objectives related to, say, taxation or regulation. Therefore, throughout the initial twenty years of the 21st century, the overall balance swung to a more conservative stance towards particular strategies, but not enough to establish an entirely novel balance. To characterise the subsequent strategies as a single outcome of these entities' action

might be inaccurate. There is proof that the Executive's perspective on the subject affects their ability to succeed (LeoGrande, 2019).

Thus, the second component of the group is the ideological orientation of those in power. Here, the administrations' ideologies and approaches to foreign policy are laid out in a highly comprehensible sequential manner. Neoconservative viewpoints, as embodied in the so-called Bush Doctrine (LaFeber, 2002), along with its aggressive position, the idea of proactive prevention, and its unipolar viewpoint, characterised the presidency of George W. Bush between 2001–2009. Barack Obama orchestrated a transformation from 2009 to 2017, leaning towards a smart-power strategy, open to changing direction when the prior direction was not working and better adjusting its instruments to specific conditions. Donald Trump returned to a more primitive and raw form of physical power than in the past. Regardless of verbal differences, the acts of the Joseph Biden government in its first year essentially amounted to a full continuation of policy of Donald Trump.

The complicated dynamic within Congress makes up the third element. The two parties held virtually equal representation in the increasingly split federal legislature. Recent studies have demonstrated that this led to a situation where legislation was less likely to pass but where individuals and small organisations were more able to exert their influence through negotiations and other House political manoeuvres. These circumstances had an effect on the Cuba issue, which was the subject of numerous bills but did not result in significant legislation (Delgado, López & Gorpinchenko, 2021). The internal aspects reveal a dynamic structure of power groups with various tastes, assets, and levels of fascination with the matter. They dealt with a president that alternated between a hard power neoconservative viewpoint and a more nuanced smart-power one that supported various strategies, as well as a Congress that was powerless to legislate meaningful regulations on the subject.

Security implications: An Analysis

Historic or current perspective, Cuba has always affected the security of the United States. Above discussed factors have defined clearly the implication of US-Cuba relations on the American region. The United States has been the hegemon of the world and it intends to

keep its current status. It is also considerable here that the biggest threat the USA faced was from Cuba back in 1959 when the USA and USSR came to a brink of nuclear war. The USA has been successful in maintaining its influence over the world after the WW-II. It has tried to influence many countries in the region including and many fear US wrath. Cuba has been a hard nut to crack of the USA as compared to other nations.

Where the United States has been able to impose embargo on Cuba, it has failed to bring democratic norms in Cuba. The ideological war is far from over between the USA and Cuba. The US has tried everything in its grasp to change the mindset of Cubans from every aspect. With the passage of time and Cuban migrations to the USA, Cubans in fact, have now have major stake in the US politics. Any president that wants to assure its place in the Washington, needs to persuade the Cuban diaspora in his favor. This leaves us with a notion that Cuba is influencing the United States and its politics and the security of the region. No doubt that Cuban policies for its people have failed to bring any fortune or prosperity and this is capitalized big time by the USA. The continuous worsening law and order situation in Cuba, less opportunities of good life and many factors have led to mass migration of Cubans to the USA. The USA on the other hand, have tried to compensate the Cuban immigrants to undermine Cuban government policies so it could create a sentiment among Cuban people.

But in the 21st century, there has been fluctuations in American policy for Cuba. Where Obama tried to loosen the ropes in Cuban neck, Trump tried to tighten those ropes again and same was continued by Biden. The migrants have been a security threat to the United States.

Migration

In 2022, more Cubans left their country than ever before, exceeding previous highs in the 1980s and 1990s. Between January and September 2022, the United States Border Patrol detained nearly 203,000 Cubans, a sharp rise over the 33,000 detained during the same time in 2021. By far the largest in five years, the United States Coast Guard apprehended over 6,182 Cubans at sea between October 2021 and September 2022. Travelling Cubans to the United States have to deal with violence by criminals and law enforcement along the way, especially in the Darien Gap at the border between Colombia and Panama and at Mexico's southern border. Many Cubans now start their journey in Nicaragua because of Nicaragua's late 2021 decision to eliminate its visa necessities for people of Cuba.

In reaction to the government of Cuba's activities, the US President Kennedy imposed travel restrictions in the country in 1962. The restrictions were imposed because Cuba was inclined towards USSR and the Missile issue. The actions of Cuba were direct threat to the US national security thus, the measure was taken. Even then The Cubans kept flying to the USA due to Cuban internal policies. Since that time, it is against the law for Americans to visit Cuba. Furthermore, a number of laws and rules further distanced Cuba from the United States. The Obama administration started speaking with the interim leader of Cuba, Raul Castro, in 2014. The easing of the travel ban is one topic on the agenda. As a result, the U.S. demanded that the Cuban government adopt new policies in exchange for full travel freedom between the two nations. By 2016, Cuba wanted the 2011 adjustments to be expanded to all travel, while the United States wanted Cuba to adopt new policies in exchange.

Terrorism

It was in the administration of Ronald Reagan when the USA first labeled Cuba as a sponsor of terrorism in 1982. US government took this extreme step upon allegations that Castro provided assistants to communist militant groups in different Latin American states like Nicaragua, El Salvador, Angola and also in African nations. Since then, Cuba has been in state sponsor of terrorism list of the USA along with Iran, Syria and then North Korea. Successive governments came and Cuba remained in that list. This step was taken by the USA to avoid anything bad coming from Cuba and take measures if something happens in their state. This step caused a lot of mistrust and bad blood between the USA and Cuba until the government of Obama who sought to bring ease in US-Cuban relations.

Communism

The United States have always seen Communism as its arch rival and ideological threat. They have been taking actions against communism around the world ever since the end of WW-II. Cuban ideological inclining towards USSR and communism also played huge role in US-Cuban relations. Being a democratic state, the USA has always tried to promote democracy and democratic values around the world one way or another. Same is the case with Cuba. America has always urged Cuba to adopt democracy and give its people their due right to vote and human rights. Castro had always denied this US demand and stuck to communism regardless of consequences. 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.

Trade Embargo

A limited group of socialist nations, including Vietnam, China, North Korea, Laos along with Cuba as a result, it was a crucial ideological associate of the former Soviet Union during the period known as the Cold War, which caused a thaw in relations with the United States of America. When the USA imposed its initial trade embargo on Cuba in 1960, shortly following the Cuban Revolution, relationships with Cuba deteriorated even worse. In the years that followed, Washington was to reinforce the trade embargo against Cuba by passing laws intended to stifle business ties. This also played a crucial part in American security. These sanctions did not let Cuba trade freely which dented its economy. Embargo forced thousands of Cubans to flee from Cuba to settle mostly in the USA's Coastal city of Miami and adjoining area. Where the USA welcomed the Cuban immigrants with open arms as part of their Cuba policy, it also initiated many illegal immigration problems in the United States.

Conclusion

The history of US-Cuban relations is filled with numerous historical and events. Ever since the dawn of 20th century, both nations have seen many ups and downs throughout the century. Cuba that was once a colony of Spain, got its independence from Spain with the help of the USA. Cuba has always been strategically important for the USA. The US influence over the Island nation is evident of that. Cuba impacts security of the USA and the region in many ways. Domestic, Contextual and structural, there are many factors that impact security of the region. Along with that it is also important that the main ideological difference and policy of trade embargo over the Cuba by the USA should also be considered, as these have led to many structural changes in the US policy towards the Island. Many presidents came in the government but the US policy remained same towards Cuba. Although there was an exception of Obama era who tried to change the policy towards Cuba and took measures to bring peace in the hostile terms. Other than that, there has not been big change in the US policy. In this article all the factors involving in the US-Cuban relations and their impact on the security of the region have been explored. Addressing these issues will ultimately lead to a better atmosphere of confidence in these two neighbours.

REFERENCES

- Bulmer-Thomas, V. (2018). *Empire in retreat: The past, present, and future of the United States*. Yale University Press.
- Burnard, T. (2010). Bernard Bailyn and Patricia L. Denault (eds.), Soundings in Atlantic History: Latent Structures and Intellectual Currents. *Journal of American Studies*, 44(3), 640-641.
- Campos, C. O., & Prevost, G. (2017). Cuba's Relations with Latin America. *social research*, 84(2), 487-506.
- Connell-Smith, G. (1966). *The inter-American system*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Domínguez López, E. (2020). Transition and political change. On the dynamic nature of the system and how to study it. *Domínguez López, E. and González Martín, OR (Coords.). How to study the United States*, 13-66.
- Domínguez López, E., & Yaffe, H. (2017). The deep, historical roots of Cuban anti-imperialism. *Third World Quarterly*, 38(11), 2517-2535.
- Domínguez-López, E., & Rodríguez, S. B. (2018). *America in Transition: Changes, Resistance, Realignment*s. Editorial of Social Sciences.
- Engdahl, W. (2018). *Manifest Destiny: democracy as cognitive dissonance*. Wiesbaden: mine Books.
- Fonseca, B., Polga-Hecimovich, J., & Feinberg, R. (2020). Venezuela and Cuba: The Ties That Bind. *Latin American Program*.
- Gilens, M., & Page, B. I. (2014). Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and average citizens. *Perspectives on politics*, 12(3), 564-581.
- González Delgado, D., Domínguez López, E., & Govea Gorpichenko, J. (2021). El Congreso federal de Estados Unidos y la política hacia Cuba. *Universidad de La Habana*, (292).
- Gorodetsky, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Russia Between East and West: Russian Foreign Policy on the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century*. Routledge.
- Haney, P. J., & Vanderbush, W. (1999). The role of ethnic interest groups in US foreign policy: the case of the Cuban American National Foundation. *International studies quarterly*, 43(2), 341-361.

- Hayton, B. (2018). Chinese Assertiveness in the South China Sea: Power Sources, Domestic Politics, and Reactive Foreign Policy. *Young Scholars in Southeast Asia Studies*, 40(2), 339-341.
- Inspire America Foundation. (2019). Inspiring Democracy in Cuba and the Americas *Inspire America.*, Retrieved from: <https://www.inspiredemocracy.org/aboutus.html>.
- Krogstad, J. M., & Flores, A. (2016). Unlike other Latinos, about half of Cuban voters in Florida backed Trump. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/15/unlike-other-latinos-about-half-of-cuban-voters-inflorida-backed-trump/>.
- LaFeber, W. (2002). The Bush Doctrine. *Diplomatic History*, 26(4), 543-558.
- LeoGrande, W. M. (2019). Pushing on an open door? Ethnic foreign policy lobbies and the Cuban American case. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 16(3), 438-456.
- López, E. D., & Pías, J. B. (2016). Estados Unidos y Rusia en el siglo XXI: de la cooperación reticente a la confrontación abierta. *Revista Mexicana de Análisis Político y Administración Pública*, 5(1), 93-118.
- López, E. D., & Rodríguez, R. R. (2022). There and Back Again. *International Journal of Cuban Studies*, 14(2), 309-342.
- López, E. D., & Rodríguez, S. B. (2020). La conformación de la política de Estados Unidos hacia Cuba: las sanciones como política pública. *Estudios del Desarrollo Social: Cuba y América Latina*, 8, 172-198.
- Max, W. (1971). Economía y Sociedad Tomo I. *Editorial Ciencias Sociales, La Habana*.
- Pérez Jr, L. A. (2016). *Cuba en el imaginario de los Estados Unidos*. Nuevo Milenio.
- Pérez, L. A. (1983). *Cuba between empires, 1878-1902*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Prieto Rozos, A. (2014). Visión íntegra de América. *Centro de Estudios Latinoamericanos Manuel Galich, CELAT Escuela de Ciencia Política USAC*.
- Roosevelt, T. (1904). Fourth annual message. *The American Presidency Project*, 6. Retrieved from: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/fourth-annual-message-15>.
- Torreon, B. S., & Plagakis, S. (2020). *Instances of use of United States armed forces Abroad, 1798-2020*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service.
- Yun-Casalilla, B. (2022). Early modern Iberian empires, global history and the history of early globalization. *Journal of Global History*, 17(3), 539-561.