

## Международные отношения

УДК-327

DOI: 10.17072/2218-1067-2025-1-112-120

### OVERLAP OF OAS AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE IN US FOREIGN POLICY

A. Trebukh

*Aleksandr Trebukh*, PhD Student, World Politics Faculty,  
Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia.  
E-mail: alexandr.trebukh@yandex.ru (ORCID: 0009-0007-2485-2573).

#### Abstract

This article is to demonstrate actions and the U.S. operational abilities in the usage of the Organization of American States as a tool in implementing their foreign policy interests in Latin America. The organization under consideration is analyzed in the context of the Monroe doctrine at the present stage. The author uses regional security complex. Using a historical approach, the article attempts to trace the importance of this organization for the USA in ensuring its national interests. The author concludes that the OAS is the organizational embodiment of the Monroe doctrine from the U.S. strategic goal setting. It is a key institution, that ensures stability and the existing regional system of international relations forged after World War II. The United States utilizes the Organization of American States as a mechanism to uphold and promote the principles of democratic governance, market-based economic activity, and the protection of human rights. Historically, the OAS has been designed as a tool to exert pressure on unfavorable regimes and to foster a unified hemisphere adhering to liberal-democratic principles of governance. The ultimate goal is to safeguard U.S. national interests and mitigate threats within the regional security complex.

**Keywords:** The Monroe Doctrine; U.S. foreign policy; OAS; Latin America; U.S. national interests; Western Hemisphere; security complex.

The United States of America are prone to view Latin American countries in a meticulously detailed way, although sometimes they completely neglect the needs and the meaning of this region in its regional foreign strategy. However, arising cyclic structural changes in the regional dynamic of international relations make the United States of America adjust its strategy to the region. Structural changes in the regional system dynamic in the 2010s caused by migration crisis, political changes and mass protests coupled with covid-19 pandemic, a rising role of the People's Republic of China and the inclusion of many Latin American countries into "Belt and Road" program, led to an attempt from the USA to update its foreign policy in the region.

The Organization of American States is one of the crucial pillars of the whole Western Hemisphere political system, within which the USA shape its agenda and promote national interests. At the same time, the history of Washington's relations with the countries of the region over the past two centuries, since the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, bears the imprint of a paternalistic, coercive character associated with attempts to subordinate the region to the foreign policy priorities of the United States of America.

This article is to define if the OAS can be called an organizational multilateral embodiment of the Monroe Doctrine from the U.S. strategic goalsetting. Taking into account the organization's activities at the present stage, this work defines an evolution and interpretation of the main Monroe doctrine ideas by the U.S. political establishment, clarifies the role and place of the OAS for the USA since its creation, characterizes the current state of the U.S. relations with the regional countries on the basis of a number of metrics.

#### Background

Russian scholars analyzed the following topics in the context of the OAS and the U.S. role in it: the evolution of the OAS and the role of the United States in this organization were researched by Khadorich L.V (Khadorich, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c). In addition, the issues of the evolution of the OAS development are examined in the works of Heifetz V.L. (Heifetz & Khadorich, 2015a, 2015b). Kuteynikov A.E records the

current state of the OAS and analyzes its historical foundations and the role of the United States in it, mentioning several scenarios of development at the present stage (Kuteynikov, 2012). Nelina O.V. touched upon the problems of countering terrorism in the countries of the Western Hemisphere by the OAS (Nelina, 2009). Eremin A.A. analyzed the issue of regional security and the role of the OAS (Eremin, 2020). Sudarev V.P. comprehends the problems of the OAS reforming and the ability of this organization to respond to modern regional challenges (Sudarev, 2020). Strigunov K.S. and Manoilo A.V. point to the role of the OAS as a factor of foreign policy influence on the countries of the region in the context of a Bolivian coup (Strigunov & Manoilo, 2021), and Strashko Ya.I. wrote on the OAS activities to prevent regional conflicts and ensure security in the Western Hemisphere (Strashko, 2015).

The following problems can be traced in the works of foreign researchers: some studied the changing nature of Inter-American multilateralism using the example of the OAS (Therien J.P. et al, 1996), others considered the possibilities and the OAS role in promoting democracy in the region (Olivari, 2014). In addition to the problem of democracy, some scientists also touched upon the issue of human rights in the context of the OAS activities (Martinez, 2013), as well as the relationship of the OAS with other regional associations (Johnson, 2019). Foreign researchers also analyzed the viability of this organization at the present stage (Herz, 2008), modern challenges and future threats to this association (Mace, 2022). The viability issue of inter-American summits within the OAS was examined by Legler T. (Legler, 2013). Some authors researched the problem of the U.S. relations with the OAS (Kusumaningrum, 2019).

Thus, this article aims to fill the gap in studies devoted to the role of the United States and the Monroe Doctrine within the framework of the Organization of American States. The article is based on regional security complex theory. It allows us to examine the U.S. foreign policy in the Organization of American States as a tool in handling the security issues in the Western Hemisphere, as they are perceived in Washington. As Buzan and Waever state, proximity is a main category related to the perception of threats by state actors (Buzan & Waever, 2003: 45). Thus, in this article we focus on the institutional level and attempt to determine whether the origin and principles of OAS are in line with the U.S. strategic interests.

### **The Monroe Doctrine in the United States foreign policy strategy**

The bicentennial of the Monroe Doctrine, proclaimed in 1823, has revived discussions about its historical and political significance for the United States of America in the 21st century. The main tenets of this doctrine are the following statements:

- The United States advocated for the delimitation and inviolability of spheres of influence, defining the Western Hemisphere as its sphere and while recognizing the existing colonies in the region.
- The doctrine clarified the right of the United States to protect its national interests and security in this part of the world.
- The doctrine stated a ban on interference by European countries in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere states, as well as a warning about the inadmissibility of attempts to spread “their systems”, which would be interpreted as a threat to American security<sup>1</sup>.
- The Western Hemisphere was being closed for any future colonization attempts.

Adopted and came into effect in 1823, the doctrine worked. Until 1861, there were no attempts by foreign states to interfere in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere countries. The doctrine passed its first test of strength during France’s attempt to establish a monarchy in Mexico, but Napoleon III’s reluctance to enter into an open military conflict with the United States convinced him to withdraw his troops. However, the doctrine itself is not mentioned in any official statement by the American authorities during this conflict (Bancroft, 1896: 42).

The further evolution of the doctrine before the First World War was characterized by the beginning of a consistently hard line based on the principles of non-intervention of European countries in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. The apogee of this line was the Roosevelt Corollary of 1905, which changed the nature of the doctrine from passive to active. It allowed the United States to intervene in the affairs of countries in the Western Hemisphere if they had “violated the rights of the United States or provoked foreign aggression to the detriment of all nations of the Americas”<sup>2</sup>. This resulted in interventions in a number of Latin

<sup>1</sup> December 2, 1823: Seventh Annual Message (Monroe Doctrine) (1823) [online], *Miller Center*. URL: <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches/december-2-1823-seventh-annual-message-monroe-doctrine> (accessed: 23 October 2024).

<sup>2</sup> Theodore Roosevelt to the Monroe Doctrine (1905) [online], *National Archives*. URL: <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/roosevelt-corollary> (accessed: 10 October 2024).

American countries (Ricard, 2006: 24), and the doctrine, according to some researchers, began to be used as a justification for them (Bailey, 1974: 505).

The interbellum period was characterized by a discussion of the need for a more active U.S. foreign policy on the world stage and an attempt to legalize the postulates of the doctrine, especially before the Second World War (Spencer, 1936: 405). It was clearly manifested in Article 21 of the Covenant of the League of Nations<sup>3</sup>. The First World War had a strong impact on Woodrow Wilson who stated that: "the world must be made safe for democracy"<sup>4</sup>. According to him, the Monroe Doctrine was to become a "doctrine of peace", upon the adoption of which no nation should seek to extend its state system to any nation or people, that each nation should determine its own, unthreatened, path of development. Despite this mission to nurture democratic ideals, the situation in the controlled countries remained the same with the changed rhetoric of the U.S. leadership.

The understanding of the Monroe Doctrine that existed before the Good Neighbor Policy of F.D. Roosevelt, who renounced the right of the United States to intervene in the countries of Latin American and the Caribbean, was revised with the beginning of the Cold War and the rise to power of H.S. Truman. Truman refused to amend the doctrine and put forward his own, which resulted in a departure from the limitations of the "traditional" sphere of influence of the United States<sup>5</sup>. In the Western Hemisphere, the United States began to create institutions that would extend the postulates of the Monroe Doctrine to the entire regional system of international relations. One of these institutions was the Inter-American Treaty on Mutual Assistance of 1947 and the Organization of American States that was established later. Their main principle was the postulate of collective defense of the signatory countries in the event of an attack by an extra-regional power on one of the countries in the region<sup>6</sup>.

During the Cold War, the discourse on the Monroe Doctrine began to fade away, only to be revived during the Cuban Missile Crisis, primarily in the American press. The US did not abandon its active position related to intervention in the affairs of Western Hemisphere states, often bypassing OAS decisions.

The "end of history" era was characterized by public debate on the end of the Monroe Doctrine<sup>7</sup>, which began with Clinton's decision to use the United Nations institutions to ensure the protection of democracy in Haiti<sup>8</sup>. With the growing tensions between the United States and major extra-regional actors such as China, Russia and Iran at the beginning of the second decade of the 21st century, the discourse on the Monroe Doctrine in the modern USA has become more active, and references to this policy document have become more frequent from high-ranking politicians in Washington. However, this discourse is undergoing through various metamorphoses: in 2013, Secretary of State John Kerry officially stated that the doctrine was a mistake and announced its end, while simultaneously putting forward the thesis that the LAC countries are now perceived exclusively as equal partners<sup>9</sup>. Just a month before this statement, the head of the State Department claimed that Latin America is the "backyard" of the United States of America<sup>10</sup>. Six years later, National Security Advisor to the President John Bolton stated: "the Monroe Doctrine is alive and well"<sup>11</sup>. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson echoed him<sup>12</sup>. All this not only speaks to the absence of a unified American

<sup>3</sup> The Covenant of the League of Nations (1919) [online], *United Nations*. URL: <https://www.un Geneva.org/en/about/league-of-nations/covenant> (accessed: 11 October 2024).

<sup>4</sup> Read President Wilson's 1917 Address on the U.S. Entering World War I. (1917) [online], *TIME*. URL: <https://time.com/4718404/wwi-wilson-request-to-congress/> (accessed: 10 May 2023).

<sup>5</sup> Truman Doctrine (1947) // *National Archives*. URL: <https://www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/truman-doctrine> (accessed: 10 October 2024).

<sup>6</sup> Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance [online], *Organization of American States*. URL: <https://www.oas.org/juridico/english/treaties/b-29.html#:~:text=INTER%2DAMERICAN%20TREATY%20OF%20RECIPROCAL%20ASSISTANCE&text=The%20High%20Contracting%20Parties%20formally,Nations%20or%20of%20this%20Treaty> (accessed: 10 April 2024).

<sup>7</sup> Goodbye, Monroe Doctrine (1994) [online], *The Washington Post*. URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/opinions/1994/08/13/goodbye-monroe-doctrine/7770f2a0-3259-493b-8103-8d532a2a5dec/> (accessed: 10 April 2024).

<sup>8</sup> Haiti: restoring a democracy [online], *Clinton digital library*. URL: <https://clinton.presidentiallibraries.us/haiti-topic-guide> (accessed: 10 October 2024).

<sup>9</sup> Kerry Makes It Official: 'Era of Monroe Doctrine Is Over' (2013) [online], *The Wall Street Journal*. URL: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/BK-WB-41869> (accessed: 10 October 2024).

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Let the Monroe Doctrine Die (2019) [online], *Foreign Policy*. URL: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/05/29/let-the-monroe-doctrine-die-venezuela-bolton/> (accessed: 10 October 2024).

<sup>12</sup> Tillerson Praises Monroe Doctrine, Warns Latin America of 'Imperial' Chinese Ambitions (2018) [online], *Foreign Policy*. URL: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/02/02/tillerson-praises-monroe-doctrine-warns-latin-america-off-imperial-chinese-ambitions-mexico-south-america-nafta-diplomacy-trump-trade-venezuela-maduro/> (accessed: 04 October 2024).

approach to interaction with the states of the region, but also testifies to the tenacity of the postulates proclaimed 200 years ago.

This perception of the region has not bypassed the administration of J.R. Biden. Despite demonstrating an alternative approach to Trump's policy, he also declared that Latin America is America's "front yard"<sup>13</sup>. In contrast to the offensive "back yard", the new metaphor was supposed to sound like a compliment.

A discourse on the Monroe Doctrine showing the number of its mentions in the English-written press from 1823 to 2019 displays time periods when the attention to the doctrine was the highest: during T. Roosevelt administration, in the beginning of World War II and in the days of Cuban Missile Crisis<sup>14</sup>. The evolution of both the doctrine itself and its perception by the American establishment makes it possible to trace its normative significance for U.S. policy strategy in the region. It can be noted that its existence remains on the information agenda of the modern United States, but the growing contradictions between Washington and extra-regional actors do not significantly increase the discussions about the need to revive the doctrine, despite individual statements by officials in power.

### The meaning of the Organization of American States

Speaking of the significance of the OAS, it is worth briefly describing the motivation for its creation both from the U.S. and Latin American points of view. For the USA the creation of the organization was necessary for the legalization of the provisions of the Monroe Doctrine and their extension to the entire Inter-American system of international relations being formed under the auspices of American leadership in the region (Thomas & Thomas Jr, 1970: 554). The main goal of creating this organization was to ensure the military-political advantage of the USA in the region in the context of the aggravation of the confrontation between the two political and economic systems: capitalist and communist. For Latin American countries, the motivation for concluding an agreement with Washington was as follows: the OAS was presented to them as an attempt to deepen the development of economic relations with the USA, the absence or weakness of which would significantly slow down the economic growth of Latin American countries.

At the initial stage, the OAS addressed the task of maintaining the political integration of the countries of the Western Hemisphere and preventing the spread of communist systems in the region. To this end, in 1954, a declaration of solidarity was adopted in defense of the political integrity of American states against the intervention of international communism<sup>15</sup>. The principles of the Monroe Doctrine were expanded not only to military intervention by extra-regional actors. J. Foster Dulles sought to include the concept of banning foreign ideologies in the American republics in the Inter-American system of international relations and emphasized it to the U.S. National Security Council as an extension of the Monroe Doctrine, leaving for a conference in Caracas in 1954 with this goal in mind<sup>16</sup>.

During the years of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the OAS was used by the United States as an institutional means of implementing the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, which resulted in the decision to exclude Cuba from the organization due to the incompatibility of its political regime with the Inter-American system. J. Kennedy stated that the exclusion of Cuba showed the unanimity of the entire Hemisphere on this issue, and the United States itself was trying to implement its national policy in every possible way through the organization and through the entire Hemisphere<sup>17</sup>. In 1960, he repeated that a part of the doctrine was alive, and the OAS joined this part. According to him, the paternalistic understanding of the U.S. as a police region had become less important, since the USA are not becoming the region's policeman, but is joining them, bearing in mind the emerging united front of the hemisphere's countries in the fight against attempts to seize power in any of them<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> Remarks by President Biden at Press Conference (2022) [online], *The White House*/ URL: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/01/19/remarks-by-president-biden-in-press-conference-6/> (accessed 08 October 2024).

<sup>14</sup> Monroe Doctrine [online], *Google Books Ngram Viewer*. URL: [https://books.google.com/ngrams/graph?content=Monroe+Doctrine&year\\_start=1823&year\\_end=2019&corpus=en-2019&smoothing=3#](https://books.google.com/ngrams/graph?content=Monroe+Doctrine&year_start=1823&year_end=2019&corpus=en-2019&smoothing=3#) (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>15</sup> Caracas Declaration of Solidarity; March. 28, 1954 (1954) [online], *Yale Law School*. URL: [https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/intam10.asp#:~:text=This%20declaration%20of%20foreign%20policy,own%20social%20and%20cultural%20life](https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/intam10.asp#:~:text=This%20declaration%20of%20foreign%20policy,own%20social%20and%20cultural%20life) (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>16</sup> Memorandum of Discussion at the 189<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the National Security Council on Thursday, March 18, 1954. (1954) [online], *Office of the Historian*. URL: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v04/d77> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>17</sup> The President's News Conference (1962) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/the-presidents-news-conference-175> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>18</sup> Question and Answer Session Following Speech of Senator John F. Kennedy, Multnomah Hotel, Portland, OR (1960) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/question-and-answer-session-following-speech-senator-john-f-kennedy-multnomah-hotel> (accessed 10 October 2024).

American presidents have also addressed the Organization in other time periods. The most active were the administrations of George W. Bush and Barack Obama. It can be explained by the consequences of globalization, namely the growth of global and non-traditional security threats<sup>19</sup>. The trigger for the activation of the U.S. policy towards the OAS was the infamous events of September 11, 2001<sup>20</sup>. The global financial crisis of 2008 became another reason why the U.S. began to use the OAS's capabilities to restore economic activity in the countries of the region<sup>21</sup>. D. Trump's active policy against the so-called "troika of tyrannies" represented by Cuba, Venezuela and Nicaragua was expressed in the use of the OAS to try to put pressure on these countries. The United States proposed adopting a declaration condemning the violent policy of the Managua regime, facilitating early elections in Nicaragua and taking measures to investigate cases of violence by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights<sup>22</sup>. The question of violation of the OAS Charter was raised with regard to Cuba and Venezuela<sup>23</sup>. The 46th U.S. presidential administration has also turned to the OAS both to condemn authoritarian regimes<sup>24</sup> and to develop measures to protect human rights and the democratic character of the region.

The role of the OAS in English-language discourse from 1949 to 2019 shows a largely downward trend. The peak, when the OAS was discussed in printed materials the most, was the period of the Cuban Missile Crisis. The end of the Cold War shows a sharp decline in mentions of the OAS<sup>25</sup>.

### Dynamics of the U.S. positions in the Western Hemisphere

The significance of the Western Hemisphere in US foreign policy usually was lesser than the importance of other regions. Under George W. Bush administration, a priority was given to the U.S. policy in the Middle East, and with the advent of the B. Obama administration, the so-called "pivot to Asia" was outlined. During the years of D. Trump's rule, the United States demonstratively proclaimed the principle of "America First".

Even before the representative of the U.S. Democratic Party came to power, a platform was published outlining the vision of the U.S. domestic and foreign policy. Thus, the 2020 Democratic Party platform states that the Western Hemisphere is perceived as its own home, cooperation in which with the countries of the region should be based not on coercion, but on sharing common values and responsibilities, and the policy of the former D. Trump administration should be rejected as undermining the interests of American citizens<sup>26</sup>. At the same time, the Republican Party platform, in effect since 2016, sharply criticizes the Democrats' policy towards Cuba, calls Venezuela an outpost of Iran and a narco-state threatening the countries of Central America<sup>27</sup>. Published in 2022 National Security Strategy again outlined the goals of moving forward, strengthening economic resilience, increasing the level of security and democratic stability. The need to combat threats posed by extra-regional actors – China, Russia, Iran – was also stated. The 2022 NSC also ranks the Western Hemisphere third after the Indo-Pacific and European regions, indicating the increas-

<sup>19</sup> Joint Statement Between the United States of America and the Republic of Chile (2006) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/joint-statement-between-the-united-states-america-and-the-republic-chile> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>20</sup> Press release – Bush Administration Actions Consistent with 9/11 Recommendations (2004) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/press-release-bush-administration-actions-consistent-with-911-recommendations> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>21</sup> FACT SHEET: United States Support for Economic Growth and Development in the Caribbean (2013) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/fact-sheet-united-states-support-for-economic-growth-and-development-the-caribbean> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>22</sup> Statement by the Press Secretary on Nicaragua (2018) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/statement-the-press-secretary-nicaragua-0> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>23</sup> Press briefing by Press Secretary Sarah Sanders (2019) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/press-briefing-press-secretary-sarah-sanders-44> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>24</sup> Press Briefing by Press Secretary Jen Psaki and Secretary Of Commerce Gina Raimondo (2021) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/press-briefing-press-secretary-jen-psaki-and-secretary-commerce-gina-raimondo-0> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>25</sup> OAS [online], *Google Books Ngram Viewer*. URL: [https://books.google.com/ngrams/graph?content=OAS&year\\_start=1949&year\\_end=2019&corpus=en-2019&smoothing=3](https://books.google.com/ngrams/graph?content=OAS&year_start=1949&year_end=2019&corpus=en-2019&smoothing=3) (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>26</sup> 2020 Democratic Party Platform (2020) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/2020-democratic-party-platform> (accessed 01 October 2024).

<sup>27</sup> 2016 Republican Party Platform (2016) [online], *The American Presidency Project*. URL: <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/2016-republican-party-platform> (accessed 01 October 2024).

ing importance of the region for the U.S. officials<sup>28</sup>. The U.S. National Defense Strategy only briefly confirmed the intention to cooperate with the countries of the region in joint defense against emerging threats<sup>29</sup>. Thus, in view of the emergence of new threats there is a need to strengthen the U.S. position in the Western Hemisphere and maintain the democratic structure of the regional system.

Moreover, economic competition remains the most vital problem for the U.S. national interests. In trade and economic relations, for the first time, imports of goods from the United States exceeded exports to the Latin American countries in 2019, and then, after a sharp decline against the backdrop of the covid-19 pandemic, actively increased, reaching \$783.9 million in 2023, exceeding exports by \$76.9 million<sup>30</sup>.

Accordingly, the U.S. trade balance with the countries of the region over the past 10 years shows negative dynamics<sup>31</sup>. At the same time, as a percentage of all imports to the U.S., the countries of the Western Hemisphere make up 20.5%, having increased by 1% over the past decade, and exports make up 23.2% of all the U.S. exports, having decreased by 1.4% over 10 years<sup>32</sup>. These changes can be taken as an error, since the share of imports and exports in trade with the countries of this region for the U.S. has remained at a stable level for 10 years.

Bilateral investments show a much more interesting dynamic: for example, the U.S. investments in the Western Hemisphere countries increased from \$788.7 million in 2013 to \$1.037 billion by 2022, reaching \$1 billion in 2017 and remaining stable there until 2022<sup>33</sup>. Reverse investments from the countries of the region to the U.S. have doubled over the decade: from \$100.4 million in 2013 to \$211.8 million in 2022<sup>34</sup>. These data may indicate a weak, but still growing, bilateral interest in trade and economic relations. Historically, for more than a quarter of a century, foreign direct investments from the USA to Latin America have shown stable growth<sup>35</sup>.

The Western Hemisphere accounts for 22.4% of all direct foreign investments from the USA. In total, investments in the Western Hemisphere countries are one and a half times greater than the U.S. investments in the Asia-Pacific region, but are more than twice as low as investments in Europe<sup>36</sup>. At the same time, the main trading partners of the United States in the region remain the most developed economies, with which the USA both increased the degree of bilateral economic ties and increased investments in their national economies<sup>37</sup>. One of the main problems facing the countries of the region is the debt problem. According to the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the vast majority of countries south of the Rio Grande increased their public debt from 2012 to 2021<sup>38</sup>. This undoubtedly soared the dependence of these countries on the influx of foreign investment and major creditor countries.

\* \* \*

In summary, a number of conclusions can be drawn regarding the role and place of the OAS in the U.S. foreign policy strategy. Firstly, the OAS is essentially an organizational and institutional embodiment of the provisions of the Monroe Doctrine, which was recorded in its statutory documents. Secondly, the Organization is used by the United States of America as a means by which the existing structure of the regional system of international relations and security complexes, based on the principles of free trade and liberal democracy, is maintained. Thirdly, the OAS is used by the United States of America to put pressure on coun-

<sup>28</sup> National Security Strategy of the United States of America (2022) [online], *The White House*. URL: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Biden-Harris-Administrations-National-Security-Strategy-10.2022.pdf> (accessed 01 October 2024).

<sup>29</sup> National Defense Strategy of the United States of America (2022) [online], *Department of Defense*. URL: <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/trecms/pdf/AD1183514.pdf> (accessed 01 October 2024).

<sup>30</sup> U.S. international trade in goods and services. Latin America and Other Western Hemisphere (2024) [online], *U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis*. URL: <https://apps.bea.gov/international/factsheet/factsheet.html#299> (accessed 01 October 2024).

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Balance of Payments and Direct investment Position Data (2024) [online], *U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis*. URL: <https://www.bea.gov/international/diIusdbal> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>36</sup> Direct Investment by Country and Industry (2024) [online], *U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis*. URL: <https://www.bea.gov/data/intl-trade-investment/direct-investment-country-and-industry> (accessed 10 October 2024).

<sup>37</sup> International Trade in Goods and Services (2024) [online], *U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis*. URL: <https://www.bea.gov/data/intl-trade-investment/international-trade-goods-and-services> (accessed 04 October 2024).

<sup>38</sup> Public debt and development distress in Latin America and the Caribbean (2023) [online], *ECLAC*. P. 15. URL: <https://repositorio.cepal.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/d84a5041-0a2c-4b8e-9b01-d91b187477ce/content> (accessed 01 October 2024).

tries attempting to violate these principles. However, given the economic and political importance of the region, as well as the intensification of the policy of non-regional actors in the Western Hemisphere, the USA has not developed a clear strategic vision for using its capabilities in the organization. Its role for the USA is doctrinally defined as significant, but there is practically a lack of attention to its mechanisms. This leads to both discussions about whether the OAS will be viable in the medium term, and the lack of a bipartisan consensus on an accelerated procedure for appointing a United States representative to the OAS.

Making a forecast for the medium term, the OAS, for all its shortcomings and turbulence of the U.S. policy towards Latin American states, will remain the main institution of multilateral cooperation, human rights protection and dialogue for the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Until alternative regional cooperation projects can achieve the same level of interaction as exists within the framework of the OAS, the USA will have more opportunities to promote its foreign policy interests through the legitimate institution of multilateral cooperation in the Western Hemisphere.

### Список литературы / References

- Еремин, А. А. (2020) 'Организация Американских Государств и региональная безопасность', *Аспект-пресс*. 176 с. [Eremmin, A. A. (2020) "OAS and regional security" [Organizacija Amerikanskih Gosudarstv i regional'naja bezopasnost'], *Aspekt-press*, 176 p. (In Russ.). ISBN: 978-5-7567-1064-9 EDN: IWDDII
- Кутейников, А. Е. (2012) 'ОАГ – Типичная и уникальная международная структура', *Латинская Америка*, (5), сс. 15–31. [Kuteynikov, A. E. "Organization of American States (OAS): A typical and Unique International Structure" [OAG – Tipichnaja i unikal'naja mezhdunarodnaja struktura], *Latinskaya Amerika*, (5), pp. 15–31. (In Russ.).]
- Нелина, О. В. (2009) 'ОАГ в противодействии террористической угрозе: латиноамериканские альтернативы', *Латинская Америка*, 9, сс. 38–44. [Nelina, O. V. (2009) "The OAS in countering the terrorist threat: Latin American alternatives" [OAG v protivodejstvii terroristicheskoy ugroze: latinoamerikanskije al'ternativy], *Latinskaya Amerika*. 2009, 9, pp. 38–44. (In Russ.).] EDN: VIMCRT
- Страшко, Я. И. (2015) 'Особенности современных конфликтов в Латинской Америке и роль ОАГ в урегулировании Фолклендского конфликта', *Вестник МГИМО университета*, 1(40), сс. 177–183. [Strashko, Y. I. (2015) "Modern conflict features in Latin America. The Role of the OAS in the settlement of the Falkland Conflict" [Osobennosti sovremennyh konfliktov v Latinskoj Amerike i rol' OAG v uregulirovanii Folklendskogo konflikta], *MGIMO Review of International Relations*, 1 (40), pp. 177–183. (In Russ.).] DOI: 10.24833/2071-8160-2015-1-40-177-183
- Стригунов, К. С., Манойло, А. В. (2021) 'Переворот в Боливии: внутренние и внешние факторы', *Вестник Томского государственного университета*, 466, сс. 131–142. [Strigunov, K. S., Manojlo, A. V. (2021) "The coup in Bolivia: internal and external factors" [Perevorot v Bolivii: vnutrennie i vneshnie faktory], *Tomsk State University Journal*, 466, pp. 131–142. (In Russ.).] DOI: 10.17223/15617793/466/16 EDN: BMEWHV
- Сударев, В. П. (2020) 'Межамериканская система в очередном тупике?' *Латинская Америка*, (7), сс. 6–14. [Sudarev, V. P. (2020) "The Inter-American system in another deadlock?" [Mezhamerikanskaja sistema v ocherednom tupike?], *Latinskaya Amerika*, (7), pp. 6–14. (In Russ.).] DOI: 10.31857/S0044748X0009858-2 EDN: ZVVTES
- Хадорич, Л. В. (2014) 'ОАГ (OAS) как центральный элемент системы региональной безопасности в Западном полушарии на рубеже веков', *Клио*, 7(91), сс. 106–112. [Khadorich, L. V. (2014) "OAS as a central element of regional safety system in the western hemisphere at the turn of the centuries" [OAG (OAS) kak central'nyj jelement sistemy regional'noj bezopasnosti v Zapadnom polusharii na rubezhe vekov], *Klio*, 7(91), pp. 106–112 (In Russ.).] EDN: SICCBN
- Хадорич, Л. В. (2014) 'ОАГ в начале XXI в.: демократическое развитие и демократическая стабильность', *Клио*, 12(96), сс. 58–67. [Khadorich L. V. (2014) "The Organization of American States (OAS) in the Early 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Establishment and Stability of Democracy" [OAG v na-

- chale XXI v.: demokraticeskoe razvitie i demokraticeskaja stabil'nost'"], *Klio*, 12(96), pp. 58–67. (In Russ.)). EDN: TEGGWH
- Хадорич, Л. В. (2014) 'Социальное и экономическое развитие Западного полушария: достижения и проблемы ОАГ', *Иbero-американские тетради*, (3), сс. 118–130. [Khadorich L.V. (2014) "Social and Economic Development in the Western Hemisphere: The OAS Achievements and Challenges" [Social'noe i jekonomicheskoe razvitie Zapadnogo polusharija: dostizhenija i problemy OAG'], *Iberoamerican Papers*, (3), pp. 118–130. (In Russ.)). EDN: WYINSJ
- Хейфец, В. Л., Хадорич, Л. В. (2015) 'Эволюция Организации Американских Государств в 90-е гг. XX века', *Мировая политика*, сс. 120–140. [Kheifets V.L., Khadorich L.V. (2015) "The evolution of the Organization of American States in the 90s of the XX century" [Jevoljucija Organizacii Amerikanskih Gosudarstv v 90-e gg. XX veka'], *World Politics*, (2), pp. 120–140. (In Russ.)).
- Хейфец В. Л., Хадорич, Л. В. (2015) "Латинская Америка между ОАГ и СЕЛАК", *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*, (4) сс. 90–100. [Kheifets V. L., Khadorich L. V. (2015) "Latin American between OAS and CELAC" [Latinskaja Amerika mezhdru OAG i SELAK], *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya*, (4), pp. 90–100. (In Russ.)). EDN: TRNTVZ
- Bailey, T. A. (1974) 'A diplomatic history of the American People, 9<sup>th</sup> ed.', *NJ: Prentice*. p. 505.
- Bancroft, F. (1896) 'The French in Mexico and the Monroe Doctrine', *Political Science Quarterly*, 11(1), pp. 30–43.
- Buzan, B., Waever, O. (2003) 'Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security', *Cambridge*. 598 p.
- Herz, M. (2008) 'Does the Organization of American States Matter?', *Regional and Global Axes of Conflict*, 34(2), pp. 1–33.
- Johnson, S. (2019) 'Neorealism and the Organization of American States (OAS): An Examination of CARICOM Rationality Toward Venezuela and the United States', *Sage Open*, 9(4), pp. 1–10. DOI: 10.1177/2158244019887950
- Kusumaningrum, D. N. (2019) 'The United States and Latin America Regional Cooperation: Organization of American States (OAS)', *Jurnal Sosial Politik*, 4(1), pp. 149–167. DOI: 10.22219/sospol.v4i1.5566
- Legler, T. (2013) 'The Rise and Decline of the Summit of the Americas', *JILAR*, (2), pp. 179–193. DOI: 10.1080/13260219.2013.853350
- Mace, G. (2022) 'The Organization of American States (OAS) - Challenges and Visions for the future', *International Organizations: Serbia and Contemporary World*, 2(1), pp. 267–279. DOI: 10.18485/iipe\_ioscw.2022.2.ch17
- Martinez, Zela de H. (2013) 'The Organization of American States and Its Quest for Democracy', *Yale Journal of International Affairs* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.yalejournal.org/publications/the-organization-of-american-states-and-its-quest-for-democracy-in-the-americas> (Accessed 31 October 2024)
- Olivari, D. R. (2014) 'The Role of Organization of American States in Promoting Democracy', *International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance*. 31 p. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/the-role-of-the-organization-of-american-states-in-promoting-democracy.pdf> (Accessed 31 October 2024)
- Ricard, S. (2006) 'The Roosevelt Corollary', *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36(1), pp. 17–26. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-5705.2006.00283.x
- Spencer, J. H. (1936) 'The Monroe Doctrine and the League Covenant', *The American Journal of International Law*, 30(3), pp. 400–413. DOI: 10.2307/2191012
- Therien, J.-P., Fortmann, M., Gosselin, G. (1996) 'The Organization of American States: Restructuring Inter-American Multilateralism', *Global Governance*, 2(2), pp. 215–239. DOI: 10.1163/19426720-002-02-90000005
- Thomas, A. V. M., Thomas, Jr. A. J. (1970) 'The Organization of American States and the Monroe Doctrine - Legal Implications', *Louisiana Law Review*, 30(4), pp. 541–581.

Статья поступила в редакцию: 12.12.2024

Статья принята к печати: 15.01.2025

**ПЕРЕСЕЧЕНИЕ ОАГ И ДОКТРИНЫ МОНРО ВО ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКЕ  
СОЕДИНЕННЫХ ШТАТОВ АМЕРИКИ**

**А. Д. Требух**

*Требух Александр Дмитриевич*, аспирант факультета мировой политики,  
Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова, Москва, Россия.  
E-mail: alexandr.trebukh@yandex.ru (ORCID: 0009-0007-2485-2573).

**Аннотация**

Рассматривается деятельность США в Организации американских государств с точки зрения ее использования как инструмента по продвижению своих интересов в Латино-Карибской Америке. Анализируется важность для Соединенных Штатов Америки этой региональной организации в контексте доктрины Монро на современном этапе. Используя теорию комплексов региональной безопасности и принцип историзма, авторы предпринимают попытку проследить важность этой организации для США при обеспечении своих национальных интересов. Автор приходит к выводу о том, что Организация американских государств определяется организационным и институциональным воплощением доктрины Монро с точки зрения стратегического целеполагания США и является ключевым политическим институтом, который обеспечивает стабильность существующей региональной системы международных отношений, сформированной после Второй мировой войны. Соединенные Штаты используют ОАГ как средство, с помощью которого поддерживаются и обеспечиваются принципы демократического правления, торгово-экономической активности на основе рыночных идеалов, проводятся меры по защите прав человека. Организация американских государств исторически была спроектирована с целью давления на неудобные режимы и формирования единого полушария, разделяющего либерально-демократические принципы правления.

**Ключевые слова:** доктрина Монро; внешняя политика США; ОАГ; Латинская Америка; национальные интересы США; Западное полушарие; комплекс региональной безопасности.