

On the Home Front Abroad: Domestic Political Influences on U.S Foreign Policy with Cuba

Kate Ellis
Suffolk University

Abstract

This paper is a case analysis of American foreign policy as it pertains to Cuban relations in the latter half of the twentieth century. I seek a negative relationship between domestic political influences and the efficiency of foreign policy. What is the role of domestic political institutions within foreign policy execution and implementation? I evaluate the evolution of United States and Cuban relations and use the case studies to find patterns of unilateral foreign political activity that have negatively impacted the efficiency of the policy. The United States has not implemented its policies as a collective initiative and consequently multiple singular actions have impeded the goals the foreign policy entirely. Multiple institutional interferences have driven foreign policies into illegitimate, biased, and ineffective initiatives. My paper challenges the modern interpretations of United States foreign policy and uses the Cuba case studies to delineate points of inefficiencies.

Introduction

The United States is well established as a world power and its global credibility is crucial to its international success. But what empowers the United States and how does this cross into international relations? United States foreign policy is a complex issue, often subject to confusion over who runs what and how that affects policy decisions. Within the United States, key domestic political institutions instigate, organize, and implement policy, whether the world agrees or not. The question I plan to investigate is: how do domestic political influences affect the efficiency of foreign policy? Understanding the manner by which domestic political issues translate into the efficiency of foreign policy will provide explanations of what triggers, changes, or interferes with international policy initiatives. I will also be able to draw conclusions on what this relationship does to the United States and the countries involved in foreign policy, for better or worse.

My research delves into the relations between the United States and Cuba from 1960 to 2000, a period of international conflict and unsuccessful foreign policy. I will preface my argument with the multiple perspectives surrounding the topic of domestic influence within foreign policy. I review the literature from the power, economic, and institutional schools of thought and use each, primarily the institutional school, to direct me towards my own conclusions. The institutional school of thought emphasizes the roles that domestic political actors play and their failure to tackle foreign policy as a collective initiative and instead are driven to maneuver through different domestic institutions towards a more singular goal. Assessing the known literature on the topic of foreign policy and its domestic

implications is my first step towards solving the question of domestic influence on foreign policy.

After identifying the primary schools of thought, I will lay the foundation for my research. The Model and Hypothesis sections outline my independent variable (domestic political influences) and my dependent variable (efficiency of foreign policy) and how they relate to one another. I propose, in my hypothesis, that more domestic political influences in a foreign policy case cause less efficiency within that policy. In the Research Design section, I give value and context to my variables, and, because the topic is so complex, the independent and dependent variables are broken up into four subsections. The domestic political influences are defined as the executive and legislative branches, interest groups, and the media. I will measure this variable with four main indicators: Political/Media Attention, Economic Influence, Institutional/Operational Influence, and Implementation Influence. Measuring the efficiency of foreign policy must be more selective, because there are many interpretations over the definition of 'efficient' foreign policy. For the sake of this study, I will examine each case and define its efficiency according to whether the end result of the policy benefited the international sphere more than the domestic sphere. This dependent variable will also be measured with four indicators: Policy Goals, Policy Risks, Policy Implementation, and Policy Interpretations. I will measure the variables from six selected case studies of American foreign policies with Cuba between 1960 and 2000. I chose varying cases, from the Bay of Pigs Invasion, to the Embargo, to reactions from the United States to Cuban foreign policy decisions. Each case offers insight into motivations and points of error within U.S. foreign policy. I will use my model, hypothesis, and research design as my guide during my Assessment of the data later explored.

In the analysis section, I organize my research on the independent and dependent variables within the six cases of United States foreign policy with Cuba. I will critically examine each case with the intention of determining whether the degree of domestic political influence on foreign policy negatively affected the efficiency of foreign policy or not. I find within these cases that there is, in fact, a negative relationship between domestic political influences and foreign policy. I find that domestic politics is instinctively individualistic in its policy operations, and the abundance of singularly motivated institutions proves detrimental to the efficiency of foreign policy with Cuba.

What can one gather from this research and how can it be applied to modern international relations? The cases discussed from United States and Cuban relations are not likely the only of its kind— i.e. those by which domestic politics rule. Determining how domestic politics affect foreign policy is important for many governments when deciding how to organize and distribute responsibilities within foreign policy procedures. The foreign policy organization within the United States is that of an "every man for himself" mentality: where institutions must push, pull, force their way into impacting foreign policy without a cohesive plan of action in mind. The future of foreign policy may want to look at United States foreign policy, and decide that perhaps foreign policy should encompass foreign incentives and not domestic ones.

The Literature on the Effects of Domestic Politics on U.S. Foreign Policy

There has been much debate among many political scholars over the role of domestic politics in the initiation, execution, and end result of foreign policy. The United States is often criticized internationally for the predominant use of unilateral foreign policy (Kaempher 1999, 37). We can gain critical insight from the policy experiences of the United States that have inevitably shaped foreign policy implementation globally. I will approach the question in both general terms and in terms more specifically geared towards the analysis of Cuba relations in the last half of the twentieth century. The literature points to a general misconception over the influence of domestic politics in foreign policy: in many cases, including Cuba relations, there is little reason to assume that domestic politics affect foreign policy (McKeown 2000, 70). However, through the evidence reviewed, there is a significant causality between domestic politics and foreign policy in terms of how institutions react and relate back to domestic pressures when making foreign policy decisions.

In the study of domestic pressures, three major schools of thought offer varying insight over the degree to which domestic politics rule foreign policy: the power approach, rational choice theory, and institutionalism. Scholars from the power approach view foreign policy with the idea that implementation is heavily enforced through the president and that there is textual theory that leads institutions within the government to react according to the constitutional limits of foreign policy powers (Prakash and Ramsey 2001, 252). However, power theorists fail to apply their theory to relevant events and ignore substantial incidents by which political actors avoid and manipulate the powers vested in the constitution. Economic or rational choice scholars offer evidence of a protectionist theory, by which domestic pressures on the executive and legislative bodies by special interest groups affect or encourage specific foreign policy decisions. Institutional scholars effectively distinguish what circumstances and which political actors make foreign policy successful in achieving domestic goals. Additionally, scholars from the institutional school of thought apply their argument to the case of Cuban foreign policy, where domestic politics drive many actors to make foreign policy a worthy interest and effort.

Kenneth Mayer (1999), a power theory scholar, asserts that there is a prevalent power over foreign policy within the executive branch and that the expansion of authority is due the implicit and non-implicit choreography of duties from the legislative branch to officials within the executive branches. Prakash and Ramsey (2001) reinforce the notion with the textual support of the constitution that makes presidential input on foreign policy paramount. Formal powers like executive orders, vested to the president, give him institutional standing; the branches of government utilize each other to cohesively make foreign policy decisions according to the executive preferences. And, as Prakash and Ramsey discuss, the constitution assigns the power of setting foreign policy to the president, and Congress acts as a partner in establishing law according to the executive policy (2001). The weakness within this theory is that there is a false assumption made that within the levels of government, there is collective interest in policy decisions, which is often not guaranteed. From this limitation of the power theory, we look to the economic scholars to explain the special interests of parties that have influence in foreign policy.

Kaempher, through his analysis of economic sanctions, centralizes the rational choice theory, arguing that economic interests, specifically interest groups, drive the implementation of foreign policy. These domestic pressures are “protectionalist” (Kaempher 1999, 54). Interest groups consider economic risks and benefits that would result from certain foreign policies, join forces with congressional members with similar interests, and influence the execution of policy. In addition to gaining legislative support, interest groups have the ability to affect public opinion by swaying constituents and or presenting their policy as a collective interest of the United States (Kaempher 1999, 50). More often than not, interest group goals are not a collective interest and the influence of domestic politics on foreign policy is negative. Timothy McKeown, a political science professor and economic theory scholar, applies this view of interest groups to the foreign policy arena involving economic sanctions in Cuba. Business interest groups, in search for compensation from Cuba, encouraged, rallied for, and instigated the naval blockade of Cuba in 1962 McKeown argues (McKeown 2000, 81). Rational choice scholars are effective in describing the different methods by which economic interests can impede collective democratic goals. To fully identify how domestic politics influence foreign policy, further institutional evidence beyond interest group activity must be explored.

DeGregorio and Richards are the key investigators that help us to better understand the influence of domestic politics in foreign policy decisions: “Consensus among opinion elites, such as the president, congressional entrepreneurs, lobbyists, and media spokespeople, bodes well for a policy’s survival” (2003, 168). This institutional theory incorporates every aspect of domestic politics and demonstrates the relationships that lead to influenced foreign policy. In an examination of Cuba, DeGregorio and Richards apply this theory to the way that “personal interests and political context” allow for government officials to exercise their authority faster than their opposing branches before law is made (DeGregorio and Richards 2003, 165). Congress and the president compete for the first move in foreign policy while interest groups act on their special interests by prompting support from congressional counterparts and the general public. Haney and Vanderbush (2005) associate the power of domestic politics in Cuban foreign policy execution on a larger scale to that of a looming pattern for foreign policy between many different nations. In suggesting that Cuban foreign policy is now to be considered a typical model for foreign policy, there is substantiation that domestic politics does play a role, perhaps to varying degrees, in foreign policy. The evidence provided by the institutional school of thought makes the best arguments of the three schools: we can make inferences over the weight of domestic politics in foreign policy, examine all the political actors involved, and demonstrate the theory with significant events.

From the literature reviewed, it is clear that there are more than a few ways by which domestic politics affect foreign policy in its initiation, content, and application. The power theory examines how different branches of government react to the delegated powers and how they execute foreign policy with those limits in mind. However, this theory is too stifled by the strict adherence to the constitutional limits of foreign policy, and its idealist quality lessens the applicability to modern theory on foreign policy. The economic theory attacks the role of interest groups and their effect on policy decisions, and it is ascertained that

economic advancement goals often can clog democratic goals. The institutional theory has the strongest bearing on the effects of domestic politics on foreign policy. The dominance of the “opinion elites” increases the amount of special interests within domestic politics, and this decreases an overall consensus of foreign policies inside and outside the United States (DeGregorio and Richards 2003, 168). From an institutional perspective, I will look deeper into Cuban Foreign policy and study the long term and short term effects of domestic politics on foreign policy.

Model

I delineate the independent and dependent variables as follows:

Domestic Political Influences → Efficiency of Foreign Policy

This model designates domestic political influences as the independent variable, and the efficiency of foreign policy as the dependent variable. At this stage in the research process, it is important that I distinguish the exact variables that I will later define, measure, and apply to my argument.

Hypothesis

From the scholarly evidence explored along with the independent and dependent variables established, my hypothesis is that the more that there is domestic political influences in a given foreign policy case, then the less efficient that foreign policy will be. This negative relationship requires an evaluation of multiple cases incorporating domestic political influences and the efficiency of foreign policy. I will explore multiple domestic political institutions to determine whether there is validity to my hypothesis.

Research Design

This study is formatted to evaluate the evolution of United States relations with Cuba and to decipher the degree to which domestic politics influence policy choices and the implementation of these choices. Before analyzing the data found and making connections, I must carefully distinguish what I am measuring, especially the two concepts of domestic political influences and efficient foreign policy

Cuban relations with the United States have many actors from within the United States that instigate, modify, and pressure the implementation of policies that have purposes beyond the democratic goals of foreign policy. I will provide an overview of my cases, how I plan to measure my variables, and offer an outline for how my research will be prepared and executed. The goal is not only to demonstrate causality between the domestic political players and their effect on efficient foreign policy, but to critically examine the power of domestic political influences and their impact on policy in general.

Concept Definition and Measurement

How do domestic political influences affect the efficiency of foreign policy? This question requires the reader to acknowledge which domestic political influences are being measured and under what context, in addition to understanding the meaning of efficient foreign policy. While examining the

variables involved, we must frequently return back to the hypothesis stating that the greater United States domestic politics influence foreign policy in Cuba, the less efficient¹ foreign policy will be. By domestic political influences I mean the institutions including interest groups, executive and legislative branches of government, and the media. Rather than examining the personal and collective motivations of the institutions, I will focus my research on the direct level of influence they use in foreign policy. My analysis will gauge the level of influence with four main indicators:

- Political and media attention
- Economic influence
- Institutional/Operational influence
- Policy implementation influence

How do these influences affect “efficient” foreign policy? Looking at the political and media attention derived from domestic influences, I will catalog media coverage (New York Times documents), the advocacy community (interest groups, government branches, and the Cuban-American community), and polls established. I will measure the economic influences with the degree of funding, either contributed towards a policy, or funding delivered to the particular institution that signals an incentive for interfering with foreign relations. As an example, the Cuban American National Foundation gave funding to many policies including military aid to Angola, the Helms Burton Law, and the embargo policies. CANF was also given an abundant amount of funding by the government directly and through extensions of CANF which were, with the assistance of the executive branch, designed to appear as separate interest groups. I will assess the institutional or operational influence by recording the foreign policy responsibilities, either designated to, or aggressively pursued by the institutions (i.e. consultation, task force management, or pleas for reevaluation). When considering policy implementation influence, I will outline the particular institution’s role in advise, consent, monetary or public support, and formal enactment of policy. These measurements should lend a critical eye to how much a domestic actor’s influence surrounds foreign policy.

I am looking for a positive or negative result that domestic political actors have impressed upon the efficiency of foreign policy. By measuring the efficiency of foreign policy, many perspectives must be evaluated. The degree of efficiency becomes a difficult measure when you consider the many political players with varying views of what makes a foreign policy efficient. A member of congress may feel completely satisfied when his vote supporting a successful foreign policy initiative results in constituent support. What do I mean by efficient foreign policy and are my measurements realistic and supportive of the cases being studied?

The best way to consider foreign policy as efficient is to decide whether the result of policy implementation caused the intended result in the international arena, not the domestic arena. If the primary success of a foreign policy was votes and campaign contributions between congress members and interest group lobbyists, foreign policy has failed. I will lay out the dependent variable indicators by citing:

- Policy goals

¹ Definition of ‘efficient’ to be found on page 7

- Policy risks
- Policy implementation
- Policy interpretations both domestically and internationally

This will allow me to dissect the impact of each and to determine the level of efficiency within the foreign policy. To allow for an organized and conclusive argument, the foreign policies measured will be United States foreign policies impressed on Cuba, examining cases from the latter half of the twentieth century. The cases studied will give evidence of causality between domestic politics and foreign policy, and will undoubtedly challenge my hypothesis.

Case Selection

United States relations with Cuba have been very strained during the last fifty years and not without reason. Both sides have struggled to negotiate relations because of the sharp differences in government organization, willingness to sacrifice rights within leadership positions, and the interference of other nations which has stimulated further conflict. The power struggle can be examined more thoroughly by selecting a sample of six major events, each including the existence of domestic influence on the implementation of policy. From each case, I will label the major players, reason for conflict, and the significance of the result of the policy. Assessing each case thoroughly is important in acknowledging controls for the sample, connections between domestic political influences and efficient foreign policy, as stated in model and hypothesis, and gaining a general understanding of the domestic relations driving implementation of policy.

The cases examined should encompass several elements of support for my hypothesis and should not rely on one angle for the argument. Case One: The failed invasion of the Bay of Pigs; Case Two: The Cuban missile crisis; Case Three: The Embargo policy; Case Four: The United States reaction to Cuban deployment of troops to Angola; Case Five: The founding and activities of CANF, the Cuban-American National Foundation; and Case Six: The institution of Helms-Burton law. From each case, I will draw conclusions from specific factors including the goal of the policy, the risks domestically and internationally, the progression towards implementation, and the perspectives on the home front and abroad. To control for outside influences that would affect my findings, I will analyze only United States domestic choices and their specific influence on the targeted part of the policy. This will include executive, legislative, and public actors and their role in initiating, shaping, and driving foreign policy.

The importance of noting controls within any case study is so that one can give reasoning and evidence of an independent variable consistently affecting a dependent variable regardless of differences of time and context. In a historical case study I must offer more than a few instances in varying time frames that produce consistent results. Each case begins, changes, and is impacted because of domestic political influences. I chose a variety of cases to demonstrate the evolution of American political thought: during the Cold War, presidents were granted authority upon their whim, while the legislative and judicial branches offered their support. In the 1980s, there was a significant shift in interest on foreign policy from within congress. Outside the main government institutions, there was growing attention to United States and Cuban relations due, in part, to

ethnic interest groups and their growing power legislatively, and because of the media coverage of these events. The domestic sphere grew and simultaneously placed pressure on major decision makers in foreign policy.

I will research the domestic political influences by gathering data on the birth of the institutions and their motivations for supporting of or opposition to American foreign policy vis-à-vis Cuba. This task is more difficult because there's been a question over the relevance or even existence of domestic political influences on foreign policy. I will observe the direct influences by institutions on an individual and group level that impact foreign policy. Influences include political and media attention, economic influence, institutional and operational influence, and policy implementation influence. To understand "efficient" foreign policy, I will examine the policy goals, risks, development, implementation, and interpretations both domestically and internationally on the success or failure of the policy.

Scholars Patrick J. Haney and Walt Vanderbush (2005), authors of *The Cuban Embargo*, chronologically map out the evolution of United States-Cuban relations and analyze the domestic political influences and how they impact foreign policy with Cuba. Haney and Vanderbush (2005) offer important benchmarks in relations between the U.S. and Cuba and distinguish connections between domestic politics and foreign policy. How do I measure the degree of influence on domestic politics on foreign policy? In the understanding of efficient foreign policy, there are sources that document the policy agendas, success or failure, and public opinion both domestically and abroad. Public opinion polls will describe the sentiment of Americans and people around the world concerning United States policy towards Cuba and give logic to some motivations of decision makers. The Gallop Polls (2007) are data sets that I will refer to on all polls taken involving Cuba from 1959 to 2000. Several other scholars offer interpretations of the implementation of policy including Gerald Bender (1981) in *Foreign Policy* journal, Brendan Krisher (2005) of *Associated Content*, William G. Mayer (2001) of *Public Opinion Quarterly*, and Shirley Scott and Withana (2004) of the *Chinese Journal of International Law*. Understanding the social constraints, policy context, and historical political movements that affect foreign relations with Cuba, I can defend my hypothesis on the causality between domestic political influences and efficient foreign policy.

Research is successful when there is a new comprehension of a given topic and conclusions have been introduced that had not previously been done effectively or at all. Domestic politics and their effect on foreign policy is a topic that challenges the structure of government and the actual effectiveness and execution of the balance of power. By examining the relationships among and between the levels of government, including the general public and private institutions, there will be a better base of knowledge as to how government officials interact in office and in the public to achieve policy goals. Concepts have been distinguished for the terms of the hypothesis: domestic influences include executive and legislative branches, interest groups, and media, and efficient foreign policy includes the initiation of policy, execution of policy, and public opinions domestically and internationally. I selected six cases from 1961 to 2000 in order to give a broad time frame of American and Cuban policies and their effectiveness. I use sources to uncover policy initiatives, budget distributions, media attention, and public opinions that shape the makeup of foreign policy. The power of domestic

influence on foreign policy is the question and through my findings, causality will be distinguished and conclusions will be made concerning their impact on foreign relations.

Analysis

My analysis is the section by which I weigh out the independent and dependent variables and associated data, and determine whether the cases studied demonstrate the causality between domestic political influences and the efficiency of foreign policy. I have placed all data into two figures that I will be continuously referring to and critically breaking down. I will preface the analysis by giving context on the cases examined to allow for a general understanding of what makes up the foreign policy initiative.

Brief Context for Cases Studied

Figure one and two provide data on the four independent variables and the four dependent variables that surround the six case studies of United States-Cuban relations from 1960 to 2000. Forty years of relations, bordering on diplomatic ruin, is not a subject to be mentioned lightly. For this reason, I will give some background on the case, and why I have chosen the case to defend my hypothesis.

Case One: Bay of Pigs Invasion 1961

The Bay of Pigs Invasion can be considered the largest mistake within United States-Cuban relations. Beginning in the Eisenhower administration, the CIA proposed an idea for destroying the Castro regime, a goal that has persisted throughout United States-Cuba relations history. When Kennedy succeeded Eisenhower, he was briefed by the CIA on the plan and authorized its continuation. The CIA trained 1500 Cuban exiles secretly in Guatemala with the intention of launching them in Southeast Cuba. The policy initiative fails when Castro learns of the training camps, Kennedy cancels the second air strike upon the exposure of U.S. interference and then reinstates it, and it proves unsuccessful.

This case is an epic example of the complexity of American foreign policy. I chose this to demonstrate the ability of the executive branch to manipulate the United States and aggressively enforce policy. This case study will show how even a tight operational endeavor, organized domestically, can fail miserably.

Case Two: The Cuban Missile Crisis

As one of the only widely recognized successful policies of the cases studied, I will carefully critique on what made this implementation different. On October 16, 1962, United States planes spotted nuclear missile sites built by the soviets in Cuba (JFK Library). For the next twelve days, the United States negotiated terms with the United Nations and the USSR, in order to dismantle the nuclear sites and remove threat. The Kennedy administration orders, under the consent of the United Nations, a naval blockade of Cuba. Eventually, Soviet Leaders comply with the terms and dismantle the nuclear sites.

I chose this case because the response to a national security threat stimulates quick action from several domestic and international spheres while testing the stability of political influences and efficient policy decisions.

Case Three: Cuban Embargo

In an attempt to force the communist regime of Fidel Castro into submission, President Eisenhower enforces economic sanctions on Cuba in 1960. For the next forty years, the embargo policy ranges in extremities, as there are periods of tightened and loosened sanctions. This case is significant as there is an abundant global opposition to the embargo, considering it an illegitimate and unsuccessful policy.

Case Four: United States Reaction to Cuban Deployment of Troops to Angola

In the summer of 1975, during the Angolan civil war, Fidel Castro sent 36,000 Cuban troops to aid the MPLA (Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola) Marxist forces (Haney & Vanderbush 2005, 26). In reaction, the United States sends military aid towards UNITA and the FNLA in Angola and demands for the withdrawal of Cuban troops. This case introduces the realm of foreign policy by which there is conflict between the executive and legislative branches of government. In 1996, Congress refuses to repeal the Clark Amendment, that would allow United States military aid to Angola, and the Executive initiative is ended.

Case Five: Founding and Activities of CANF

The Cuban American National Foundation was established in Florida by Cuban Americans and encouraged by the executive branch in 1981. Categorized as an educational organization, CANF has the most developed power of any ethnic interest group. This case is necessary to understand the level of influence in policy that CANF has implemented within United States and Cuban relations.

Case Six: Helms Burton Law

This law is an effort to tighten the embargo and finally destroy the Castro regime. Drafted in 1994 by house and senate members, the essence of the bill is to punish those who provide monetary support to the Castro regime and to broaden the terms of the embargo. The bill was weakly supported initially, but after Cuban government shot down American planes in a peaceful 'Brothers to the Rescue' flight, the bill gained momentum and was signed in 1996.

After gaining a general understanding of the tension levels, goals, and development of the given case studies, I will be able to forcefully defend my argument. I will display the data on independent and dependent variables, and put my two cents in. Conclusions will be made on the validity of my hypothesis and I will be able to say whether domestic political influences do in fact damage the efficiency of foreign policy.

Figure one lays out the political/media attention, economic influence, institutional/operational influence, and implementation influence on each of the six cases:

Figure 1: Independent Variable Data: Domestic Political Influences

Independent Variables	Bay of Pigs	Cuban Missile Crisis	Embargo	Reaction to Angola Activities	CANF	Helms Burton Law
------------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------------	----------------	--------------------------------------	-------------	-------------------------

POLITICAL/MEDIA Media Coverage	974	2032	233	1185	216	122 ²
Advocacy Comm.	Execut-ive	Executive OAS	Executive CANF Legislative	Executive CANF	Executive Legislative	CANF Legislative
U.S. Polls	Favor, 44-41	Favor, 48-34	Favor	Opposed		Marginally Opposed
ECONOMIC INFL. Funding towards policy	Federal Funds	N/A				
Funding delivered to group	To CIA		CANF	Federal Funds CANF	CANF	N/A
					Federal Funds, NED, INS, PAC's	
INSTIT/OPERATIONL Task Force	Execut-ive, CIA	Executive, EXCOMM	U.S. Military, UN	Executive CIA Legislative Corporate	Executive Legislative Cuban-Americans NED,INS	Executive Legislative CANF
Consultation	Execut-ive CIA	Media EXCOMM UN	OAS UN	Executive Legislative CIA	Executive Legislative CANF	Executive Legislative CANF
Pleas for reevaluation	None	USSR Cuba	USSR Cuba UN Americans Esp. Investors	Executive	None	Executive § Investors
IMPLEMENTATION Advice and Consent	None	UN	Executi-ve Legislat-ive	Execut-ive Legisla-tive	Executive Legisla-tive	Executive Legisla-tive

² Number of documents found in the New York Times Archive containing the case title

Monetary/Public Support	Federal \$	OAS	OAS CANF	Federal \$ CANF	Federal \$ NED,INS PAC's	Legislative CANF
Formal Enactment	Executive	Executive EXCOMM UN	Executive Legislative UN(<Which later pleas for reevaluation)	Exec fails, Legis. acts	Executive Legislative	Executive

Findings

From the given data, it is clear that the six cases examined involve many, if not all, domestic political actors who have an unprecedented amount of power over the handling of foreign policy. I can assume that the institutional/operational influence and the implementation influence show the most power over the execution and end result of policy. Within the political/media sector, the executive branch directs and organizes information that is exposed and withheld. By looking at the economic influences on the foreign policies, it is seen that federal funds and CANF dominate funding and thus have the upper hand in the negotiations of policy. Each subsection of the independent variable indicators involve, in many cases, more than one domestic actor who influences, contributes, and implements foreign policy.

What one can gather from the data that strongly supports my argument is that in each case, the domestic political actors that influence policy carry out their influence in most arenas (i.e. the Executive branch funds, organizes, releases information to the public, and formally implements policies). The independent variables weigh heavily in each case and I conclude that their degree of influence is validated. But what does this information say about my argument concerning the efficiency of foreign policy? I will now examine the dependent variable of the data to see if my hypothesis holds.

Figure 2: Dependent Variable Data: Efficiency of Foreign Policy

Dependent Variables	Bay of Pigs	Cuban Missile Crisis	Embargo	Reaction to Angola Activities	CANF	Helms Burton Law
POLICY GOALS	Destroy Castro regime.	Prevent missiles from entering Cuba.	Destroy Castro regime.	Discourage communist activities, and legitimate Cuban	Destroy Castro regime; Promotion and fund	Destroy Castro regime.

				presence in Angola. ³	anti-Castro activities	
POLICY RISKS	Revealed secrecy to U.S. and world. Legality	Weak U.S. position. Difficult and Dangerous. ⁴	\$ Turmoil for Cuban people and not Castro. Mass Cuban immigration to U.S.	Interference with foreign investment in Angola More USSR alignment from Cuba	Legality	Threat to foreign diplomacy and \$ investments.
POLICY IMPLEMENTATION	Eisenhower approves plan, Kennedy authorizes, Mission fails, and many die and are imprisoned.	Kennedy authorizes naval blockade, USSR agrees to terms, blockade ends.	Eisenhower first enforces in 1960. Embargo continues today with periods of tightened and loosened conditions.	U.S. gives covert aid to UNITA and FNLA. ⁵ Executive demands withdrawal of Cuban troops and repeal of Clark Amendment: Congress refuses.	CANF est. in 1981. Promote Radio Marti and TV Marti, lobbying activities, and direct immigration role	1995- Helms Burton Law is drafted. Executive and corporations oppose bill. The Brothers to the Rescue attack occurs. 1996- Clinton signs bill.
POLICY INTERPRETATION						
Domestically	betrayal, failure, and mistake	Success	Policy of national security. Lost business investments, Opposition and support.	Large opposition by investors, and the public.	Illegitimate, unfair and biased.	Unnecessary, not productive. Some support.
Internationally	Embarrassment and scorn	Success ⁶	Unfair, unnecessary. ⁷	Scorn and opposition.	Promotes terrorism	Unfair, illegitimate.

³ Bender 1981 (see bibliography)

⁴ Kennedy, speech in 1962

⁵ Haney 2005 (see bibliography)

⁶ Scott, Shirley, and Withana, 2004 (see bibliography)

⁷ Krisher 2005 (see bibliography)

Findings

The dependent variables examined incorporate the policy goals, risks, implementation, and interpretation. These factors, for the sake of this research study, allow me to weigh the level of efficiency of the policy and to determine whether there is causality between domestic political influences and foreign policy. One of the more striking observations of the dependent variables is that in each case, the primary goal of the policy is to destroy the Castro regime. This indicates that this goal has transcended generations of domestic political actors and remained a primary goal. Each case builds on my hypothesis and makes connections between the domestic political actions and the efficiency of foreign policy. In Case One, the recurring goal of destroying the Castro regime directs the manner by which domestic decisions are made. The risk of domestic and international legality in the Executive-based policy does not play an important role in the implementation process; this explains the essence of executive privilege. The secret activity and singular actions of the Executive branch and the CIA lay the framework for even more repercussions of the widely interpreted failure. The one successful policy and distinct outlier in Case Two shows that the risks of the policy were mainly to the United States detriment. This forces the United States to align all domestic forces, with little conflict, to quickly respond to a national threat to security; thus the United States cannot fail. Case Three continues for a prolonged period of time, and it is understood from the data that this case would have the most pleas for reevaluation. With a policy whose risks are mostly international and not domestic, there is more impulse from the United States to implement. Case Four demonstrates the connections between domestic politics and efficient foreign policy when domestic investment is at risk. This case, along with Case Six, risks loss of American investment. Because of this domestic risk, there is more conflict between the executive and legislative branches. Case Five displays the ability for CANF to slip under the radar with the support of both the executive and legislative branches. CANF has the largest task force and this explains why there are few records of formal pleas for reevaluation. Case Six is an instance by which the policy agenda is out of the executive branch's hands. This policy, like others, is accelerated by Cuban actions (Brothers to the Rescue attack). Foreign policy is affected by domestic political influences in every aspect of implementation, and this case analysis lends a critical eye to how these influences are supported, funded, and driven within the United States.

Several important conclusions have been drawn from this analysis showing validity to my model and hypothesis. During the implementation process of each case, the political actors involved act singularly and not collectively, showing there to be connection to the fact that several domestic political influences working individualistically run the high risk of harming the efficiency of the policy itself. Foreign policy that runs a high risk directly to the United States, like national security threats, show the most efficiency, collective action, and successful implementation and interpretations. Risks involving domestic investments produce the most conflict within the domestic political institutions, mostly between the executive and the legislative, that also threaten the efficiency of policy. It is clear that the interpretations of the policy are important in determining the domestic and global impact of the policy initiative. With the exception to the Cuban Missile Crisis, each policy has delivered mixed interpretations, but with a large amount of

discontent over the execution of policy that was particularly carried out by the United States domestic players. These findings grant me my substantiation, as I can conclude that more domestic political influences driving policy has damaged, if not destroyed, United States and Cuban Policy initiatives.

Conclusion

This research has journeyed into the nooks and crannies of American foreign policy, outlining its strengths and weaknesses as a collective effort for efficient foreign diplomacy. I have found a strong defense for my argument that domestic political influences negatively affect foreign policy. My findings show large connections between domestic political institutions, risk assessment, and implementation. What can political science gain from this research? I have begun to uncover the internal and external impulses towards policy choices that the United States has used over time, particularly with Cuban relations. The findings made in this study delineate patterns of success and failure for foreign policy choices that, with further examination, can benefit the United States political institutions by showing areas of operation that are in dire need of improvement. The largest detriment to United States foreign policy is the inability for domestic institutions to act collectively and for the purpose of fulfilling international goals as well as domestic ones. I have been able to show the connections I had originally intended, and discover how foreign politics can turn into a home team-advantaged disaster.

Future research should explore the domestic influence of the media. Having stripped most communications between the United States and Cuba, media coverage is the primary link between Cubans and Americans. From my data, I ascertained that cases with more *New York Times* articles also had the sharpest variance in favor or opposition of the policy. Political institutions rely heavily on the media to deliver preferred and beneficial messages to the public. The examination of the partnership between the media and political institutions would allow us to learn much more on the domestic relationships surrounding foreign policy. Future research should also look deeper into international ramifications of the foreign policy cases by which the United States acts against international legal regulations, such as damaged trade and diplomatic relations. By challenging the infrastructure of American foreign policy, I effectively examined the negative relationship between domestic political influences and efficient foreign policy and outlined weak positions of the American government that should be improved upon for the sake of a cohesive foreign policy and the improvement of United States and Cuban relations.

References

- Bender, Gerald J. 1981. "Angola: Left, Right & Wrong". *Foreign Policy* 43 (April): 53-69.
- Clifton, Jim. 2007. "Poll Archives." *The Gallup Organization*.
<http://www.gallupoll.com> (April 11, 2007).

- Davis, Timothy S. 2005. *Close up Foundation on Education*. <http://closeup.org> (April 14, 2007).
- DeGregorio, Christine, and David H. Richards. 2003. "Context and Decision: Explaining U.S. Policy Towards Cuba." In *Congress and the Politics of Foreign Policy*, ed. Colton C. Campbell, Nicol C. Rae, and John F. Stack, Jr. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall: 165-184.
- Haney, Patrick, and Walt Vanderbush. 2005. *The Cuban Embargo: The Domestic Politics of an American Foreign Policy*. Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press.
- Kaempher, William H., and Anton D. Lowenberg. 1999. "Unilateral Versus Multilateral International Sanctions: A Public Choice Perspective." *International Studies Quarterly* 43 (March): 37-58.
- Krisher, Brendan. 2005. "Lifting the U.S.-Cuban Embargo: A Case of Current Events". *Associated Content*. <http://www.associatedcontent.com/article> (April 12, 2007).
- Mayer, Kenneth R. 1999. "Executive Orders and Presidential Power." *Journal of Politics* 61 (May): 445-466.
- Mayer, William G. 2001. "The Polls-Trends: American Attitudes towards Cuba". *Public Opinion Quarterly* 65 (Winter): 585-606.
- McKeown, Timothy J. 2000. "The Cuban Missile Crisis and Politics as Usual." *Journal of Politics* 62 (February): 70-87.
- Plotkin, Stephen. 2007. "Historical Resources." *JFK Presidential Library and Museum*. <http://www.jfklibrary.org> (accessed April 12, 2007).
- Prakash, Saikrishna B., and Michael D. Ramsey. 2001. "The Executive Power Over Foreign Affairs." *Yale Law Journal* 111 (November): 231-356.
- ProQuest Historical Newspapers the New York Times (1851-2003)*. <http://www.il.proquest.com> (accessed April 17, 2007).
- Scott, Shirley, and Withana. 2004. "The Relevance of International Law for Foreign Policy Decision-Making when National Security is at Stake: Lessons from the Cuban Missile Crisis". *Chinese Journal of International Law* 3 (June): 163-187.