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Preface

The Cuban Research Institute at Florida International University is honored to release this report, The Cuban Diaspora in the 21st Century.

The committee that developed this document began its work on February 12, 2011, led by the Cuban scholars Uva de Aragón (Florida International University), Jorge Domínguez (Harvard University), Jorge Duany (the University of Puerto Rico), and Carmelo Mesa-Lago (University of Pittsburgh). Orlando Márquez, director of Palabra Nueva, a journal of the Havana Catholic Archdiocese, joined the committee in March. The committee’s coordinator, Juan Antonio Blanco (Florida International University), also coauthored the report.

The committee finished drafting the report on July 12, 2011 but put it aside to await the results of a poll of Cuban residents of Miami implemented in September on many of the same issues. The poll was implemented by Florida International University and was commissioned by the committee itself to ensure the highest possible degree of accuracy in describing the public opinions trends cited in this document. The original text was written in Spanish and later translated to English.

The authors have analyzed relations between several states and their diasporas and studied the problems and potentials associated with the Cuban diaspora’s potential role in Cuba’s national development. While this document does not attempt to evaluate the measures adopted by the Cuban government in August 2006, it suggests that Cuba’s so-called economic update would have a better chance of success were it accompanied by a parallel update of the island’s migratory policy.

The authors have reviewed the tensions, conflicts, and traumas in the history of Cuban state’s relationship with its diaspora, but their emphasis is always on the future. Without glossing over problems, they prefer to scan the horizon for possibilities that could bring about a genuine normalization of relations between the diaspora and its country of origin; in particular, changes in existing migratory policy to bring it in line with universally recognized standards. Their analysis also includes the obstacles posed by United States policy toward Cuba, especially for the
Cuban diaspora, and the need for their removal.

The members of the committee—who volunteered their services to produce this report—have formulated a series of recommendations for respectful submission to the governments of Cuba and the United States, as well as to the Cuban diaspora and Cuban civil society.

As the authors note in the conclusion to this document, “Many of the observations, conclusions, and suggestions expressed in this report are aimed at tomorrow, with the hope that they will eventually be implemented in whole or in part. Tomorrow can begin today, however, if the actors with decision-making power in this area so choose, as Cuba so urgently needs.”

Juan Antonio Blanco
Committee Coordinator
Cuban Research Institute
Florida International University
Summary

Between February and July 2011, the Cuban Research Institute (CRI) at Florida International University (FIU) coordinated an academic committee to analyze the relationship between the Cuban diaspora and its country of origin. This research resulted in a report titled, *The Cuban Diaspora in the Twenty-First Century.*

The report aims to make an intellectual contribution to the modernization of Cuban legislation and migratory policy for the purpose of improving the island’s relations with its diaspora. Such an effort, the committee members believe, would significantly benefit the interests of Cuban families on both sides of the Florida Straits.

The committee’s considerations, however, are not confined to the present. The report is written from the perspective of the Cuban diaspora’s potential to contribute to Cuba’s national development, and its recommendations should be viewed as an effort to lay the groundwork for long-term processes.

The authors analyze the different types of state-diaspora relations to evaluate potential problems and opportunities in the future Cuban diaspora’s role in the development of its country of origin. The report identifies examples of successful migratory policies and the desirability for Cuba to take these cases into consideration in formulating its own practices.

Although the report is not intended to evaluate recent economic measures the Cuban government has adopted – which various members of the committee have commented upon elsewhere – it does suggest that these steps would have a greater likelihood of success if they were accompanied by a parallel review of the regime’s migratory policy to bring it into line with existing international standards. It is to be hoped that the President of Cuba’s Council of State, Raúl Castro, was referring to this possibility when he announced this August 1 that his government is working on “an update of migratory policy.”

The committee understands the modernization and normalization of Cuba’s migratory policies to mean, among other things, the elimination of the requirement that Cuban nationals obtain entry and exit permits for travelling from or to the Island; recognition of their right to reside temporarily or permanently in other countries; and other measures designed to facilitate circular migration, such as lower fees and simplified procedures for consular services, air fares, telephone calls, email, validation of academic degrees and
professional licenses, and the removal of other obstacles impeding a normalization of relations with the diaspora.

All of the above implies changes in the current legal system to acknowledge and protect the migratory rights of Cubans on and off the island in light of universally accepted standards.

To this end, the committee recommends two essential measures:

a) Changing Cuba’s laws and its Constitution to remove the requirement for entry and exit permits and guarantee Cubans unrestricted freedom of movement and the right to freely choose their place of residence.

b) Additional modification of the existing legal system to recognize all Cubans—emigrants and residents of the island—as equal under the law and in their ability to participate in the national economy. This should include granting them the same or greater rights as those extended to foreign capital under the 1992 reform of the constitution and Foreign Investment Law No. 77 (1995).

The committee also analyzes the obstacles posed by US policy toward Cuba in allowing members of the diaspora to develop closer links to their country of origin, and advocates the removal of these hurdles. Many Cuban Americans already assist financially needy relatives and friends eager to explore employment and income opportunities in Cuba’s new emerging private sector. Given this sector’s non-state status, the committee considers that the government of the United States should take note of this new reality and act accordingly. The US government could facilitate cooperation between the Cuban diaspora and Cuba’s emerging private sector by excluding economic transactions with the non-state sector of the Cuban economy from the US embargo on the island. This also supposes changes in certain US executive orders and legislation in this area.

The central issue the committee considered was relations between the Cuban diaspora and its country of origin and, from this perspective, the ways these relations are affected by Cuban and US government regulations. The authors of the report consider that both governments should prevent spillover from their bilateral conflict from inhibiting direct relations between Cubans living in these two countries. This issue should be approached in the same spirit that inspires international humanitarian legal principles against making innocent civilians the target of actions designed to cause collateral damage to the enemy.

The committee recognizes and underscores the will displayed by Cuban families over the decades to overcome political barriers and the historical trauma of distance and separation that were imposed upon them.
Finally, the committee calls on other countries that host Cuban emigrant communities, or that serve as transit points for Cuban emigrants on their way to other destinations, to fully respect their rights and offer them the dignified and humane treatment to which they are entitled under multilateral international covenants and treaties.

Cuban Research Institute
Florida International University
Introduction

Cuba and its diaspora have a relationship dating back 200 years. Even in the nineteenth century, Cuban emigration was characterized by a complex combination of social, cultural, religious, economic, and political elements. Then as now, the diaspora community was scattered throughout Latin America, Europe, and, increasingly, the United States, with a more recent presence in Africa.

In its majority, this diaspora views itself as an integral part of the Cuban nation and, as such, has provided uninterrupted support for the literary, artistic, musical, religious, economic, and political endeavors of all who consider themselves to be Cuban, whether they live on the island or elsewhere. The poet José María Heredia, Father Félix Varela, and José Martí are examples of the many and important ways in which such individuals have contributed to the Cuban nation. In turn, several of the Cuban Liberation Army generals who fought for Cuba’s independence were US citizens, among them Pedro Betancourt, Francisco Carrillo, Emilio Núñez, and Carlos Roloff.

The diaspora is and always has been heterogeneous, encompassing a range of political leanings, economic circumstances, and cultural identities. Most complex of all are its emotional and civic links to Cuba. For a significant portion of the diaspora, relations with the Cuban authorities have been generally hostile, particularly in the nineteenth century and again since 1959. This explains why, in the broadest sense, the relationship between Cuba and its diaspora has been so difficult.

Cuba and its diaspora have never developed a shared proposal to construct a better future. In earlier decades, when relations were not hostile, the Cuban government simply behaved as if the diaspora community in Tampa, Key West, New York, Mexico City or Madrid did not exist. In more hostile times, both the Cuban government and the largest diaspora communities, especially those in South Florida, have not hesitated to turn on each other.

A Better, Shared Future

Both Cuba and its diaspora will endure into future generations. The two sides may maintain the hostility that has characterized their relationship for the past half century,
ignore each other as they did during the second quarter of the twentieth century, or recognize the opportunity to build a better, shared future. To follow this last path, they will each need to recognize a few basic premises:

- Mutual respect. All people have the right to be recognized as human beings and to express their ideas about any issue in every context.

- The will to dialogue. There can be no shared future without exchanges between parties who have never really gotten to know each other. The two sides must discuss their differences and explore opportunities for cooperation in the type of venue that only dialogue can offer. All Cubans, no matter where they live, should exercise their right to dialogue.

- Participation. Respectful dialogue requires recognizing the right to pluralistic participation and a human and political climate that guarantees and promotes this right.

- The role of governments. For such participation to be possible, governments must lift the obstacles that stand in the way of meetings between Cubans from the island and the diaspora. Members of the diaspora, especially US citizens, should insist that the US government respect their right to dialogue with Cubans in Cuba. This must include the legal and logistic steps to facilitate travel by residents of the island to the United States. For its part, the Cuban government must recognize the right of Cubans residing in Cuba to hold exchanges with their counterparts in the diaspora and eliminate the legal and logistic obstacles that impede members of the diaspora from visiting the island. It should allow Cuban citizens to travel abroad without requiring additional documentation or permission beyond a passport. Anyone who does not have a domestic or international criminal case pending against them should be free to enter their country of origin regardless of their ideology or political affiliation, or whether or not they have chosen to express opinions in or about a particular country.

Points of Departure

A respectful and participative dialogue will not occur unless both parties acknowledge some important precepts. This does not mean setting prerequisites or preconditions for dialogue; much less “demands” or requirements before discussions can begin. Instead, it
is a matter of recognizing certain points of departure for the prospective participants.

- Cuba experienced a far-reaching social, economic, and political revolution that transformed the nation. Early on, this social revolution enjoyed broad popular support and brought many benefits, especially in the areas of education and public health.

- The Cuban diaspora community, particularly in the United States, experienced a social, economic, and political revolution of its own. This revolution transformed them and they, in turn, transformed South Florida. The most obvious manifestation of this transformation is the community’s entrepreneurial and professional success.

- Both Cuba and its diaspora are experiencing a demographic transition. Cubans age just as quickly on both sides of the Florida Straits. The Cuban population is decreasing, a trend that will accelerate by the end of the current decade. The physical and cultural preservation of the Cuban nation is an agenda all Cubans in and outside of Cuba share.

- In Cuba and in its diaspora, Cubans have shown impressive talent in many spheres of political, military, professional, and entrepreneurial life throughout the nation’s history.

- A propensity toward public insult, personal defamation, unjustified hyperbole, and preconceived notions of the “other” as a murderer, against all democratic values and a traitor to the fatherland, is part of the shared political vocabulary and has acted as a symbolic and practical obstacle to the adoption of behaviors more conducive to mutual understanding.

Advantages of a Shared Future

Cuba has changed in many respects and could begin building a better future through cooperation with sectors of the diaspora that have demonstrated a collaborative spirit. As the future unfolds, new opportunities for cooperation will appear and will facilitate the expansion of opportunities for collaboration among individuals who have the will to work together.
Cuba is a producer of services. Its economy no longer relies as much on agricultural or industrial products, but rather on a wide range of professional services including medical care, tourism, music, and art. Cuba finds ways to “sell” many of these services under the aegis of international cooperation and solidarity or through barter (oil in exchange for services). Cuban Miami, in addition to exporting professional services, generates and invests financial capital, lends its entrepreneurial skills, and provides access to the US market.

For half a century, Cuba has invested significant money and effort into the applied sciences, especially biotechnology, but its economy has benefited little from this investment. In general, investment in human capital, whatever its other virtues, has brought Cuba few economic advantages.

The Cuban diaspora, whose numbers include distinguished scientists, professionals, and artists, has been blocked from contributing to these fields in its country of origin, as diaspora communities normally do.

A shared future would bring multiple advantages. Just as Miami should not ban artists from the island from performing in the city, the Cuban government should not try to stop diaspora musicians from reaching Cuban audiences.

The state of Florida should not block academic collaboration between its universities and those in Cuba, and the Cuban government should not deny visas or entry permits to Cuban scholars in other countries.

Cuba’s relationship with its diaspora could improve significantly if relations between the Cuban and US governments did not exacerbate, impede, or complicate emigrants’ relationship with the island. Improved relations between non-governmental entities and individuals, in turn, could facilitate more favorable relations between the two governments.

Persons of Cuban origin in and outside of Cuba should seek channels for cooperation regardless of their lingering differences. Removing the remaining barriers to this possibility will open a door for exploring a shared future for Cuba and its diaspora.

The tools already exist to build this better future. The basis is cooperation, to add
to and multiply the talents and efforts Cuba and its diaspora have already invested in generating human, social, and financial capital. Wherever possible, this report emphasizes the advantages of cooperation for both sides and the common good.
State-Diaspora Relations

Numerous countries around the world have experienced massive emigration in recent decades. In 2010, around 214 million people lived outside their native countries, approximately 3% of the world’s population. Migrants are also sending more money back home to their families: $440 billion in remittances in 2010.\(^1\) Never before have diasporas played such an important economic role in their countries of origin.

Many migrant-sending countries have begun to view them as an important resource for national development. For these countries, migrants represent sources of investment, commercial ties, entrepreneurial experience, and the transfer of skills and expertise. A growing number of nations—from India and the Philippines to Haiti and El Salvador—have established government ministries and other state offices to serve the needs and interests of their diaspora populations. Some, including China and South Korea, have active policies to incorporate their diasporas in productive ways. Other governments use their consular services to interact systematically with their citizens abroad.\(^2\)

In this context, the issue that has drawn the most public attention is the impact of remittances on national development. For many countries that receive remittances, this flow of cash brings in more external financing than foreign investment or international aid. One of the most successful models for using remittances is Mexico, whose “Tres por Uno” (Three for One) program finances community infrastructure projects with matching contributions from diaspora hometown associations and federal, state, and local funds. Other governments recruit migrants and their descendants to lend their talents and resources to businesses, capital markets, tourism, trade, volunteer organizations, circular migration, and job creation.\(^3\)

---


\(^3\)Raúl Delgado Wise and Margarita Favela, eds., *Nuevas tendencias y desafíos de la migración internacional México-Estados Unidos* (Mexico City: Miguel Ángel Porrúa/Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, 2004); Kathleen Newland, ed., *Diasporas: New Partners in Global Development Policy*
To conceptualize the relations of states with their diasporas, we used the three-part framework formulated by the sociologist Peggy Levitt and the anthropologist Nina Glick Schiller.¹ Most common category in this framework is strategically selective states, which allow expatriates to participate in their countries of origin but do not extend them citizenship rights or incorporate them completely into national affairs. Although this type of government considers the diaspora to be part of the nation, it has yet to institutionalize its relationship with its citizens residing abroad. Examples of strategically selective states include Haiti, Ireland, Turkey, and India.

The second type is transnational nation-states, which define migrants as long-distance members of the nation by recognizing dual citizenship and including them as an integral part of public policy. Among other measures, transnational nation-states restructure their ministerial and consular bureaucracies; extend the right to vote to their citizens abroad; allow these same citizens to run for public office; offer a range of state services to expatriates; and reinforce their sense of belonging to their countries of origin.⁵ The Dominican Republic, El Salvador, and Mexico are examples of this type of state, which “extend[s] beyond the state’s territorial boundaries and incorporate[s] dispersed populations.”⁶

The third and least common type is disinterested and denouncing states, which treat emigrants as though they no longer belong, often branding them as traitors. When two states develop a belligerent relationship, the divided loyalties of emigrants are intensely disputed. In such circumstances, contact between the sending and receiving countries is difficult, sporadic, and even dangerous.⁷ Cold War Cuba, Slovakia, and Vietnam exemplify the exclusion of expatriates for political reasons.

Table 1 summarizes the main differences and similarities between the three types of governments discussed above. The sections that follow briefly describe the cases of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba as examples of the three types of states and their relations with their diasporas. Later we will review the measures these states have

---

taken to improve relations with their citizens who live abroad. Our main goal is to identify concrete ways in which governments can transition away from disinterest and denunciation to maximize the diaspora’s potential impact on national development.

Table 1

Three Basic Types of State-Diaspora Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Haiti</th>
<th>Dominican Republic</th>
<th>Cuba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emigration policy</strong></td>
<td>Strategically selective state</td>
<td>Transnational nation-state</td>
<td>Disinterested and denouncing state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition of dual citizenship</strong></td>
<td>Partial (since May 2011)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right to external vote</strong></td>
<td>Yes (since May 2011)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right to run for elected office from abroad</strong></td>
<td>Partial (excluding the posts of President and Prime Minister)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government office to handle diaspora affairs</strong></td>
<td>Ministry of Haitians Living Abroad</td>
<td>National Council for Dominican Communities Abroad</td>
<td>Bureau of Consular Affairs and Cuban Residents Abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of migration</strong></td>
<td>Mostly one-way</td>
<td>Two-way</td>
<td>One-way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transnational ties to the country of origin</strong></td>
<td>Extensive and extra official</td>
<td>Extensive and official</td>
<td>Limited and unofficial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Haiti: A strategically selective state**

Until the 1990s, the concept of national identity in Haiti was closely linked to residence in the national territory. During the long Duvalier dictatorships (1957–1986), the Haitian government branded emigrants as traitors and enemies of the nation. First under François Duvalier and then his son, Jean-Claude, Haitians who lived abroad were considered to have renounced their citizenship and be officially stateless. The Lavalas movement, led by former priest Jean-Bertrand Aristide, challenged this definition of the diaspora when it gained power in 1991, after the Duvalier regime was toppled in 1986, and the adversity between the Haitian government and its diaspora soon faded.

---

In 1988, the new government set up a commission to study the issue of Haitian emigration. After Aristide’s inauguration in 1991, his government reclaimed all persons of Haitian discordance as part of the nation, regardless of where they lived or the citizenship they held. Aristide himself referred to the diaspora as Haiti’s “Tenth Province,” in addition to the nine that make up the national territory. In 1994, he created a unit assigned to the President’s Office to handle issues relating to Haitians residing abroad. This eventually became the Ministry of Haitians Living Abroad, with the mission to forge closer ties between Haitians in the diaspora and their home country.9

Nevertheless, the diaspora’s claims to national belonging lack a legal basis in Haiti, whose constitution does not recognize the right to dual citizenship. Until recently, the Haitian Chamber of Deputies refused to give official recognition to the diaspora as the country’s “Tenth Province.” Haiti did not allow expatriates to vote in national elections until May 2001, when the Haitian legislature amended the constitution to grant the vote to Haitians residing abroad.10 It also granted expatriates the right to run for public office in Haiti, except for such key offices as president or prime minister; candidates for these positions must have lived in Haiti for three years and renounced all other citizenships before launching their campaigns.

In June 2011, however, current President Michel Martelly revoked this constitutional amendment, citing numerous errors it contained. Despite its transnational rhetoric, therefore, the Haitian state has taken few concrete steps toward political incorporation of its diaspora. While encouraging certain forms of transnational identification, Haiti restricts the activities emigrants may pursue in the country of their birth, making it an example of a strategically selective state as far as emigration is concerned.

Many Haitians in the diaspora cite blood ties and ancestry as lasting bonds to their country of origin.11 Such “long-distance nationalism,” however, has no clear expression

11Glick Schiller and Fouron, “Terrains of Blood and Nation.”
in Haitian law. Even though the country is ever more economically dependent on its diaspora, it has not reformed its political structure to become a transnational nation-state in the sense of Mexico or the Dominican Republic.

To date, the Haitian diaspora has mostly been in one direction: outward, albeit with various destinations (the Dominican Republic, the United States, Canada, France, the Bahamas, the French Antilles, and other countries). Haiti’s precarious economic situation, especially since the 2010 earthquake, has made it difficult for migrants to return. Even so, Haitians in the diaspora use various methods to keep in constant touch with their countrymen. Among their numerous transnational activities, Haitians who live abroad maintain intergenerational family ties, belong to religious organizations, and send remittances back home (a total of $1.971 billion in 2010, more than 30% of the country’s GDP).  

The Dominican Republic: A Transnational Nation-State

Since the 1960s, Dominican emigrants have been popularly known as “los ausentes” (the absent ones)—a term with nostalgic overtones but of little practical use to the Dominican government. Over the last five decades, however, Dominican expatriates have made themselves increasingly more visible in their country of origin. By the mid 1980s, their economic importance—reflected most clearly in remittances—was unquestionable, as was their crucial role in fundraising for national presidential campaigns. Little by little, Dominican emigrants and their descendants have formally rejoined Dominican politics, aided by dual citizenship and the right to the external vote.

Starting in the early 1990s, the Dominican government created a number of institutional mechanisms for incorporating its growing diaspora. In 1991, the Dominican Congress exempted Dominicans residing abroad from paying taxes on gifts brought into...

---

the country at Christmas time. Three years later, it passed a constitutional amendment allowing Dominicans to adopt dual citizenship and granting full political rights to migrants, except the right to run for president or vice president of the republic.\footnote{José Itzigsohn, “Immigration and the Boundaries of Citizenship: The Institutions of Immigrants’ Political Transnationalism,” \textit{International Migration Review} 34, no. 4 (2000): 1126–54; José Itzigsohn and Daniela Villacrés, “Migrant Political Transnationalism and the Practice of Democracy: Dominican External Voting Rights and Salvadoran Hometown Associations,” \textit{Ethnic and Racial Studies} 31, no. 4 (2008): 664–686.} Soon after, in 1994, José Fernández was elected to the Dominican Congress while living in New York. The same amendment also extended Dominican citizenship to children born abroad to Dominican parents.

In 1996, Leonel Fernández, who spent much of his childhood and adolescence in New York, was elected president of the Dominican Republic. He was reelected in 2004 and 2008. Under his leadership, the Dominican government has encouraged Dominicans abroad to invest in the country and to consider resettling there. In October 2000, the Dominican Chamber of Deputies held a seminar in Puerto Rico to identify the concerns of the emigrant population, including civil rights protections and political participation.\footnote{Cámara de Diputados, Comisión de Dominicanos Residentes en el Exterior, \textit{Seminario “El futuro de la comunidad dominicana residente en Puerto Rico”} (Santo Domingo: Cámara de Diputados de la República Dominicana, 2002).} The right to the external vote, approved in 1997, was put into practice for the first time in 2004. The registered voters in those elections included 51,603 Dominicans in the United States, Puerto Rico, Spain, Venezuela, and Canada. The number of voters registered abroad tripled to 154,789 in 2008, ranking the diaspora ninth in the number of voters in any of the country’s provinces.\footnote{Junta Central Electoral, República Dominicana, \textit{Elecciones ordinarias presidenciales del año 2004: Total voto del exterior} (2011), \url{http://resultadoselectorales.jce.gob.do/boletines/2004/boletines2004.asp} (accessed June 15, 2011).}

In 2006, President Fernández created the Presidential Support Program for Dominican Communities Abroad as part of a commitment to integrate Dominican emigrants into the nation’s development. In 2008, the Dominican Congress officially established the National Council for Dominican Communities Abroad. The Fernández administration has also increased the number of leading diaspora figures named to consular posts in New York, San Juan, and other cities.

In sum, the Dominican Republic has become a transnational nation-state. This type of state defines its members not by citizenship, place of birth, or residence, but according to ties of blood and ancestry.\footnote{Nina Glick Schiller, “Transmigrants and Nation-States: Something Old and Something New in the

---

The Cuban Diaspora in the XXI Century
passport they hold, Dominicans and their descendants are officially part of the Dominican nation. Like other transnational nation-states, the Dominican Republic has reclaimed its emigrants, even those who have become citizens of other countries. As members of a transnational community, many Dominicans switch constantly between “aquí” (here) and “allá” (there) in their daily lives—so much so that the Dominican producers of a popular television show in Boston adopted this slogan as its name.

In recent decades the Dominican diaspora has grown into a massive two-way flow, with return migration accounting for a significant part of the tide. The round-trip movement between the Dominican Republic, the United States, and other countries has strengthened ties between Dominicans in their country of origin and those residing abroad. Dominicans in the United States today participate more often in transnational activities than most other Latino groups. Many of them attend Dominican cultural events, belong to hometown associations, and cast their votes in Dominican elections. Dominicans abroad also call their country of origin, travel, and send money there on a much more regular basis than many other immigrant groups.  

In comparison with other Latin American and Caribbean countries, the level of Dominican remittances is extraordinarily high. In 2010, the Dominican Republic received $2.908 billion in remittances, ranking it fifth in this category in the Americas. At least 20% of Dominican households receive money regularly from relatives and friends in the United States, Spain, Puerto Rico, and other countries.


Cuba: Between Disinterest and Denunciation

As noted earlier, Levitt and Glick Schiller characterize Cuba as a disinterested and denouncing state with regard to its diaspora. The Cuban government withholds dual citizenship and other legal rights (such as the external vote) from those who definitively leave the country. Officially, Cuban citizens who adopt another nationality lose their Cuban citizenship, although in practice many Cubans who live abroad have two passports.\(^\text{20}\) To visit Cuba, they must request an entry permit from a Cuban diplomatic or consular office.\(^\text{21}\)

Cubans differ from other contemporary cases of transnationalism in several ways. Above all, the long history of antipathy between the Cuban and US governments, as well as between the Cuban government and its diaspora, colors all contacts between the two. “The main difference between Cubans and other [transnational] groups,” writes Cuban American sociologist Yolanda Prieto, “is that Cubans cannot participate in their homeland’s political process.”\(^\text{22}\) Since the 1959 Revolution, many Cubans abroad have developed an antagonistic relationship with the island’s government. As Roger Waldinger and David Fitzgerald point out, in states “where emigration is tantamount to betrayal, the regular and sustained contacts between source and destination societies that supposedly distinguish transnationals from immigrants are not just out of the question, but imperil sending-country residents whom the transnationals try to contact or help.”\(^\text{23}\) In this respect, Cuban exiles have much in common with other refugees who flee their countries in fear of persecution, incarceration, torture, and even death, and in consequence do not want to return.\(^\text{24}\)

A distinctive aspect of the Cuban case is the persistent animosity between the revolutionary government and its diaspora. Ever since the 1960s, the Cuban government has considered exiles traitors to the nation and has expelled members of the opposition. During the Cold War, the US government encouraged the Cuban exodus for symbolic
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reasons, praising Cubans for “voting with their feet” against communism. This policy made contacts between Cubans on and off the island more difficult. Travel, mail, and phone service between the two countries became sporadic, expensive, and complicated. “During the Cold War,” Susan Eckstein notes, “the two governments blocked cross-border bonding among Cubans united by blood and a shared culture.”

Several characteristics of the Cuban diaspora derive from its historical tensions with the Cuban Revolution. Since 1961, the Cuban state has equated leaving the island with “abandoning” the country for good. Under Cuban law, emigrants are considered to have “permanently exited” the country and lose their civil, political, and social rights, including the right to own property in Cuba. Until recently, those who announced their intention to move abroad also lost their jobs. Many were marginalized by their neighbors and coworkers, and the majority were not allowed to return to Cuba except for short visits. The Cuban diaspora since the revolution, therefore, has mostly been in one direction, in contrast to the two-way flow of the Dominican diaspora.

Until the 1990s, Cuba restricted emigration by age, gender, and occupation. The island’s prolonged economic crisis, however, resulted in a relaxation of the requirements for travel abroad. Today, some Cubans are able to live abroad temporarily without losing the right to return to Cuba. Between 1995 and 2004, the Cuban government issued around 30,000 Permissions for Residency Abroad (PRE), which authorize the holders to enter and exit the country freely. The permits are most
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often granted to Cubans who live in Europe and Latin America, and only rarely to residents of the United States. Cubans who live abroad are still required to obtain entry and exit permits when they visit the island, and those who left after 1971 must carry a Cuban passport to return to Cuba, whether or not they have become citizens of other countries.

The Cuban government has made some overtures toward the diaspora, but it has not developed a coherent position on such key questions as repatriation, retirement, and investment. As Cuban historian Jesús Arboleya acknowledges, “the rights and duties of émigrés and their descendants with regard to the Cuban nation haven’t been clarified adequately.” To date, the Cuban government does not allow emigrants to open businesses or buy property in Cuba, although citizens of countries such as Spain and Canada are permitted to do so. Entry visas for Cuban Americans continue to be much more expensive than they are for foreign tourists. Travel to and from Cuba is restricted to a small fraction of Cubans on and off the island. The Cuban government continues to consider anyone who was born in its territory to be a Cuban citizen, even if that person holds a passport from the United States, Spain, or another country. For those who live abroad, keeping their Cuban passport offers few practical advantages; in some cases, such as international travel, it is a great disadvantage, because most countries require that Cubans have a visa to enter.

Belligerence has been the dominant tone in US-Cuban relations since 1959. During the Carter administration (1977–1980), however, the United States began loosening its policy toward Cuba. In 1977, “interest sections” were opened in Havana and Washington, a first step toward restoring diplomatic relations. In response, the government of Fidel Castro approached moderate elements of the Cuban American community in November-December 1978, inviting 140 emigrants to debate issues of common interest, including travel to Cuba.

Along with this so-called Dialogue, the Cuban government freed 3,600 political prisoners and allowed around 150,000 exiles to visit the country between 1979 and 1982. Castro began to refer to exiles as “the Cuban community abroad” instead of “gusanos” (worms). In the everyday Cuban vernacular, “worms” were transformed into “butterflies,” “traidores” (traitors) into “trae dólares” (bringers of dollars). According to


some estimates, Cuban exiles sent between $300,000 to $1 billion annually to Cuba in the 1980s. The Cuban government even allowed exiles to bring in household goods such as television sets, stereo equipment, and other electronic appliances.

Relations between the Cuban government and the diaspora turned tense again after the Mariel boatlift in 1980. The Cuban authorities mounted an intense propaganda campaign to discredit the “marielitos,” as they were contemptuously called. Ironically, the US media perpetuated negative images of the Mariel arrivals as the dregs of Cuban society. “The immediate effect of this ideological campaign,” Cuban American political scientist María de los Ángeles Torres points out, “was to reduce the number of visits allowed to Cuban exiles.” In May 1985, in response to the United States’ creation of the anti-Castro outlet Radio Martí, the Cuban government banned exiles from returning and suspended its immigration accords with the United States. Emigrants were not allowed to visit the island again until the next year.

After 1989, the end of socialism in Eastern Europe and the eventual collapse of the Soviet Union left Cuba with few commercial partners. The Cuban government turned to tourism as its primary option for reinsertion into the global market and to the diaspora as a readily available source of cash. To this end, the regime in Havana renewed its efforts to “normalize” its contacts with the diaspora. As Eckstein notes, “Cuba followed a growing trend among Third World governments, including those of the Dominican Republic and El Salvador, to reclaim their emigrant population.” Emigration and remittances became two of Cubans’ most common survival strategies during the economic crisis, known as the Special Period in Times of Peace.

While the Cuban government encouraged certain contacts between Cuban
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34 Torres, *In the Land of Mirrors*, 109.
Americans and the island after 1989, the US government tended to discourage them. Between 2004 and 2008, to take an extreme case, President George W. Bush imposed draconian restrictions on remittances and travel to Cuba. When he was elected in November 2008, President Barack Obama promised to facilitate contacts between Cubans in and outside of Cuba. In March 2009, the Obama administration eliminated most US restrictions on Cuban American travel and remittances to Cuba, although it reiterated the ban on travel by US citizens not of Cuban descent in September of the same year.

Like many other migrant-sending countries, the Cuban government took steps to reform its bureaucracy to address diaspora issues. In 1994, Cuba’s Ministry of Foreign Relations opened a Bureau of Cuban Residents Abroad, later renamed the Bureau of Consular Affairs and Cuban Residents Abroad. In 1995, the Ministry launched a glossy periodical, \textit{Correo de Cuba}, subtitled “the journal of Cuban emigration,” to publicize the bureau’s activities. That June, the Union of Writers and Artists of Cuba and the University of Havana cosponsored a symposium on national culture and identity. Twenty Cuban intellectuals from abroad attended.\footnote{Unión de Escritores y Artistas de Cuba y Universidad de La Habana, eds., \textit{Cuba: Cultura e identidad nacional} (Havana: Unión, 1995).}

Since the 1990s, the Cuban government has organized several forums on the topic of “nation and emigration.” The first, held in Havana in April 1994, attracted approximately 220 members of the exile community. The second conference, in November 1995, drew 357 representatives of the Cuban diaspora from 37 countries. This number increased again, to 520 emigrants from 49 countries, at the third conference, in May 2004.\footnote{Ajay Díez, “La emigración cubana en los años noventa,” 12; Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, Cuba, \textit{Nación y emigración}, \url{http://www.nacionyemigracion.cu/inicio.html} (accessed June 15, 2011).} US travel to Cuba was among the main topics of discussion at these gatherings.

Eckstein summarizes the initiatives taken by the Cuban authorities to encourage visits by Cuban Americans during the post-Soviet era:

They removed the caps on the number of Cuban Americans permitted to visit annually, they extended the length of time of permissible visits, and they made travel more affordable by ceasing to require visiting émigrés to stay in state-run hotels . . . . Cuban authorities also reduced bureaucratic hurdles. To make visits more likely, they introduced multiple entry permits.\footnote{Eckstein, \textit{The Immigrant Divide}, 135.}
To date, however, efforts to expand the “dialogue” between Cubans on and off the island have been weak. With the exception of two brief truces in the late 1970s and early 1990s, the last five decades have been characterized by a policy of open confrontation and mutual isolation. Many Cuban officials still perceive exiles as enemies and refer to Miami Cubans as “the Cuban American mafia.” In turn, the majority of exiles consider the Castro brothers’ government to be a ruthless dictatorship. Even so, official tensions have not entirely suppressed unofficial ties between Cuba and its diaspora. As Cuban American sociologist Silvia Pedraza has documented, many Cuban Americans remain in contact with relatives and friends on the island in spite of the obstacles created by the Cuban and US governments. 39

For the most part, Cuban transnationalism has developed outside of official channels. The financial, political, and emotional cost of maintaining family ties with Cuba is still relatively high. On average, Cubans call, travel, and send money home less frequently than other US Latinos. 40 Only rarely do they manage to own property on the island, and when they visit Cuba they bring few Cuban-made products with them when they return to the United States (mostly because the US government prohibits it). Nevertheless, Cuba’s prolonged economic crisis since 1989 has revitalized kinship ties between Cubans on both sides of the divide. Remittances have increased, albeit to only moderate levels compared to other Caribbean and Central American countries. In 2009, Cuba received approximately $1.239 billion in remittances, mostly from the United States, Spain, and Venezuela. 41

Policies for Improving State-Diaspora Relations

Table 2 summarizes the efforts of states around the world to incorporate their diaspora populations. (Much of the information for this table was compiled from Migration Policy
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40 Orozco et al., Transnational Engagement, Remittances, and Their Relationship to Development; Waldinger, Between Here and There.
These public policies fall into nine categories: 1) establishment of government institutions; 2) relations with non-governmental actors; 3) dual citizenship laws; 4) external voting; 5) investment incentives; 6) “brain circulation”; 7) ethnic tourism; 8) nostalgic trade; and 9) relations with charitable and volunteer organizations. Each of these policies is examined in detail below.

Table 2

Effective Policies for Improving Government-Diaspora Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Establishment of government institutions | Philippines  
A. Establish well-financed, technically-equipped administrative structures in coordination with other government agencies  
B. Take advantage of the talent and experiences of citizens residing abroad  
C. Incorporate sectors that represent a range of interests and perspectives within the diaspora  
D. Collaborate with international organizations to recruit skilled migrants willing to work in the country of origin  
E. Act as a link between the governments of the sending country and the host country  
F. Provide services to the diaspora (education, health, documentation) at consular offices in the host country  
G. Encourage the creation of hometown associations in the country | Haiti  
Philippines  
Mexico  
Mali |
| II. Relations with non-governmental actors | Haiti  
Mexico |
| A. Promote the development of hometown associations, religious, professional, and other non-governmental organizations in the diaspora | Haiti  
Mexico |
| B. Lobby sending and receiving countries | |

See especially Kathleen Newland’s edited volume, Diasporas: New Partners in Global Development Policy.
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>to extend political rights to diaspora communities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Form alliances with other groups (labor, religious) to gain their support in influencing migratory policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Raise funds for political candidates and parties amenable to diaspora interests</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Use the electronic communications media—especially the Internet—to stay in contact and promote diaspora causes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Preserve the cultural legacy of the country of origin through art, music, film, literature, and other means of cultural expression</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Assist the country of origin in recovering from disasters such as earthquakes and hurricanes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **III. Dual citizenship laws** | **Germany**
| **A. Extend political rights to emigrants and their descendants abroad** | **Colombia**
| **B. Eliminate the legal requirement to renounce one citizenship before taking another** | **Dominican Republic**
| **C. Broaden the concept of citizenship from *jus solis* (place of birth or residence) to *jus sanguinis* (place of origin or ancestry)** |   |
| **D. Amend the constitution to include migrants as citizens of the country of origin** |   |
| **E. Abandon the principle of exclusive citizenship to facilitate the integration of migrants in the countries where they settle** |   |
| **F. Extend the right to enter and leave the country of origin without the need for visas** |   |
| **G. Recognize migrants’ right to own property in the country of origin** |   |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **IV. External vote** | **Dominican Republic**
| **A. Allow expatriates to participate in the electoral process in their country of origin** | **Mexico**
| **B. Reserve congressional seats in the country of origin for diaspora** | **Colombia**
|   | **Italy**
|   | **Portugal**

---
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representatives
C. Eliminate legal residency requirements for participating in national elections
D. Reconceptualize the nation as a political and ethnic community scattered across different territories
E. Adapt republican notions of citizenship to a world where political borders are increasingly blurry
F. Clearly define who has a right to the external vote (individuals born in the country and their descendants)
G. Provide practical mechanisms for implementing the external vote (access to registration and ballot casting)
H. Facilitate the external vote with the help of consulates in the host countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Investment incentives</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Attract small and medium diaspora businesses through loans, credits, and matching funds</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Provide education and technical training to develop knowledge-intensive industries (science, engineering, business administration)</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Reduce import taxes for bringing prime materials and equipment into the country of origin</td>
<td>Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Establish regular consultations with diaspora professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Issue multiple-entry visas to facilitate movement by entrepreneurs and investors between the sending and receiving country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Simplify the bureaucratic procedures for setting up businesses in the country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Offer fiscal incentives to diaspora entrepreneurs and investors in strategic economic areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. Promote “brain circulation”</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Encourage the return of highly qualified workers (scientists, engineers) to their country of origin</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Organize professional contact networks to link the diaspora and the country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Facilitate temporary visits by diaspora professionals with more flexible entry visas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Simplify bureaucratic procedures for obtaining work and residency permits in the country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Improve the educational and health care infrastructure in the country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Attract students, retirees, athletes, and skilled workers from the diaspora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Improve educational and professional development opportunities in the country of origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| VII. Promote ethnic tourism |
| A. Develop marketing campaigns and tourism packages targeting the diaspora population, including educational, medical, religious, and cultural tourism |
| B. Subsidize cultural and sporting events of special interest for ethnic tourism (for example, patron saint festivals) |
| C. Develop a strong online media presence (including social networks) |
| D. Market national brands on multiple media platforms |
| E. Facilitate access to public documents of genealogical interest (birth, death, marriage, and baptism certificates) |
| F. Eliminate visa requirements for citizens living abroad |
| G. Subsidize the conversion of historic buildings into restaurants and hotels |
| H. Offer the same quality of facilities and services to visiting members of the diaspora community as to other tourists |

| VIII. Promote the nostalgia trade |
| A. Stimulate exports of handcrafts and artisanal products |
| B. Facilitate the manufacture, transportation, and distribution of products associated with the country |

| India |
| Ireland |
| Israel |
| Mexico |
| Vietnam |

| Spain |
| Mexico |
| France |
| Italy |
of origin
C. Promote artistic, musical, and film production of interest to diaspora consumers
D. Collaborate with private and public trade associations in areas with large diaspora communities
E. Protect national products and brands from unfair competition abroad
F. Promote cooperative agreements between small producers of agricultural and manufactured goods for the nostalgia trade

IX. Relations with charitable and volunteer organizations
A. Seek out individual and group donors in the diaspora
B. Establish collaborative relationships between donors in receiving countries and the country of origin
C. Recruit prominent individuals and groups in the diaspora
D. Attract skilled workers from the diaspora to participate in volunteer missions
E. Develop programs for young people in the diaspora to work with community groups in the country of origin

Ireland
Vietnam
Philippines

The Role of Government Institutions

Many countries with large emigrant populations—including Mexico, India, the Philippines, Haiti, and Mali—have created offices to administer relations with their diasporas. Most of these offices operate as part of the federal or national government, usually as ministries or vice-ministries. The main challenge such offices face is a scarcity of financial, technical, and human resources. These institutions should mold themselves to fit the particular circumstances of their respective diasporas and reevaluate their programs and services as necessary. They would do well to follow the success of countries such as Mexico in developing a trusted dialogue between diaspora and government representatives to avoid mistakes and learn from past experiences.  

43 Agunias, Closing the Distance.
Relations with Non-Governmental actors

In addition to creating their own administrative structures, governments with large diaspora populations can form strategic alliances with civil society organizations. These can include groups of migrants from the same region (hometown associations), professional and religious organizations, alumni groups, political party affiliations, and community and charitable organizations. These groups tend to have a wide and diverse agenda ranging from advocating dual citizenship and external voting to recognition of ethnic and religious minorities, and often play an important role in recovery efforts after natural disasters. The governments of sending countries should identify the sectors of the diaspora these groups represent, their activities and resources, and the ways they can best contribute to national development. The most successful example may be the lobbying efforts by Jewish organizations in the United States to support the state of Israel.44

Dual Citizenship Laws

A growing number of sending governments offer legal recognition to their citizens abroad, even those emigrants who become citizens of other countries. Currently, at least 100 countries around the world recognize some form of dual citizenship.45 These include 16 countries in Latin America: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Dual citizenship allows migrants to adopt new political loyalties without losing their rights in their countries of origin, including the right to vote, own property, and re-enter the country. The main practical benefit of dual citizenship is that it allows migrants to enter and leave the country of their birth and the country of their residence without legal restrictions.46 The extension of dual citizenship

strengthens migrants’ ties to their countries of origin and facilitates their incorporation into the countries where they settle.

**External Voting**

Along with dual citizenship, the right to cast votes from abroad in national elections is increasingly common. Many Latin American countries passed constitutional and electoral reforms in the 1990s granting this right to their diasporas. A growing number of governments have eliminated the legal requirement that citizens reside in the country of origin as a prerequisite for voting. Countries such as Italy, Portugal, and Colombia even reserve seats in their legislatures for representatives of expatriate communities. Two of the most common mechanisms for implementing external voting are polling places at embassies and consulates and mail-in ballots. Although the practical difficulties involved in these operations have contributed to low turnouts among some emigrant groups, the external vote is a basic way to ensure a diaspora’s political participation in its country of origin and encourage it to continue sending remittances.

**Investment Incentives**

Some migrant-sending countries have recruited business and investment leaders in the diaspora to contribute to job creation and economic growth. The cases of China, India, Ireland, and Israel demonstrate that diasporas can contribute the capital, technology, expertise, and commercial networks needed to develop knowledge-based industries such as information and biotechnology. Several of these governments have facilitated access to capital and training and have lowered taxes on imports of prime materials and equipment, among other initiatives designed to foment this type of activity. They have also allowed diaspora investors and business owners to enter and leave their countries freely. Such measures send a clear message that diaspora entrepreneurs are welcome in their country of origin.

**“Brain Circulation”**

Many countries have lost human talent through “brain drain,” the emigration of large
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47 Bauböck, “Stakeholder Citizenship and Transnational Political Participation.”
numbers of highly qualified citizens. Better salaries, working conditions, and opportunities for professional development in the more industrialized economies of Western Europe and North America attract professionals, scientists, and technical personnel from less industrialized countries in Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, and Africa. For countries that lose professionally and technically qualified migrants, the challenge is how to salvage human resources that have been transferred abroad. Some governments, among them the Philippines, China, and India, have encouraged the return of well-trained workers by offering more flexible entry visas and simplified requirements for living and working in the country of origin. Improved physical and institutional infrastructure, especially in the areas of health care and education, has also been a priority for these governments.\textsuperscript{49} Their experiences suggest that it is possible, albeit difficult, to stimulate “brain circulation” instead of “brain drain” among developed and developing regions of the world.

**Ethnic Tourism**

A growing proportion of migrants and their descendants make regular visits to their countries of origin. Diaspora tourists usually stay with relatives or in small hotels, eat at local restaurants, buy locally produced items, and contribute more to the local economy than do other types of tourists. Many return “home” on special dates such as Christmas, local festivals, or other ritual occasions such as birthdays and weddings. Ethnic tourism can generate demand for new types of goods and services in the receiving country, including package trips to sites of cultural or genealogical interest. Governments can capitalize on the younger generation’s interest in finding their ancestral “roots” through guided visits to their countries of origin. Several countries—India, Ireland, Israel, Mexico and Vietnam—promote the temporary return of their diasporas, in some cases waiving visa requirements.\textsuperscript{50}

**Nostalgic trade**

Increasingly, emigrants represent an important consumer market for their countries of origin. Buying ethnic products is a way of maintaining cultural traditions in a foreign


country. Nostalgic trade consists of exporting goods produced in the country of origin—food, handcrafts, traditional clothing—for consumption in the diaspora. Latin American and Caribbean immigrants import large quantities of rum, cigars, tamales, bread, tea, and cheese, among other products, from their countries of origin. Small ethnic businesses in the receiving countries, the United States among them, serve as intermediaries for these products. Spain and Mexico have promoted traditional craft collectives to serve this market, while other countries, including Italy and France, have protected the identity of national brands (for products such as wine and olive oil) against infringement by third-party knockoffs.

Relations with Charitable and Voluntary Organizations

Historically, immigrants and their descendants have donated money to promote different causes in their countries of origin. Today’s diaspora communities include numerous prominent individuals and voluntary organizations interested in contributing to the development of the countries to which they can trace their ancestry. They include public figures, business executives, athletes, artists, and other influential individuals, as well as hometown associations, private foundations, religious groups, and other donors. The experiences of various foundations in India, the Philippines, Lebanon, and Colombia have shown that diasporas can make significant charitable contributions to their countries of origin and represent an important source of volunteers and professional expertise for local development projects. Charitable incentives and matching funds have been effective mechanisms for channeling donations of time and money in tandem with government- and NGO-supported international aid programs.

The Cuban Diaspora in the United States

Demographic and Economic Characteristics
Available data on the Cuban community in the United States, by far the main destination for Cuban emigrants, reflect the group’s economic and political influence in this country. The 2010 United States Census counted 50.5 million Hispanics, 16% of a national population of 308.7 million. Individuals of Cuban descent accounted for 3.5% of Hispanics, in third place after Mexicans (31.8 million, 63%) and Puerto Ricans (4.6 million, 9.2%). These three groups together represent three-quarters of the US Hispanic population. A total of 1,785,547 Cubans and their descendants live in the United States, most of them—1,213,438—in Florida, where they make up the largest Latin American immigrant group, especially in Miami-Dade County. According to Census figures, the number of Cubans in the United States grew by almost 44% between 2000 and 2010.

Fifty-eight percent of Cuban Americans speak English fluently, a 2008 Pew Hispanic Center poll reported. Education levels were higher than in the rest of the Hispanic community, with one-fourth of Cuban Americans holding a university degree, compared to only 12.9% of other Hispanics.

In 2000, the median annual household income for Cuban Americans was $30,084, representing an aggregate total of $14.2 billion for the 1.2 million Cuban Americans then residing in the US. The authors of a study published in 2003 estimated that if the value
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of Cuban American-owned homes and businesses were added in, the real figure would be anywhere from $40 to 50 billion.\textsuperscript{57}

More recent research from the Pew Hispanic Center published in 2008 estimates the median personal income of Cuban Americans aged 16 and older at $26,478, compared to $21,488 for other Hispanics in this age group. The real estate crisis and recession that began in September 2007 may have led to a decline in these resources.

The difference between Cuban Americans and other US Latino groups is even greater when the percentage of Cubans who lived below the poverty line in 2008, before the recession, is compared with other Hispanic communities: 13.2\% vs. 20.7\%. The national poverty rate at the time was 12.7\%. No less important, 59.7\% of Cubans owned their own homes before the housing bubble burst, compared to 49.1\% of other Hispanics and a national rate of 66.6\%.\textsuperscript{58}

\textbf{Political Trends and Identities}

More than half of Cubans in the United States (58.2\%) in 2008 were US citizens. They enjoy much greater political representation than other immigrant groups at all levels of government: local, state, and federal. Of 13 Hispanic representatives in the Florida state legislature, only two are not of Cuban descent (one is Puerto Rican and the other has Spanish ancestry).

Six Cuban Americans currently serve in the US Congress. The presence of these Cuban Americans in both houses of Congress, along with the efficacy of the organized political lobby led by Cuban American civil society groups, has been an influential—but not the only—factor in US laws and policies toward Cuba under successive administrations, both Democratic and Republican.

Several universities and institutes in the United States have tracked the evolution of the Cuban American community. Invariably, research involving Cuba leads not only to academic debate but also heated political and ideological discussions. Studies of the

\textsuperscript{57}Díaz-Briquets and Pérez-López, \textit{The Role of the Cuban-American Community in the Cuban Transition}, 1.

\textsuperscript{58}Median annual income divides the population into exactly two parts: one half with income that exceeds the median and the other with income below it.
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diaspora are no exception. In fact, some members of the Cuban American community consider it to be “politically incorrect” to refer to Cubans outside of the island as emigrants or a diaspora. They prefer to be known as exiles, the term used to define them for decades and which they consider to be their true group identity.

Diasporas are complex and plural communities, made up of individuals with different reasons for emigrating and resettling in another country. Their members may define themselves as political refugees, asylum seekers, exiles, economic migrants, victims of wars or natural disasters, etc. Many diasporas include some exiles, but that does not mean that the entire diaspora community is composed of “refugees” in the sense of people who fled their country for fear of political, ethnic, or religious persecution. By the same token, exiles are by definition emigrants, in the sense of having relocated to another country, even if their motivation for doing so was political and not primarily economic.

The concept of a diaspora comes mostly from the history of the Jewish people and the saga of the African slave trade, and is therefore associated with the notion of forced displacement as a result of conflict, persecution, or discrimination. Over time, the use of the term has become more flexible and has grown to include individuals in search of a better life and opportunities they believe do not exist in their country of origin, but who continue to sustain a relationship with that country. In other words, the members of a diaspora can have many reasons for leaving their birth country and settling abroad, temporarily or permanently. The common denominator is a desire to maintain the various ties that bind them to their country of origin, despite their belief that it could not meet their aspirations—whether personal or collective—at the time they decided to emigrate. 59

This report uses the term *diaspora* to refer to communities of nationals who have settled in other countries for a range of reasons, and whose members tend to maintain various types of interaction—family, economic, cultural, or political—with their country of origin, even if part of the community opts to distance itself from it and integrate into the society of the host country. 60 This type of interaction—pursued beyond the borders of the sending country and in some cases legally enshrined in dual citizenship status — has been facilitated in recent decades by the impact of mass transportation and new

59 According to Gabriel Sheffer, “Modern Diasporas are ethnic minority groups of migrant origins and acting in host countries but maintaining strong sentimental and material links with their countries of origin – their homelands”. Gabriel Sheffer, *A New Field of Study: Modern Diasporas in International Politics* (London: Croom Helm, 1986), 3.
60 Shaffer, *A New Field of Study*. 

The Cuban Diaspora in the XXI Century

40
forms of information and communication technology. States can promote or obstruct the network of transnational relations that diaspora communities forge with their countries of origin, or, in some circumstances, vulnerable sectors and regions can grow to depend on constructive cooperation with their diasporas.

Increasingly since the twentieth century, emigrant communities have developed and sustained multiple cultural, economic and political ties with their countries of origin, altering former perceptions of these communities as segregated and marginal offshoots of their respective countries. The growth of diaspora communities and the complex web of relations they sustain with their countries of origin have led some experts to begin speaking of transnational nations, a concept used to describe a part of a nation that is physically located outside its territorial borders but that maintains such fluid interactions with it that it cannot be considered separate from national life. While some of these processes began to develop even before the twentieth century, new technologies and the phenomenon of globalization have extended and deepened their impact.

In the specific case of Cuba, the diaspora includes a sector of individuals who view themselves as exiles or political refugees and may or may not belong to and participate in organizations and activities associated with exile politics. Others abandon Cuba without developing an opposition consciousness and do not identify themselves as “exiles,” claiming instead to have “emigrated” in search of better personal opportunities. Nevertheless, certain peculiar aspects of the Cuban diaspora represent a common denominator among those who describe themselves as exiles and those who prefer to avoid this term. Except for a minority with foreign residency permits, all Cubans residing outside of the country—whether they describe themselves as exiles or emigrants, whatever their reason for relocating—have a “permanent exit” stamp in their passports. All have lost the right to live in their country of origin.

61 Alejandro Portes refers to this phenomenon as transnationalism and defines it as communities that mobilize family and cultural ties to overcome spatial barriers and formal government regulations to ensure a constant flow of people, goods and information to and from their country of origin. Portes, *Economic Sociology: A Systematic Inquiry* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 195.


As a result of this policy, a relevant segment of the Cuban nation has been formally excluded from their country of origin, which they can only visit with a special permit that may be revoked at any time without explanation. This is the main difference between the Cuban diaspora and emigrants from other countries, whose movements are governed by internationally accepted immigration laws.

**Obstacles to Full Incorporation of the Diaspora**

Cubans are required a government permit to emigrate or even travel. If they leave without the right permit, or if the permit expires before they reenter the country, they may be considered “deserters” and refused permission to live in Cuba, which from then on they may only visit for a month at a time with the appropriate visa. For Cubans, therefore, emigration represents a permanent life decision with no possibility of circular migration. The state has the right to confiscate all of their belongings—from their homes to their bicycles, right down to trivial objects like board games. These peculiarities of the Cuban case present Cuban migrants with additional challenges to those emigrants of other nationalities face.

Long-distance calling rates to Cuba are the highest in the Western Hemisphere and personal access to the Internet is not available on the island except via an official, state-assigned email address or on the black market. Tourists using Internet services at their hotels face steep surcharges. Cuba is among the seven Latin American and

---

2011, the VI Congress of the Cuban Communist Party studied the possibility of facilitating travel by Cubans to other countries. Statements by President Raúl Castro at the conclusion of the seventh session of the National Popular Power Assembly on August 1, 2011 included the announcement that the Cuban government is planning to review its migratory policy. At the time this report was finalized, the scope of any possible reform was unknown.

64In the case of Cuban Americans, the Cuban government prefers to issue “entry permits” instead of visas to indicate one-time visits to the island not to exceed one month, with a possible extension to two. When multiple entry visas are needed, Cuban Americans must “adjust” their passports, which must be renewed at regular intervals and can be revoked at any time.

65By circular migratory patterns, we mean the ability of migrants to leave their country of origin to obtain financial resources or professional experience and return to invest these resources there, where their capital will yield a much greater return on investment and their newly gained skills face much less competition than in a developed country. Some experiences even point to a pattern of cyclic migration, in which migrants may return to their country of origin if their projects fail to prosper but repeat the endeavor with more success a second time. Cuba’s policy of “permanent exit” stops migrants and the country from reaping the benefits of such a circular pattern. For an analysis of circular migratory movements see Newland et al., “Learning by Doing.”

66There are known to be discussions in Cuba about ending confiscations, but at the time this report was prepared any such development had yet to materialize.
Caribbean countries with the lowest connectivity; only 2.9% of respondents in a survey by Cuba’s National Statistics Office (ONE) claimed to have accessed the Internet even once in 2008.\(^{67}\)

The consular paperwork Cuban Americans must obtain to visit the country of their birth—or to invite relatives in Cuba out of the country for a visit—is cumbersome and expensive. Cuban passports can cost up to $400 at a US consulate and are valid for only two years, after which they may be extended for another two years for an additional fee. Keeping a Cuban passport for six years implies an expense of at least $730, not including processing fees.\(^{68}\) Airplane tickets to Cuba from Miami, the closest US airport (less than 100 miles away), cost anywhere from $300 to $600—sometimes even more, depending on the season. It is sometimes possible to fly from Miami as far as Barcelona for the same price.

**Migratory Policy: A Necessary Revision**

The United States responded to the exceptional disadvantages affecting the growing numbers of Cubans arriving on its shores with the Cuban Adjustment Act. This legislation grants would-be immigrants from the island certain benefits just as exceptional as the disadvantages they face.\(^{69}\) The US cannot process Cubans the same way as undocumented migrants from other countries, deciding whom to welcome and whom to send back, because the Cuban government will not accept return migrants. The only option for the US and other countries, pending any change in Cuba’s own policy toward its migrants, was to “adjust” the migratory situation of Cubans arriving in their territory to avoid subjecting them to a prolonged legal limbo. In practice, however, this solution, and the laxity of its implementation, acts as an incentive to emigration for many people on the island, including some who lack the proper documentation in Cuba as well as in the United States.

---


\(^{69}\) Cuban Refugee Adjustment Act (CAA). Passed on November 2, 1966, this law was intended to facilitate a legal status for Cuban citizens who arrived in US territory, passed inspection by the immigration authorities, and waited one year without working to apply for residency. Contrary to a widespread myth, the law does not require all Cubans to be granted residency automatically; it merely makes them “eligible” to request this status. The authorities decide whether or not to grant residency upon review of each case.
The ideological overtones of the migration issue in Cuba since 1960 and the official labeling of potential migrants as “traitors” resulted in several public “actos de repudio” (acts of repudiation), including the Mariel exodus in 1980. It is not by chance that even people who did not consider themselves to be opponents of the Cuban regime before they left Cuba, and who today do not perceive themselves as exiles, ended up with strong negative feelings toward the Cuban government because of the traumatic circumstances they endured upon their departure and the continued denial of their rights as emigrants.

Over this long period, the Cuban government has not overhauled its laws to normalize migratory processes or the relations of the diaspora with its country of origin. A normalization of this type would make it easier for the United States to regularize its own migratory processes toward Cuba, including an agreement on deportations and a possible revision of the Cuban Adjustment Act to end the incentive toward migration that it represents.

The Cuban government has occasionally argued that it cannot guarantee its national security without requiring entry and exit permits for travelers to and from the island. Without underestimating the legitimate desire on the part of all states to control their borders, it is difficult to believe that limiting the movement of millions of people is a necessary requirement for protecting a nation against external threats. Countries as different as the United States, Russia, Pakistan, India and Algeria, and almost all Western European countries, face a serious, credible, and immediate threat from terrorism, but none of them have resorted to migratory controls such as the ones in force in Cuba. Other options exist for controlling a state’s borders than restrictive migratory policies like those common in the Socialist bloc during the Cold War, which countries such as China and Vietnam have since abandoned.

**Cuban American Attitudes toward US-Cuban Relations**

As politicians and lobbyists in the United States may confirm, the Cuban American community constituency has experienced a demographic transformation over the last five decades and is more interested today than at any other time in maintaining and expanding ties with relatives and friends in its country of origin. In this sense, the community is currently much less inclined to support the violent or isolationist strategies of a half-century ago, when some of its members participated in armed
actions against the government in Havana or favored sanctions limiting any sort of links with the island.

The Cuban diaspora in the United States has always included segments that oppose armed action against the government in Cuba. Successive polls (1993–2008) conducted by Florida International University (FIU) show a growing tendency among the Cuban community to distance itself from such actions and oppose isolationist policies that impede the normal flow of relations with friends and family. In the first FIU poll, in 1993, 87% of respondents favored increasing international pressure on Cuba and 73% said they would approve of armed action by the exile community against the island’s government. By 2008, only 45% of poll respondents supported maintaining the US embargo on Cuba, while 55% rejected it. At the same time 65% supported the idea of reestablishing diplomatic relations with Cuba while only 35% was still opposed.

The Cuban diaspora—exiles, political refugees, and others—increasingly resembles other communities that live outside their country of origin and strive to stay in touch with and support the relatives, friends, and institutions they left behind. The context in which the Cuban diaspora attempts to maintain normal relations with its country of origin, however, is much more complex and adverse in comparison with other nationalities. Cuba’s current migratory policy makes circular migration impossible and raises obstacles to transnational activity between the diaspora and its country of origin. It also results in the loss of human capital when professionals—whose training implies a considerable investment of time and resources by Cuban society—emigrate and cannot return. This singular migratory policy fuels resentment among emigrants toward the Cuban government and complicates their ability to maintain ties with relatives on the island.

New Policies and the Diaspora

Few References to the Diaspora in Recent National Discourse

In February 2008, General Raúl Castro’ position as President of Cuba’s Councils of State and Ministries was officially formalized, and in April 2011 the Sixth Congress of the

Cuban Communist Party (PPC) elected him First Secretary of this organization. From the beginning, he has repeatedly expressed concern over the country’s economy and spoken in favor of changing official attitudes and mentalities toward the so-called non-state sector.

In the past four years, there has been no visible change in attitude toward the diaspora and its possible role in the country’s development. The Sixth PPC Congress confined itself to recommending a study of the possibility of facilitating Cuban travel abroad but made no reference to the possibility of giving members of the diaspora greater access to their country of birth. As this report was being translated and prepared for publication, the Committee learned of Raúl Castro’s speech at the plenary session of the National Assembly of People’s Power on August 1, 2011, in which he announced for the first time that the Cuban government will review its migratory policy.

The Committee suggests that even before any change in official state policy, elements of the diaspora have already informally integrated to the non-state sector of Cuba’s economy. Even the new economic measures in the Island raised some expectations of further participation, Cubans abroad provided this private sector with a substantial flow of capital comparable to what would be generated by any major sector of the Cuban economy through their travel to the island, remittances, payments of long-distance telephone fees and cell phone bills for calls made on the island, and shipments of products and equipment.

The President of the United States, Barack Obama, has made the Cuban American community the focus of his administration’s policy innovations toward Cuba. Since his arrival in the White House, President Obama has worked hard to gain the good will of members of the diaspora and their relatives on the island by lifting restrictions and facilitating reciprocal relations. Cuba migratory policy, in contrast, has remained

---

71 According to a report by Ariel Terrero, an analyst for Cuban TV, based on data from Cuba’s National Office of Statistics (ONE), the United States ranks eighth among countries sending visitors to Cuba. Nearly 63,000 Americans traveled to the island in 2010; if the more than 300,000 Cuban Americans who made the trip are added to the total, however, the US comes in second place after Canada (945,000). The contributions Cuban Americans make to the island’s economy, and the many ways in which they help meet pressing social needs, is very different from the classic image of the sunscreen-toting, carefree tourist. Diaspora visitors, even if they stay with family instead of spending on a hotel, provide benefits in many different areas of Cuban society. They pay more in travel fees (for Cuban passports, entry permits); buy gifts; and spend generously on food, both in stores and local restaurants. They also show up with heavy suitcases full of useful items for their families. El Nuevo Herald, “Cubanos emigrados son el segundo grupo que más visita la Isla” (July 7, 2011), http://www.elnuevoherald.com/2011/07/07/975896/cubanos-emigrados-son-el-segundo.html (accessed August 5, 2011).
essentially the same, even though many officials and public figures have acknowledged that it is time for it to change, especially the requirement that Cuban nationals obtain entry and exit permits.\textsuperscript{72}

Another topic that Cuba has yet to discuss publicly is granting Cubans both on and off the island the same right to invest in the economy as foreigners, or at least, the same rights as those extended to new entrepreneurs in the emerging non-state sector. For the time being, the so-called economic update seems to be completely separate from any possible update of the island’s migratory laws, although the economic plan’s chances of success would increase significantly with a concurrent improvement in state-diaspora relations.

The first step is for the Cuban government to explain the scope of the economic measures and gauge the possibility of their success. It must specify whether the non-state sector will be confined to subsistence activities, currently restricted to 178 occupations of limited scope, or whether it will be able to participate in the development of a national economy in the wider sense.

Second, given the current national liquidity crisis, the emerging sector will need a significant injection of external capital to absorb the growing numbers of the unemployed. Human and institutional capital must also be trained to develop the components necessary for a market economy. These realities will require the Cuban government to make creative use of the new mentality President Raúl Castro mentioned.

The diaspora could supply part of the financial, social, and human capital the emerging sector of the Cuban economy needs. Given Cuba’s current credit situation, and the fact that the sanctions contained in the Helms-Burton Act (which include a ban on US travel to Cuba) are unlikely to be lifted anytime soon, only the diaspora is in a position to provide the necessary economic, social, and human capital swiftly enough to give an initial push to the island’s emerging private sector.

The Diaspora: Resources and Possibilities

According to Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou, “the traditional literature on national

\textsuperscript{72}For more about the Cuban government’s August 2011 announcement of its intent to revise its migratory policy, see footnote 51.
development paid scant attention to the phenomenon of international migration. When it did, the overall sense was that such flows were another symptom of underdevelopment, or that these flows further contributed to that situation by emptying entire regions of population and draining scarce talent, attracted by higher remunerations abroad. While this view has begun to be revised as governments and scholars realize the significant financial resources migrants remit to their countries of origin, there is still a long way to go in this direction. As Portes and Zhou note, insufficient attention has been paid to the varied organized efforts that migrants take both on their own and in cooperation with groups based in their countries of origin, and even with the governments of these nations.

What is the potential for the Cuban diaspora to participate in the process of Cuban development, and what conditions are necessary for this potential to emerge? The Cuban diaspora in the United States—where nearly 80% of the community lives—and in other countries has several forms of capital that would be of great use if they could be put in the service of their country of origin. These are: a) economic capital, b) social capital, c) human capital, and d) symbolic capital.

**Economic Capital**

This category includes all of the financial, productive, and commercial resources belonging to businesses of all sizes owned by Cubans abroad. As noted earlier, Díaz-Briquets and Pérez-López estimated the total capital of the US Cuban community in 2003, including income and property, at between $40 billion and $50 billion. This figure should also include the value of remittances and care packages, whether sent by formal or informal means; payment of fees for cell phone services in Cuba and long-distance calls to and from the island; customs and immigration fees; expenses incurred by Cuban visitors who travel to their country of origin; and other sources of informal income which together add significantly to the resources Cuba receives.

According to a study concluded in May 2011, the Cuban American community contributes 68% of total remittances sent to Cuba. US Cubans send an average of eight remittances per year, transferring an average of $150 at a time (for an annual average

---

73 Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou, “The Eagle and the Dragon: Immigrant Transnationalism and Development in Mexico and China” (paper presented at the University of Miami School of Law, April 20, 2011).

74 Díaz-Briquets and Pérez-López, *The Role of the Cuban American Community in the Cuban Transition*, Executive Summary.
of $1,200). The recipients usually manage to put aside a portion of this money, adding up to an estimated $900 million in savings. The overwhelming majority of these funds—87%—is not deposited into bank accounts on the island. Of those who receive remittances, 43% do not express any interest in investing the money in a business, 34% express such a desire, and 23% have already done so.\textsuperscript{75}

The notion that diaspora participation in a potential economic opening in Cuba would transform exiles into protagonists in the process of change is not consistent with reality. Members of the diaspora have been interacting with the national economy for a long time, for the reasons indicated above and through their participation in the underground economy between the island and Florida. Just as the new economic measures in Cuba are intended, among other things, to uncover the informal economy and integrate it into the formal structures of the Cuban economy, it could do the same with the multimillion-dollar underground economy that does a brisk business in the shadows between Florida and Cuba.

In this physically fragmented market, demand and consumption are concentrated in one place and supply in others, all of them connected by networks of friends and relatives. A quick survey of ads on the radio, TV, and in the press in Miami-Dade County finds chains that supply goods and services to buyers in Florida but whose final consumers—the ones that generate the demand—are in Cuba. Many of the independently owned businesses in Cuba—barbershops, costume and wedding dress rentals, restaurants, and others—obtain not only their start-up capital but also supplies and the tools of their labor from their relations with members of the diaspora. This category also includes Cubans who rent rooms in their homes and advertise through friends abroad who list their properties on the Internet.\textsuperscript{76}


\textsuperscript{76}The website www.revolico.com, a type of local \textit{Craigslist} using a server in Spain, is visited by around 8,000 unique users daily. Two other similar sites use servers in Spain and a fourth is registered in S\~{a}o Tomé & Principe with a server in the Netherlands. For more information, see Tim Elfrink and Vanessa Grisalez, “Cuba’s Black Market Moves Online with Revolico.com,” \textit{Miami New Times} (October 1, 2009), http://www.miaminewtimes.com/2009-10-01/news/cuba-s-craigslist-the-island-s-black-market-moves-online- with-revolico-com (accessed August 6, 2011).
Social Capital

By social capital, we mean the ability of members of the Cuban American community to access resources by virtue of their insertion in wider social networks. Human, professional, and business relationships are often the most important factors enabling migrants to succeed in the countries where they settle. Self-employed workers in Cuba, too, rely on the social capital provided by friends and relatives in the diaspora. In the case of the Cuban American community—not the only diaspora community with access to social capital—these networks go far beyond their original enclaves and have played an important role in allowing their members to insert themselves in financial, business, professional, and political circles in the United States and other countries.

The first waves of Cuban migrants already enjoyed a base of social capital dating back to before the revolution. Before leaving Cuba, many of these individuals had worked for Cuban or foreign companies with international business dealings. While the majority of these individuals lost all of their assets to government expropriations in 1959, they took their international contacts with them when they emigrated. The Cuban government may have confiscated their economic capital, but many took their social capital with them in their address books.

At first, migrants used this social capital to find sources of income and loans to start new businesses. Cuban social networks in Miami helped gain visibility for the city throughout the Americas and even in some European countries, transforming it into the transnational hub for tourism, finance, and trade it is today. Later Cuban emigrants had their own sources of social capital: the existing Cuban American community, which provided jobs, information, and advice to help fellow emigrants make a successful transition to the host country.

Human Capital

By human capital, we mean the wealth of knowledge, skills, and experiences that contribute to developing a productive occupation and creating economic value. Like social capital, this type of wealth is portable and cannot be confiscated. The combination of human and social capital can enable emigrants who have left their economic capital behind to put down new roots and prosper in their host country.

77 Alejandro Portes and Alex Stepick found that many Cuban entrepreneurs exiled in Miami obtained loans based on their personal reputations (“character loans”) in the 1960s. See Portes and Stepick, City on the Edge: The Transformation of Miami (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 132–35.
As noted previously, Cuban emigrants since 1959 tend to arrive in the United States with higher average educational levels than other migrants and often succeed in transmitting their high levels of schooling to the next generation. The first wave of Cuban emigrants was primarily an upper- and middle-class exodus of individuals with substantial skills and formal education. Later migrants also brought high levels of schooling and professional training as a result of the mass educational policies put in place by the Revolution after 1959.

**Symbolic Capital**

French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu introduced the concepts of *cultural capital* and *symbolic power* to the social sciences. Originally, Bourdieu used these concepts to expose the power relationships underlying control of the means of production of culture and information to influence the creation of social consensus.

We have freely adapted the use of the term “symbolic capital” in this analysis of the Cuban diaspora to describe the capacity of a social group—in this case, the Cuban American community—to obtain access to public and private resources controlled by other social groups by appealing to shared goals and values. The Cuban diaspora built its social capital during the first decade of the Cuban Revolution, when influential groups in the United States welcomed Cuban emigrants as representing certain highly valued attributes, such as patriotism and anti-Communism. For their part, many Cubans abroad were willing to contribute to the achievement of Cold War objectives, even at great sacrifice and personal risk. While other diasporas may have shared some of these attributes, none were quite as compatible with late-1950s America.

The type of symbolic capital the first arrivals brought with them helped them build personal relationships with individuals holding positions of power in the host country. Little by little, this symbolic capital, according to our use of the term, became social capital, especially for that segment of the Cuban American community that served as a direct contact between the diaspora and influential political and economic sectors in the United States.

Beginning in 1959 and for more than three decades, the United States welcomed Cuban emigrants as political refugees distinct from the mass of common migrants. As

---

noted above, the US government and wide sectors of the US population viewed the for
the most part highly educated new arrivals with special sympathy. The willingness of
some exiles to volunteer for risky US-sponsored actions against the government in
Havana and to help fight communism in other countries and regions—including
Southeast Asia during the Vietnam War—earned the Cuban American community
special status compared to other groups of economic migrants.

Social networks of American business people and politicians, both liberal and
conservative, showed a willingness, especially early on, to support organized Cuban
American groups. Little by little, Cuban Americans gained legal advantages and
resources far in excess of other migrant groups, due in large part to their symbolic
capital as a community that shared important common values and goals with the United
States.79

By 2000, however, the changing demographics of the Cuban American
community, its closer ties to Cuba—including return trips to visit family soon after
arriving in the United States—and cuts to programs and resources in this country in the
context of an economic downturn, have blurred the symbolic profile of the initial
exodus.

Possible Diaspora Support for the Non-State Sector

This document does not attempt to analyze the current Cuban economic situation or
adopt a primarily “capitalist” or “socialist” position, as so many polarized debates on the
topic have done. We limit ourselves to pointing out that today’s societies display a wide
range of economic systems with varying degrees of state and market participation. In all
of these cases, however, including the most advanced economies, small and medium
businesses are the sector that generates the most jobs and helps millions of people
around the world lift themselves up out of poverty. For the purposes of this document,
we will try to identify the necessary factors that could bring a consolidation of the
emerging non-state sector and generate employment in Cuba. Finally, we evaluate the
possibility for the diaspora to use the varied resources at its disposal to contribute
toward this end.

79Guillermo J. Grenier and Lisandro Pérez have conducted detailed research into the different ways
the symbolic capital enjoyed by the first waves of exiles helped extend resources to subsequent
arrivals. See Grenier and Pérez, The Legacy of Exile: Cubans in the United States (Boston: Allyn &
Bacon, 2002).
The Cuban diaspora in various parts of the world, but especially the United States, could contribute significantly toward meeting the demands of this emerging entrepreneurial sector. As noted earlier, it already responds to these needs, in limited but significant ways, via the underground economy stretching across the Florida Straits.

A sector of the diaspora motivated to involve itself with the private sector in Cuba could take the initiative using the different forms of capital within its reach. Any attempt to “formalize” the underground Florida-Cuba economy, however, and to encourage and expand it, first requires that the governments of the United States and Cuba change aspects of their laws that prohibit Cuban migrants from owning property or investing in their country of origin.

**Venture Capital and/or Joint Investment in Small and Medium Enterprises**

Cuban emigrants send remittances and packages to their relatives in Cuba, pay their cell phone bills, bring them gifts when they visit the island, and buy them many types of products in local and online foreign-currency stores. A former executive of the Cuban market study firm CIMEX estimates the total value of such contributions at more than $2 billion.\(^8\) Given the previous restrictions on the private sector and emigrants’ ability to invest in their country of origin, most of these resources have historically gone toward consumption and rarely into building local businesses.

The window for investment recently cracked open a bit: Cubans who live on the island are now permitted to pursue a range of entrepreneurial activities codified at present in a list of 178 professions. Most of these are occupations characteristic of a subsistence economy, and Cubans who “permanently exited” the country are still banned from investing in the non-state sector, whether jointly (through friends and family) or directly. Ending these domestic and international restrictions would make great political and economic sense for the country. The Cuban state should define which areas of economic activity it wants to keep for itself and allow the non-state sector to handle the rest. As part of this restructuring, it should also review its policy toward the diaspora.

---

Changes in this area would stimulate a far larger volume of remittances, allowing the recipients to invest part of the money while maintaining their current consumption levels. Manuel Orozco estimates that would-be entrepreneurs hoping to set up a new business in Cuba need an average of $3,000 in micro-loans. If this estimate were correct, then creating 100,000 new businesses would require approximately $300 million.\(^8\) This is equivalent to one-third of the amount relatives and friends abroad currently send to Cuba.

Encouraging investment of remittances and direct diaspora investment could rapidly increase the amount and frequency of remittances, instantly channeling hundreds of millions of dollars into the emerging non-state sector. If we consider this potential and the $900 million the recipients of remittances are believed to have put aside in savings already, then the private sector has the potential to enjoy sufficient liquidity to invest in new businesses without depending on the Cuban state.

Remittances intended for investment instead of consumption could take many different forms. Money could be provided as risk capital, for example, entrusted to friends or relatives who want to open a business but need an “investing angel” in the diaspora. It could also be a joint investment between such parties, a practice already common today but which cannot be declared openly given the existing laws that prohibit diaspora investment.

In each case, the modification of Cuban law to allow for these and other possibilities would represent an important economic incentive for individuals who, besides wanting to help their friends and relatives, are also motivated by the possibility of starting a joint business in their country of origin to complement their sources of income in the host country, in this case the United States. It would also represent an opportunity to make a significant, one-time contribution to help relatives start a business and enable them to become self-sufficient in the future. This would free diaspora relatives from the ongoing burden of supporting their families in Cuba in addition to their own households in the United States, especially when economic conditions are rough.

---

\(^8\) Orozco, *Remittance Recipients and the Present and Future of Micro-Entrepreneurship Activities in Cuba*. 
Using Symbolic and Social Capital to Attract Financial Capital

Changing the laws that exclude the diaspora would allow Cuba to send a clear message—one that would not go unnoticed by governments, multilateral organizations, and private foundations—that Havana is finally opening the door to a normalization of its relationship with Cubans abroad. For its part, the diaspora’s willingness to establish a stable relationship with the Cuban private sector would give new, constructive meaning to its symbolic capital. Instead of using a symbolic capital based on confrontation with the Cuban state to pursue resources and favorable legislation in the United States, the diaspora would be able to contribute resources for the development of the Cuban private sector and the direct benefit of the Cuban population without sacrificing or altering its stance toward the island’s political system. This redirected symbolic capital could be used to attract additional resources from international development agencies, governments, and international financial institutions to benefit the private sector in Cuba.

Diaspora participation in the national economy would also send a signal to large corporate investors that Cuba’s attitude toward the private sector is changing. While the amount of capital in the hands of the diaspora cannot be compared to, for example, a global corporation such as Ikea, foreign companies would probably consider business involvement in Cuba if the results of diaspora investment were positive. A similar process has already occurred in China following investments by so-called overseas Chinese.82

Other diasporas have already set a precedent with the creation of investment capital funds complemented by the resources obtained from development agencies and charitable groups.83 These can also take the form of mutual funds. The advantage of

82. “...these overseas Chinese investors provided the most crucial initial sources of foreign direct investment when the actual investment climate in China might have discouraged non—Chinese overseas investors” Minxin Pei, From Reform to Revolution: The Demise of Communism in China and the Soviet Union (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 108.
83. An interesting experiment of this type is Ireland Funds, founded in 1976, a network of Irish emigrant organizations in 12 countries. The funds’ initial focus was projects that could promote peace and national reconciliation in Ireland’s civil war. To date, they have provided 1,200 Irish NGOs with more than $300 million for projects in three areas: peace and reconciliation, art and culture, and education and community development. The Rwandan Diaspora Mutual Fund is another example of such experiments. A group of 11 Rwandan emigrants in countries around the world, including Canada, China, Ethiopia, Malaysia, the Netherlands, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States, started the fund with subsequent backing from Rwanda’s Ministry of Foreign Relations, National Bank and Capital Market Advisory Council. Liberia also has such a network, the Liberian Diaspora Fund, a social investment fund created and managed by Liberians in the United States that invests in small
such funds is that they provide professional management—like any other private investment portfolio—and can be used to support the development of businesses in the country of origin. The Cuban diaspora could study these experiences and adapt them to support the private sector in Cuba.

**Access to Foreign Markets, Marketing, and Outsourcing**

The diaspora already supplies such support through the underground economy between the island and Florida. When members of the diaspora buy and send items for their relatives’ businesses in Cuba, or advertise room rentals online, they are performing business and marketing functions. The big question is whether Cuba and the United States are politically prepared to admit, legalize, and empower an arrangement that already exists *de facto* in the economy.

One area of transnational activity that puts diasporas in contact with people in their countries of origin is the formation of associations and cooperatives that allow members of the diaspora to develop a part of the economic process (imports, distribution, and marketing) for producers of goods and services in the country of origin. In general, the market for such products is mostly the diaspora itself, although some develop a wider market following.

Another common area of joint entrepreneurship between diasporas and their country of origin is outsourcing (buying products or services from a foreign company to reduce costs). Using the Internet and new information and communication technologies, people in the diaspora can start businesses with partners in their country of origin to offer various types of services and take advantage of lower labor costs compared to those in the host country.

From trained professionals—designers, architects, thesis advisers, and translators – to telemarketing workers, more and more positions are being filled by outsourcing in developing countries that pay lower wages than the countries that hire these services. As it grows, this phenomenon has met with fierce opposition from protectionist sectors of the labor market, such as unions, which fear losing jobs to cheap labor in developing
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economies. Countries that explore the possibility of outsourcing must take this opposition into account.

At the same time, the dismissal of between 10% and 38% of the Cuban labor force employed in state companies and institutions, announced by Cuban officials as part of their austerity measures, would cause many trained experts and professionals to lose their jobs, in which case diaspora-organized outsourcing services would be a logical and attractive option. They could provide jobs for professionals who might otherwise choose to emigrate if they could not find sources of employment on the island. This possibility—like every potential area of diaspora participation in Cuba’s national development—is contingent on certain legal and technical conditions related to Internet access and efficient telephone systems.

**Tools, Inputs, and Technology**

The Cuban diaspora around the world, especially in South Florida, already supplies relatives and friends with the tools, inputs, and technology (computer and cell phone) to launch or develop businesses on the island through an underground economy. The scale of “exports” is quite small, but it is vital for the “importers” or recipients in Cuba. The question is whether or not it is feasible for US and Cuban law to acknowledge these transactions and allow them to occur openly, with the effect of increasing their volume.

One of the bottlenecks for developing sources of independent employment and small and medium businesses in Cuba is the absence of a wholesale market to supply Cuban entrepreneurs with the necessary tools, inputs and technology. The diaspora and its counterparts in the non-state sector could organize these supply lines if the Cuban government were willing to accept this relatively easy solution to a significant obstacle to the sector’s growth, and if the US government were to exclude the non-state sector from its embargo on Cuba, in recognition of the Cuban state’s withdrawal from this area of the economy.

---

84 A study of independent entrepreneurship in Cuba by the Cuban economists Pavel Vidal Alejandro and Omar Everleny Pérez Villanueva concludes with a list of eight recommendations; the fifth is the need to create a wholesale market for the non-state sector. Pavel Vidal Alejandro and Omar Everleny Pérez Villanueva, “Entre el ajuste fiscal y los cambios estructurales: Se extiende el cuentapropismo en Cuba,” *Suplemento Digital de Espacio Laical*, no. 112 (October 2010), http://espaciolaical.org/contens/esp/sd_112.pdf (accessed July 25, 2011).

85 On August 3, 2010, reporter Juan Tamayo wrote an article in the “Cuba” section of *El Nuevo Herald* announcing an Obama administration initiative to provide $3 million in USAID funding to support the development of independent jobs and small businesses in Cuba (“EEUU ofrece $3 millones para grupos marginados en la isla,” August 4, 2010,
Training and Consulting

Until a few years ago, a recurring theme in the bibliography on migrations was the issue of the so-called “brain drain,” the emigration of qualified personnel from developing countries in search of further training or better job opportunities abroad. This phenomenon was presented as a zero sum game between developed and developing economies, with the latter the clear losers.

More recent research has called attention to the fact that if circular patterns of migration are encouraged, members of the diaspora are able to pass on their knowledge and experiences to professionals in their country of origin. The supposed “brain drain” can then become a net gain, and the zero sum game a win-win situation. Furthermore, members of the diaspora are more willing to offer their professional talent to their compatriots voluntarily or for a nominal fee, compared to foreign experts and consultants with the same or less experience who typically charge far more for their services.

Incorporating market criteria and an incipient private sector into Cuba’s national economy requires various types of expertise and experience unavailable to workers in a state-controlled economy or with no history of private entrepreneurship. Not only future independent workers and small business owners need to know how to gauge market potential or find a competitive niche; state officials in charge of dealing with this sector must be trained, as well.86

The Cuban diaspora has been characterized historically by considerable numbers of distinguished professionals. Many of these would undoubtedly be willing to share their experiences if the country reversed its migratory policies to give equal footing to emigrants, whatever the reason for their departure or their current beliefs and preferences.

http://www.elnuevoherald.com/2010/08/03/777031/eeuu-ofrece-3-millones-para-grupos.html, accessed August 6, 2011). Putting aside the Cuban government’s reservations with regard to the political motives behind the USAID offer, the announcement set a precedent in the sense of separating the new non-state sector from embargo sanctions and identifying it as a potential future recipient of development aid. The European Union, Brazil, and Spain have also offered money and assistance to Cuba’s SMEs, as has the Cuba Study Group ($10 million).

86In a February 2011 interview in the Cuban magazine Espacio Laical, Cuban economist Pavel Vidal points to a lack of institutional capacity for change. For example, he argued, “the Cuban financial system is not prepared to work with independent workers, micro businesses and cooperatives in fields other than agriculture.” Lenier González Mederos, “Desarticular el monopolio de la gestión estatal: Entrevista a Pavel Vidal Alejandro,” Espacio Laical, no. 123 (February 2011), http://espaciolaical.org/contens/esp/sd_123.pdf (accessed July 25, 2011).
For more than three decades, various international initiatives have encouraged diaspora professionals to contribute their expertise to the development of their countries of origin. The longest-running project of this type may be the United Nations Development Program’s Transfer of Knowledge through Expatriate Nationals, known as TOKTEN. Since 1977, TOKTEN has worked to:

- Maintain an up-to-date database of potential diaspora consultants.
- Set the standards for age, experience, excellence, and commitment volunteers must meet to qualify.
- Identify and prioritize each country’s needs to ensure the most appropriate form of consultancy.
- Obtain the necessary resources to support volunteers (airfare, lodging, and fees ranging from 50% to 75% of those normally charged by international consultants).
- Guarantee that consultants work in the country of origin for a limited time (days, weeks, or months) and are not expected to reside there definitively.

In the context of a normalization of relations between the Cuban state and its diaspora, similar projects could be supported by international development funds or private (including diaspora) financing.

**Obstacles and Challenges**

While the Cuban diaspora has access to various resources that could assist in the island’s development and the growth of the emerging private sector, considerable legal and subjective obstacles must first be overcome for this possibility to materialize. In the specific case of the Cuban diaspora, efforts in this direction must contend with the considerable sector of individuals who oppose any initiatives that could indirectly prop up a system of government they reject. In Cuba, too, a sector of the government is suspicious of the possibility of opening the economy to members of the diaspora for fear they could rapidly assume an influential role in national life. If these were the only
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87 Terrazas, *Connected through Service*. 
possible interpretations of the issue, we would find ourselves in another zero sum game, where for one to win the other must lose, completely and definitively.

A third sector of opinion, however, has gained prominence since the 1990s, both in Cuba and the diaspora. This group does not believe in waiting to see what path the Cuban political system takes before working with its compatriots. These members of the diaspora think it is possible to support relatives and friends in the island’s emerging private sector even if the political regime remains for now static. This does not mean they underestimate the value of political or civil rights, or defend China’s autocratic model of capitalism, just that they seek greater prosperity for their loved ones, whose needs cannot wait.

A person who buys hair dyes and scissors in Miami to send to a sister with an independent beauty shop in Cuba does not want to be judged or blocked by a political stance that would mean abandoning her to her fate in an attempt to speed the process of transition on the island. By the same token, the elderly woman who sells coffee in the doorway of her home in Havana thanks to the pennies she saves from remittances from her balsero son, who washes dishes in a cafeteria in Hialeah, knows that government taxes could close her down, placing an additional burden on her son’s efforts to start a new life abroad.

These people—real cases known to the authors of this report—must respond to their families’ needs in the present. They cannot wait for national solutions that have already been more than half a century in coming. These individuals are exercising their right to forge a destiny for themselves through their own efforts and do not accept the legitimacy of arguments that would urge them to postpone their projects. If there is a social force committed to change in the here and now, it is this critical mass of Cubans in the diaspora and on the island that seeks greater economic freedom without more delays.

The degree of flexibility or intransigence of different sectors of the Cuban population on the island and in the diaspora are not static, however. Their positions are influenced by changing circumstances and can shift relatively quickly to the opposite pole, according to events in Cuba. The absence of normalized relations between the Cuban state and its diaspora adds even more to this fluidity.

The emergence of a Cuban private sector brings with it the possibility of diaspora support, but rests on a premise of a change in mentalities and migratory policies dating
back to the 1960s. These constitute the main obstacles to a normalization of relations with the diaspora and the national reconciliation that is Cubans’ legitimate and viable aspiration.

In addition to the questions that Cuba must resolve to allow consolidation of the non-state sector (tax relief or moratorium, legal guarantees for entrepreneurs, as well as other issues identified by the authors of this report and economists on the island), further challenges must be overcome for the diaspora to contribute to this sector. They include the following:

**Policy Framework: Updating Cuba’s Migration Laws**

Cuba’s so-called economic update brings with it a need for a parallel review of the island’s migration policy to facilitate access to the capital, markets, technologies, and expertise the Cuban economy requires, and which the diaspora can offer. Cuba’s current laws make emigration one-way and permanent, and obstruct transnational relations between the diaspora and the island.

One of the reasons why Cuban emigrants uprooted themselves and moved to other countries is because they saw no future prospects at home, whether because of economic or political conditions. This loss of demographic and economic resources and human and social capital could increase and become irreversible depending on migration policy. There is a crucial difference between defining emigration as permanent and encouraging circular migration patterns or, at least, permitting a fluid and flexible relationship between the diaspora and its country of origin.

People who emigrate with the intention of settling permanently outside their country of origin are motivated to make a greater effort to succeed in the host country. Many hope to bring their families over as well, instead of merely sending them remittances. Permanent emigrants bring with them as much of their economic capital as they can, liquidating their assets in the country of origin to invest in building a new life in the host country. They also bring along their human and social capital. Temporary emigrants, in contrast, generally do not take these resources with them, but rather add to them with new ones acquired in the host country. When they return home, these resources are reinvested anew in the country of origin.88
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It is difficult to draw a clear line between permanent and temporary migrants, given the fluidity of their goals and circumstances, but certain comparisons are possible. The basic goal of permanent migrants is to succeed in building a new life abroad; for temporary migrants, it is to acquire enough resources to return to, invest, and succeed in the country of origin. Permanent migrants take with them various forms of capital that most likely do not return to the country of origin but are instead passed on to their descendants in the host country, siphoning resources away from the country of origin. Temporary migrants seek to add to their existing resources, which they take back home when they return. The country of origin gains new resources through this type of circular migration.

Legislation that favors circular patterns of migration, therefore, benefits the national interest more than laws that encourage permanent exit from the country of origin. There is also a substantive difference between laws that allow for transnationalization of the diaspora and those that inhibit it. By transnationalism, we mean diaspora behavior intended to maintain a constant flow of people, goods, and information to and from the country of origin. Governments can opt to consider their citizens who live outside the national territory as a “loss” and halt any efforts to include them in national life, or they can view them as an integral part of the nation and facilitate an intense and varied flow of relations between the diaspora and the country of origin.

As mentioned earlier, governments around the world have opened offices abroad, usually as part of their foreign ministries, to serve the needs of their diasporas and encourage them to maintain relations with the country of their birth. This policy is based on a recognition of the flow of financial, human, and social relations between the diaspora and the country of origin and the fact that, even after settling in other countries, emigrants do not always abandon their ties with their countries of origin. Many travel back and forth and develop complex webs of business, cultural, and scientific relations between the two.

If it attains sufficient intensity and volume, this traffic has the potential to effect a de facto transformation of what was once essentially a one-way and permanent migration into a circular pattern that could salvage resources previously lost to the host


As noted earlier, Alejandro Portes successfully applies this concept to the Mexican and Chinese communities in the United States in his book, Economic Sociology.
country, and even supplement them with the resources emigrants acquire abroad. This is the model the governments of China and Mexico have pursued in their relations with their diasporas, and many other countries are following their experiences.

Ultimately, the aging of the population in Cuba—the Latin American country where this trend is most pronounced, after Uruguay and Puerto Rico—could spur the government to attract immigrants from other countries, as it did during the Republic, to fill specialized occupations as well as menial jobs. Updating its migratory policy could represent a forward-looking strategy for Cuba to meet this future challenge.

The eventual integration of members of the diaspora into the emerging non-state sector as partners or investors will require changes not only in Cuban legislation, but also—for Cuban Americans—in US legislation. Before committing substantial resources to the emerging sector, potential diaspora investors can be expected to consider various factors, such as:

a) Does the new private sector offer any legal and constitutional guarantees to guard against potential changes in state policy as those happened in the past?

b) What opportunities does the Cuban market present for members of the diaspora entering the non-state sector?

c) Do laws or constitutional amendments protect the right of Cuban migrants to participate in the emerging sector on an equal footing?

d) In the case of Cuban Americans, how can the Helms-Burton Act be reinterpreted or relaxed to allow the diaspora to participate in the non-state sector in Cuba?

The Subjective Context

Since the 1960s Cuban emigration has been accompanied by emotional distress,
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displacement, stigmatization, hostility, harassment, and physical aggression against individuals or even entire boatloads of undocumented migrants attempting to travel to the United States or other countries, on occasions resulting in the loss of human life. Over the decades, thousands of people on the island and in the diaspora have lost relatives and friends who tried to leave Cuba without exit permits to avoid the complications so often associated with the official emigration process. Many of these irregular departures involve migrants attempting to enter the United States without a US visa.

The Cuban Adjustment Act, whatever its original intentions, serves as an incentive for migrants to attempt the trip without a US visa by facilitating the process for obtaining legal residency. The legislation must be adapted to better reflect the current Cuban migratory situation and the US and Florida economies. At the same time, Cuba continues to enforce legal requirements (state permits, firing would-be migrants from their jobs, confiscating their property, denying right of return) and subjective conditions (constant rhetoric branding emigrants as traitors unwilling to share in their compatriots’ sacrifices) that scar the psyches of individuals departing the country. Updating Cuba’s migratory policy will mean replacing these measures with initiatives to transform the anti-emigrant mentality and send a clear message welcoming the diaspora to participate in the island’s development without fear of slurs or discrimination.
Conclusions and Recommendations

The goal of this report is to make an intellectual contribution to a possible modernization of Cuban migratory policy and legislation intended to improve state-diaspora relations. By doing so, the committee that authored the report hopes to further the interests of Cuban families on both sides of the Florida Straits.

The committee’s considerations are not circumscribed to the present. They have been formulated from the perspective of the diaspora’s potential for Cuba’s future national development. The recommendations respectfully submitted here are designed for implementation in the short term to lay the groundwork for a longer-term process.

This report is not about the economic measures being adopted by the government of Cuba. The committee sees these measures as part of a process that is still incomplete and open to change. Our recommendations, therefore, are not intended to “analyze,” “support,” or “criticize” the new economic measures in Cuba. They focus on the connection between the chances for the new economic measures to succeed and the need to adopt a new policy towards the Diaspora.

Conclusions

Taking the previous considerations as its basis, the committee presents the following conclusions:

1. Cuba’s relations with its diaspora span two centuries. In the medium and long terms, this web of connections is likely to expand in the context of globalization. The same is true of those foreign residents whose resources, expertise, contacts, and skills could contribute to national development and who could be persuaded to live or work in the country on a temporary or permanent basis, given a migratory policy that allowed this possibility. An understanding of this reality, and an updating of migratory laws and policies to bring them into line with national interests, is essential to Cuba’s national development in the long term.

2. Cuba’s so-called “economic update”—understood as a set of measures still opened for a series of successive and gradual changes—implies modifying
legislation regulating the domestic and foreign private sectors. In the short term, the committee sees a direct relationship between the potential for success of the economic update and the need to enact a parallel update of migratory policy and legislation, especially as they pertain to the Cuban diaspora.

3. The committee has identified two issues that should be resolved in the short term:
   a) Changes in Cuba’s legislation and constitution to guarantee full freedom of travel and choice of residency, as stipulated in Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, promulgated in 1948, that was signed and subsequently ratified by Cuba.
   b) Additional modifications to Cuba’s legislation and constitution to recognize all Cubans—on the island and abroad—as equals, granting them the same or better opportunities for participation in economic initiatives as those extended in the past to foreign capital under Cuba’s 1992 constitutional reforms and Foreign Investment Law No. 77 (1995).

4. Since the 1990s, the Cuban diaspora has played a growing role in Cuba’s socioeconomic development. As this report has shown, the diaspora provides a substantial amount of capital through travel to the island, remittances, long-distance and cell phone fees, and shipments of a wide variety of goods, tools, and equipment. Occurring on the margins of government regulations on both sides of the Straits of Florida, these exchanges have created an informal and invisible border economy between Cuba and South Florida that has yet to be officially recognized.

5. The eventual revision of migratory policies could facilitate the normalization of relations between the island and its diaspora, allowing Cuban society to benefit not only from the financial contributions, but also the human and social capital of citizens who have settled beyond its shores.

6. It has long been believed that any improvement in the Cuban state’s relations with its diaspora would have to await the normalization of relations between Washington and Havana. This may once have been true, but today the opposite is also possible: an improvement of relations between the Cuban state and its diaspora could lead to improve US-Cuban bilateral relations. This could be one of the reasons why those who disapprove of the prospect of normalizing bilateral relations, whether they live in Cuba or the United States, also tend to object to
attempts to normalize the ties of the Cuban Diaspora with its country of origin.

Cubans cannot change the past, but they can choose their future. Decades of polarization have separated countless families, torn friendships asunder, and made emigration the equivalent of expatriation, with no possibility for resettlement in Cuba or visiting the island freely. Cubans today, even those far from their homeland, have the option to follow a different path, one that allows them to collaborate in areas of shared interest with their compatriots.

For many years, the Cuban state ordered its citizens to break all ties with relatives and friends who emigrated. Those who left the island, for whatever reason, were subject to hostility, scorn and suspicion. In the political conflict that ensued after 1959, the Cuban state and sectors of the exile community engaged in the reciprocal use of political motivated violence. In its attempts to frustrate unauthorized departures from the island, the Cuban government also resorted to violence in the implementation of its migratory policy. Some of these would-be migrants, in turn, resorted to threats or the use of force to commandeer boats and evade immigration controls. To the victims of these actions we must add the indefinite—but, as all observers agree, considerable—number of people who lost their lives at sea in the attempt, common to all migrants, to realize dreams and aspirations.

Despite this traumatic legacy, most members of the diaspora have consistently showed generosity in sending remittances to the relatives and friends who repudiated them in the past and, when natural disasters stroke the Island, had made donations to their country of birth from which they have being excluded. Official discourse has lagged behind this reality. The Cuban government may have abandoned the most insulting and aggressive aspects of its rhetoric when referring to migrants, but it has not disguised its scorn, and it continues to gloss over the many resources the diaspora contributes to alleviate Cuba’s chronic scarcities. While Cuba’s migration policy has gradually grown more flexible since the 1980s, the government is still a long way from extending internationally accepted standards of freedom of movement to either emigrants or residents of the island.

Goals are not reached in a single step; an entire journey is necessary to attain them. In the case of Cuba and its diaspora, all of the parties involved must demonstrate a willingness to undertake the voyage. It is also natural for them to want some sort of scheduled itinerary to know what to expect at each stage. In this spirit of respectful cooperation, the committee has formulated a few basic recommendations.
Recommendations

Based on the conclusions and observations in this report, the committee issues the following recommendations:

To the Governments of Cuba and the United States

Governments have a special responsibility given their position to stimulate, inhibit or regulate migratory flows and relations between a diaspora and its country of origin.

In Cuba, as in any other country, the government is the entity responsible for exercising this function in the national territory. US government policies are especially relevant to the issue of Cuban migration, since this country is home to the largest segment of the Cuban diaspora and has been the main destination of all Cuban migratory flows since the nineteenth century. The committee therefore directs its main recommendations to the Cuban and United States governments.

Nevertheless, the committee also calls on other countries that receive Cuban emigrants, or that serve as transit points for those on their way to other destinations, to respect their rights and treat them in a dignified manner, as stipulated by multilateral covenants and treaties.

The committee believes that all Cubans without exception are entitled to the same right to economic participation that foreign investors have enjoyed in Cuba since the early 1990s. Obtaining full participation in the Cuban economy for the diaspora in the medium term will require the US government and Congress to lift any restrictions that block Cuban Americans from pursuing this option. On the other hand, the Cuban government must eliminate the current prohibitions on the island’s emerging private sector that prevent it from acting beyond a narrow list of subsistence economic activities.

All restrictions to Cubans’ full participation in the island’s development, both internal and external, must be eliminated to take full advantage of the whole nation’s potential financial and human resources. To facilitate the realization of this potential, the committee makes the following recommendations:
To the Government of Cuba

1. Issue a statement of principles concerning migratory policy. Just as the Cuban government has declared a new phase in state-private sector relations and has called for a new mentality to replace the former demonization of private entrepreneurship, we urge it to clearly state its intention to do the same with regard to emigration and the Cuban diaspora.

2. Introduce changes to Cuban law and the Cuban Constitution to lay the legal groundwork for a new position on emigration and the diaspora. The statement of intention recommended above will not be sufficient unless it is accompanied by legal measures that demonstrate the seriousness and long-term nature of the government’s efforts in this area.

Specifically, the committee recommends an immediate review of migratory policy and legislation to introduce the following changes:

a) Promote a pattern of circular migration to reverse the permanent loss of human resources under the current one-way flow of Cuban migrants abroad. This must include ending the current practice of labeling all emigration as a “permanent exit” from the country, eliminating the requirement for entry and exit permits, and lifting the ban on return and resettlement. Individuals the Cuban government considers to be a threat to national security should be formally accused in courts. They should be notified of the charges raised against them, have the right to refute these charges, and be given an opportunity to defend themselves with the aid of independent legal representation. In no case should Cuban law conflict with internationally recognized standards of human rights. Under these norms, Cuba may not deny free access to its territory, or prosecute or label as a public threat individuals who exercise freedom of expression, conscience, assembly, the press, organization, academic research, and other universally accepted rights outside the country’s borders.

b) Extend the same rights to Cuban citizens in the diaspora as those accorded the island’s residents with regard to establishing residence, investing in the non-state sector of the economy, and other activities. All Cuban citizens—whether or not they live on the island—should have the same rights as foreign investors to invest in sectors of the economy and benefit from tax incentives.
3. Form a new commission in Cuba to study other changes to migratory legislation in the medium term, such as introducing initiatives to attract foreign workers and professionals to reside temporarily in the country.

4. Lower fees for consular services (obtaining passports, birth certificates, academic transcripts, etc.), remittances, and shipment of packages; take steps to make plane tickets and phone calls more affordable; and expand access to email at more affordable rates.

5. Facilitate the validation of academic degrees and professional licenses and encourage academic courses, advising, and cultural and scientific exchanges in different disciplines and fields between Cubans on the island and abroad.

6. Remove the obstacles to collective social projects resulting from charitable activities conducted by members of the diaspora and residents of the island to implement successful models from Mexico and elsewhere. The “Tres por Uno” program in the state of Zacatecas, which implements community social projects funded jointly by emigrants and their families, local and national state resources, multilateral organizations, and private foundations, could be especially relevant for Cuba.

7. Hold a conference in 2012 about diaspora participation in national development in countries with experience in this area, including Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and El Salvador. Both Cuban officials and members of the diaspora should be invited to participate. A conference of this type would enable Cuban officials to learn from the experiences and successful programs described in the section of this report on “state-diaspora relations.”

8. Designate an official in the Office of the President of the Council of State to supervise and help coordinate diaspora issues among different state entities and act as an ombudsman in cases when complaints arise.

To the Government of the United States
The members of the committee do not support the US embargo of Cuba and oppose any measure in either country that restricts the free movement of US and Cuban citizens. It believes that both the Cuban and US governments should respect and facilitate the right of Cuban migrants to sustain fluid relations in all areas with their relatives and friends.
Emulating the worst of Cuba’s early efforts to suppress or minimize ties between residents of the island and the diaspora will not serve US interests and is difficult to legitimate according to democratic values.

The United States has justified its economic embargo of Cuba with the argument that it is not intended to hurt ordinary citizens of the island but rather is exclusively directed against the Cuban state. Following this logic, the sanctions and restrictions in place should at least be updated to prevent their extension to the emerging non-state sector in Cuba. We believe that this is feasible and productive even if more other changes in US policy toward Cuba take a longer time to materialize. Establishing a clear distinction between US policies toward the state and non-state sectors in Cuba would benefit US interests and improve island residents’ perceptions of the United States.

Based on these considerations, the committee recommends that the US government and Congress adopt the following measures in the short term:

1. Authorize members of the Cuban diaspora to associate themselves with the non-state sector of the island’s economy to invest, advice, and train its members, as well as assist them in importing and exporting products and services to and from the United States and other countries.

2. Instruct the U.S. Department of the Treasury not to interfere with these activities and to allow Cubans who live in the United States to use private credit to finance business projects involving the island’s non-state sector.

3. Authorize maritime vessels, including boats, cruise ships, and ferries, to transport cargo and passengers to and from Cuba and designated US ports.

4. Support federal court cases involving efforts by Florida public universities and colleges to organize courses and workshops in the United States and Cuba on the development of small and medium enterprises (SMEs), as academic institutions in other states have already done. These courses would benefit Cuban Americans who seek training at public institutions of higher learning in Florida—where the majority of the Cuban diaspora lives—to pursue such enterprises in Cuba. Florida public entities should also be authorized to organize similar courses in Cuba in conjunction with non-governmental institutions on the island, such as churches.
To the Cuban Diaspora

1. Decide freely whether or not to participate in any eventual economic opening on the island. The following factors should be considered in making this decision:

   a) the needs and interests of the relatives and friends with whom members of the diaspora plan to associate in these activities;

   b) whether supporting the project in question would improve the autonomy and economic security of these individuals in the Cuban context;

   c) the project’s soundness in terms of competitiveness, cost, profitability, and other economic considerations contributing to its sustainability in the medium term;

   d) whether the legal framework that governs this type of investment in Cuba is sufficiently transparent and reliable to withstand potential changes of policies;

   e) issues pertaining to the personal solvency of the individuals making such investments.

2. Persuade the US government to take some or all of the steps recommended here and others that could bring similar benefits to Cuban families.

To Cuban Society

The committee respectfully presents the following suggestions to Cuban society in general:

1. Take proactive steps to definitively eliminate any remaining prejudices toward the Cuban diaspora.

2. Persuade the Cuban government to take some or all of the steps recommended here and others that could bring similar benefits to Cuban families.
Epilogue

In the globalized context of the twenty-first century, Cuba must strive to make systematic and permanent progress toward enacting a new legal framework capable of accommodating the growing transnationalization of its population. Despite the geographical distance that separates them, the population within the Island is developing closer ties with its diaspora. They both represent an indivisible whole: the Cuban nation.

Many of the observations, conclusions, and suggestions expressed in this report are presented with an eye toward tomorrow, with the hope that they will eventually be implemented in whole or in part. Tomorrow can begin today, however, if the actors with decision-making power in this area so choose, and as Cuba so urgently needs.
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