February 2023 Volume 45 Issue 1 Journal of Latin American Studies ÿÿÿ ÿÿÿÿ Vol ÿÿ ÿÿ ÿ

Special Topic on Diplomacy around Major Powers

The evolution of the "Monroe Doctrine" and the U.S. strategy toward Latin America*

He Shuangrong Stegeqi

Abstract: The "Monroe Doctrine", which is about to celebrate its 200th anniversary, is still regarded as the cornerstone of the United States' policy towards Latin America. This not only reflects the stability of the United States' strategic goals in Latin America, but also reflects the flexibility of the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine has been continuously given new connotations in the process of accompanying the evolution of U.S. hegemony. While serving the goals of U.S. hegemony, the Monroe Doctrine has also become the basis for the United States to expand its territory in Latin America, intervene in and control Latin America, exclude foreign powers, and achieve U.S. globalization. A tool of expansion. The U.S. strategy toward Latin America based on the Monroe Doctrine has been adjusted with the changes in U.S. hegemony. In the era dominated by U.S. hegemony, the United States lacks a long-term strategy for Latin America. The U.S. policy toward Latin America shows a "neglect-stress response" "cyclical cycle. In the post-hegemonic period, the strategic objectives and strategic framework of the United States toward Latin America have not changed much. However, the U.S. strategy toward Latin America has shown a trend of contraction. The differences in the Latin America strategies between the two major parties in the United States have expanded. From the Monroe Doctrine From this perspective, it explores how the United States handles relations with neighboring countries in the process of its rise, establishment, and decline, and how China, as the largest extraterritorial influence in the Western Hemisphere, avoids the risk of U.S. containment. It is of enlightenment and practical value to China. Keywords: Monroe

Doctrine, U.S.-Latin America Relations, U.S. Diplomacy and International Strategy About the author: He

Shuangrong, researcher at the International Relations Research Office, Institute of Latin American Studies, Chinese Academy
of Social Sciences, Stegeqi, Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (National Academy of
Administration), Institute of African and Latin American Studies, Institute for International Strategy Assistant Researcherÿ

CLC classification number: D873 Document

identification code: A Article number: 1002 - 6649 (2023) 01 - 0050 - 24

^{**} This article is a phased result of the "Africa and Latin America Strategic Pivot Countries Research Project", an innovative project of the International Strategy Institute of the Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China

The "Monroe Doctrine", regarded as the cornerstone of U.S. policy toward Latin America and the Caribbean (hereinafter referred to as "Latin America"), "has gained deeper popular support than any other foreign policy doctrine named after a U.S. president., wider public praise and longer vitality, and also provided greater political utility to U.S. policymakers". On the occasion of nearly 200 years after the birth of the "Monroe Declaration", let's explore why the Monroe Doctrine has such a long-lasting its vitality, the evolution of its connotation, and the relationship between the effectiveness of the Monroe Doctrine and the rise and fall of U.S. hegemony and the U.S. strategy toward Latin America. These issues will help us understand how great powers handle relations with neighboring countries and how to balance the region in the process of their rise. It provides useful reference for the relationship between hegemony and global hegemony and how China, as the largest external influence in Latin America except the United States, can avoid the geopolitical risks of the Monroe Doctrine. This article will review and explore the relationship between the Monroe Doctrine and the Monroe Doctrine from the perspective of regional hegemony. The evolutionary relationship of American hegemony and the conflict between the United States in different periods of hegemony

The evolution of the "Monroe Doctrine"

The Monroe Declaration was the starting point for the United States to build hegemony. Later, the United States continued to give it new connotations based on the needs of hegemonic expansion and put forward a series of corollaries to the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine developed on the basis of the Monroe Declaration also evolved into the United States As a tool for hegemonic expansion, U.S. foreign policy began to shift from a defensive policy based on isolationism to an offensive policy seeking regional and global hegemony in the Americas. With the growth of U.S. hegemony, the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine evolved from "Americas for Americans." Gradually transformed into "American America", and then transcended the spatial limitations of the Western Hemisphere and turned to the "American World"ÿ. The United States also grew from a "big country in the American continent" to the hegemon of the Western Hemisphere, the world's superpower and a global empire. However, as With the decline of American hegemony, the traditional Monroe Doctrine has shown a tendency to return.

- (1) The connotation of the "Monroe Doctrine" In
- 1823, British Foreign Secretary George Canning proposed to work with the United States to prevent the "Holy Alliance" (Holy Alliance) from colonizing the Americas. expansion. But under Secretary of State John Quincia

[¬]The areas surrounding the Monroe Doctrine and the U.S. policy on Latin America are often referred to as the "Americas" or the "Western Hemisphere." Except for the United States and Latin American countries.

It also includes Canada and some areas that have not yet become independent. This article mainly focuses on the relationship between the United States and Latin America.

[¬]The Monroe Declaration and the Monroe Doctrine are the same English words, and both domestic translations are available. The Monroe Declaration in this article refers specifically to President Monroe's State of the Union address in 1823, while the Monroe Doctrine includes the Monroe Declaration and

ÿ the evolution of its connotations. Zhang Yongle: "The historical origins and political essence of the "New Monroe Doctrine", published in "Foreign Theoretical Trends", Issue 10, 2019, Pages 61 - 76, Page 61.

超丁美海研究 Issue 1, 2023

On the advice of John Quincy Adams, U.S. President James Monroe turned away from Britain and addressed Congress on December 2, 1823. In the State of the Union address submitted by the United States, the Monroe Declaration of U.S. policy toward the Americas was separately issued, warning that European countries no longer regard the Americas as a future colonization target and oppose Europe's expansion of its institutions to the Americas. They say they will not remain indifferent to any form of European intervention.

The principle of exclusion is the core content of the Monroe Declaration. President Monroe abandoned Britain at that time and issued a separate policy towards Europe. His true intention was not only to oppose the Holy Alliance, but also to oppose British colonization and expansion in the Americas. This principle later evolved into the exclusion of all Extraterritorial powers. The principle of exclusion in the Monroe Declaration not only refers to geographical exclusion, but also includes political system exclusion. President Monroe made it clear in his State of the Union address that "the countries of the (Holy) Alliance will expand their political systems to any region in the Americas." "It is impossible without endangering our peace and happiness." Based on this principle, "The Monroe Doctrine established ideological and diplomatic barriers between the Old World and the New World in Europe"y, which means that the Monroe Doctrine not only Countries are excluded from the geography of the Western Hemisphere, and ideologies that are not recognized by the United States must also be excluded from the Western Hemisphere. That is, "countries within the jurisdiction of the United States must adopt political and economic policies that the United States believes do not pose a threat to their national and strategic interests." system"y, thus laying the groundwork for the United States to later interfere in Latin American affairs on ideological grounds.

The Monroe Declaration is the first diplomatic strategic principle proposed by the United States after independence. It is a foreign policy declaration unilaterally issued by the United States to establish a sphere of influence in the Americas. Its purpose is to establish a Western Hemisphere system that is independent of Europe and fully dominated by the United States. The system is a strategic concept that the United States had as a great power at the beginning of its independence. Thomas Jefferson, the father of American independence, once asked the famous German geographer Alexander von Humboldt (Alexander v. on Humboldt) confided: "There is a Belonging to its own hemisphere, it must have its own independent interest system and cannot be subordinate to the European interest system." However, when the Monroe Declaration was proposed, the United States was still unable to prevent European countries from colonizing the Americas. The drafter of the Monroe Declaration Henry Clay (Henry Clay), Secretary of State in President Monroe's successor government, once clearly told the Mexican President that the Monroe Doctrine did not mean that the United States was legally committed to defend it. 4 Therefore, the focus of President Monroe's announcement of the Monroe Declaration was not whether the United States able

Implementing it is a "wise discovery of the trend of the times", that is, the United States has become "a great power on the American continent "ÿ and made a strategic oath to bring the Americas into its own sphere of influence. It solved the problems in the U.S. diplomatic strategy in the early 19th century. A fundamental question is, "Does the United States want to become an empire within the European political system, or does it want to become the sun of a completely independent system?" ÿ It can be said that the Monroe Declaration established the goal of the United States to build a monopolistic regional hegemony in the Western Hemisphere, and set this goal This goal runs through the entire U.S. diplomacy with Latin America.

(2) The "Monroe Doctrine" and the territorial expansion of the United

States. The Monroe Declaration was rarely mentioned for many years after it was issued in 1823. In order to support the territorial expansion since the 1840s, President James Polk (1845-1849) and other expansionists resurrected the principles of the Monroe Declaration, coined the term "Monroe Dectrine", and developed the "Polk Corollary" of the Monroe Dectrine. In 1845, President Polk stated in his State of the Union Address No. Once cited the principles of the Monroe Declaration to defend the United States' rights to the Oregon Territory, claiming that the concept of a "balance of power" in the Americas proposed by Britain and France (a strong Mexico, an independent Texas, a strong British North America including the Oregon Coast A large part of the United States, even an independent California) and especially British claims to the Oregon Territory, were inconsistent with the principles of the Monroe Declaration, which proposed that action must be taken before British influence became dominant to the detriment of American security. The U.S. annexed Texas, occupied "all of Oregon," extended the Texas border to the Rio Grande, and acquired California and the Yucatan Peninsula. The Polk corollary of the Monroe Doctrine was not only a response to the U.S.'s The basis for intervention against existing threats also made it rational to take action against possible threatsy.

The Monroe Doctrine thus started the United States' offensive policy towards the Americas, especially towards Latin America. In the 19th century, the United States continued to be motivated by territorial expansion. The question cited the Monroe Doctrine. In 1870, Ulysses S. Grant, who attempted to annex Dominica, proposed the "Grant Corollary" of

the Monroe Doctrine to the Senate in order to promote this goal, declaring that "no territory on this continent can be transferred to European countries" ÿÿ In 1895, in the process of resolving the border dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela, the then US Secretary of State Richard Olney proposed the "Olney Corollary" of the Monroe Doctrine.

Claiming that "Today, the United States has de facto sovereignty over this continent, and its orders are law."

ϔΫγγγη γυγγγγγη γυγγγγη: γυγγγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγγη "γυγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγγη γυγγγγγη γυγγγγγη γυγγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγγη γυγγγη γυγγη γυγγγη γυγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγγη γυγγη γυ

ÿ ÿÿÿÿ ÿÿÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ ÿÿ ÿÿÿÿÿÿÿÿÿÿ ÿÿÿÿ

 $⁽Review)"\ddot{y} \text{ in The Canadian Historic Review Universe of Toronto Press\"{y} Vol 49\"{y} No 1\"{y} 1968\"{y} p 74 [US] \textit{Written by Henry} \\$

ÿ Kissinger, translated by Gu Shuxin and Lin Tiangui: "Grand Diplomacy", Haikou: Hainan Publishing House, 2012, p.

ÿ 21 pages Dexter Perkinsÿ A History of the Monroe Do ctrineÿ Boston: Little 58-159

超丁美洲研究 Issue 1, 2023

"Law". Due to the threat of force from the United States and the fact that Britain was busy with European affairs, the United Kingdom was forced to agree to accept arbitration. This move marked the United Kingdom's recognition of the Monroe Doctrine and the United States' hegemony in the Western Hemisphere. From this, Olney deduced that "The slogan "America is for Americans" became "America is for Americans." By the

Spanish-American War in 1898, the United States drove the Spanish out of the Americas, and the United States basically completed its territorial expansion in Latin America. At the beginning of the 20th century The practice of opposing the acquisition of territory by foreign powers in Latin America has continued, and its application targets also include foreign countries outside Europe, and the application conditions are broader. In 1912, US Secretary of State Henry Cabot Lodge targeted Japanese businessmen in Mexico. The plan to purchase land in Baja California, which is adjacent to the United States, proposes to prohibit external powers and foreign forces from acquiring land in the Western Hemisphere in order to obtain "Practical Power of Control" (Practical Power of Control).

(3) The "Monroe Doctrine" and U.S. intervention in Latin America From the

late 19th to the early 20th century, with the growth of its strength and the exclusion of major powers from the Western Hemisphere, the United States basically established its hegemony in Latin America. Based on Monroe The US policy towards Latin America shifted from territorial expansion to interference in the internal affairs of Latin America. The US intervention in Latin America became the most important issue since the Monroe Doctrine The important characteristics or

pronouns. Faced with the behavior of European powers to collect debts from Latin American countries with arms, while opposing the intervention of European powers, President Theodore Roosevelt (Theodore Roosevelt Jr) put forward the "Roosevelt Corollary" of the Monroe Doctrine, which represented the face of the Monroe Doctrine. As a civilized country, the United States must intervene against the "arrogance" and "incompetence" of countries in the Western Hemisphere and exercise the power of "international police." ÿ The Monroe Declaration initially only indirectly mentioned that the systems of American countries are different from those of Europe, but Theodore Roosevelt made it clear It is proposed that the United States can intervene in Latin American countries based on their internal affairs, and regards this as the right of the United States. Under this reasoning, when other American countries are not interfered by European powers, the United States can also proactively intervene in them. This developed the originally mainly defensive principle of the Monroe Doctrine into a truly proactive principle of regional hegemony. 4 President Roosevelt even proposed the idea of collective intervention. He once suggested that when necessary, the United States should "end its single-handed control of other countries' internal affairs." Intervention, with the cooperation of other (American) countries, we will

ÿ Zhang Yongle: "The historical origins and political essence of "New Monroe Doctrine", published in "Foreign Theoretical Trends", Issue 10, 2019, Page 66.

"There will be more order and less hostility in the world"ÿÿ In 2001, the United States pushed the Organization of American States to adopt the "American Democratic Charter", in which the shadow of Roosevelt's corollary can be seen, which gave the United States' intervention in Latin America a "collective action" coat

The Roosevelt Corollary ushered in a new era of U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of Latin America. From 1898 to 1934, the United States conducted more than 30 military interventions in Central American and Caribbean countries. ÿ After the Cold War, the Monroe Doctrine was linked to the U.S.'s anti-Soviet and anti-communist policies. At this time The Monroe Doctrine not only had the intention of excluding external powers, but also had the content of interfering in the internal affairs of Latin America. George Kennan, the proposer of the "containment policy", proposed the "Kennan Corollary" of the Monroe Doctrine after traveling in Latin America in 1950. Believing that Latin American countries are vulnerable to "communist penetration" to deal with the threat of , The United States will use all means under the policy of the Monroe Doctrine communism in Latin America, including the use of dictatorships in Latin American countriesÿ. Therefore, opposing the penetration of communism in Latin America became an excuse for the United States to frequently intervene in Latin America during the Cold War. In the 1980s, Against the backdrop of internal turmoil in Central American countries, Robert Gates, who served as deputy director of the CIA's Intelligence Division during the Reagan administration, submitted a proposal to Director William Joseph in 1984. Casey) stated in a memo that support should be Nicaraguan opposition, otherwise it will abandon the Monroe Doctrine. 4. The United States' intervention in Latin America is the product of the unequal power structure between

the United States and Latin America. Its background is also the deep-rooted racism in American culture. American scholar Lars Schulz

(Lars Schoultz listed in detail the racist prejudices of the United States against Latin America in the book "Under America: A History of U.S. Policy towards Latin America"ÿ. The civilizational hierarchy theory was prevalent in Europe and the United States in the 19th century. John Quincy Adams and his contemporaries believed that, Catholics are inferior to Protestants, Hispanics are inferior to Anglos, and dark skin is inferior to white skin. In the process of annexing Mexican territory, the United States used the banner of "improving Iberian civilization" to cover up their greedy behavior.

Theoretic Roosevelt in Years later he wrote: "This is inevitable and also for the

据丁美洲研究 Issue 1, 2023

For the benefit of all mankind, the American people should eventually exclude Mexicans from their sparsely populated northern provinces." §

Roosevelt's corollary also combined the security issues of the United States with the assumption of inferiority in Latin America, believing that preventive measures should be taken against Latin American countries. Intervention in order to prevent Latin America from becoming "prey for revolutionaries, corrupt governments and predatory foreigners" §

President Woodrow Wilson even regarded the United States' intervention in Latin America as "the country's civilizing mission" and "converting the benefits of republican government to The purpose of extending to the uncivilized and poorly governed countries of the world is to create stability and remove the basis for European intervention." §

(4) The strong return of the "New Monroe Doctrine" and the "Old Monroe Doctrine" At the

beginning of the 20th century, the United States had become a global power economically and militarily. On December 16, 1907, the

U.S. Navy's Great White Fleet launched from Virginia Set off from Hampton Anchorage and began sailing around the world, the United States appeared on the world stage as a powerful country. With the growth of American hegemony, American foreign policy began to get rid of isolationism and actively participate in international affairs. The Monroe Doctrine also became the basis of American hegemony. A tool for world expansion?

As the United States moves toward the world stage, the United States is no longer satisfied with exercising international police power in Latin America. Instead, it wants to exercise police power around the world. When Theodore Roosevelt spoke in Congress in 1902, he said, "International political and economic relations are becoming increasingly complex and complex. Interdependence makes all powerful powers on the track of civilization increasingly obliged to insist on appropriate police behavior on world tasks." ÿ During World War I, President Wilson interpreted the Monroe Doctrine as "a global political principle without regional spatial restrictions. ÿ Thus providing justification for America's global influence" The Monroe Doctrine began to evolve into "American World" ÿÿ

The Cold War ended in 1991, the Soviet Union collapsed, and the United States became the only superpower in the world. The United States' global hegemony enabled the Monroe Doctrine to realize a true "American world." The United States and Western countries promoted humanitarianism and defense in the post-Cold War period. New interventionism under the pretext of universal values is essentially an expanded version of the Monroe Doctrine. After the "9 11 Incident", the Bush administration, which pursued the theory of neo-imperialism, borrowed the U.S.

ÿ [US] Written by Henry Kissinger, translated by Gu Shuxin and Lin Tiangui: "Grand Diplomacy", Haikou: Hainan Publishing House, 2012, page

<sup>ÿ 24, written by Zhang Yongle: "This Frontier: "Monroe Doctrine" and Modern Space Politics » Shanghai: New Knowledge on Life and Reading
Sanlian Bookstore, 2021, Page 25</sup>

The reporter directly shouted that "the destiny of the United States is to become the world's policeman"ÿ. The then US Secretary of State

Condoleezza Rice expressed a view that was no different from Roosevelt's corollary, "While globalization has enhanced the strength of some countries, it has also exposed and intensified many other countries." The failure of states - these states are too weak or poorly governed to cope with domestic challenges and prevent these challenges from spreading, undermining the stability of the international order. In this strategic environment, states are willing and able to fulfill their obligations. Comprehensive sovereign responsibility at home and abroad, which is crucial to our national security."ÿ Due to the global hegemony of the United States, the realistic basis of the Monroe Doctrine has changed, and the sphere of influence as the core concept of the Monroe Doctrine has lost its meaning, because "The entire world has become an American sphere of influence. Many spheres of influence have given way to one sphere of influence:

The strong still impose their will on the weak, and other countries in the world are forced to act in accordance with the rules of the United States to a large extent, otherwise they will face high costs ranging from severe sanctions to complete regime change." ÿ Latin America seems to have entered the "post-Monroe Doctrine" "Period ÿ

As early as the end of the Cold War, Gaddis Smith, a professor of history at Yale University in the United States, pointed out, "The disintegration of the Soviet Union eliminated all sense of external threats in the Western Hemisphere, and the Monroe Doctrine no longer had any use." Many years later, the Monroe Doctrine was useless It has become the public policy of the Obama administration to argue that the Monroe Doctrine is over or obsolete. In November 2013, then-U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry announced in a speech at the Organization of American States that the era of the Monroe Doctrine was over. 5 President Obama also announced in 2014, "The era of empires and spheres of influence is over" yö

However, while declaring the Monroe Doctrine obsolete, the Obama administration also launched a rebalancing policy in Asia to contain China's strategy and proposed to reshape the U.S. leadership in Latin America. This contradictory approach not only reflects the U.S.-led globalization The strategic anxiety caused by the crisis and the rapid rise of China to the United States was also reflected in the strategic dilemma that the United States had to seek cooperation with major powers under the 2008 international financial crisis. In addition,

拉丁系测研究 Issue 1, 2023

On the one hand, in the face of the collective rise of left-wing governments in Latin America, the United States is unable to confront most Latin American countries. Therefore, curbing the temptation of the Monroe Doctrine will test the strategic determination of the Obama administration. Regarding the presence of China and other foreign countries in Latin America, the Obama administration The monitoring and contact policy (EngageMent) policy was implemented without adopting Monroe's exclusion policy. It launched sanctions against Venezuela. It can be said that the United States never really gave up the Monroe Doctrine, but implemented the "Monroe Doctrine without the name of the Monroe Doctrine." In a sense, this is a "new door" "Roe Doctrine", which is a deformed product of the "old Monroe Doctrine" based on the hegemony of the US empire in the era of globalization.

Whether the "post-Monroe Doctrine" era will come is not a true proposition. As U.S. President Grover Cleveland asserted as early as 1895, "The principles of the Monroe Doctrine apply to every stage of our national life. As long as our republic If it exists, it will never become obsolete." When the political foundation of post-Monroe doctrine is shaken, the return of the old Monroe doctrine will become a historical necessity. As early as the 2000 US election, Patrick Buchanan (Patrick Buchanan) Buchanan), as a candidate for the third party reform party (The REFORM PARTY) of the United States and politics, proposed the political foundation of the backdoorism. Global police work denationalizes the United States by decentralizing U.S. power and opening its borders to unbalanced trade, illegal immigration, and terrorism."ÿ The United States must return to the Monroe Doctrine because "the Monroe Doctrine is a form of non-intervention . Isolationism in distant conflicts" ÿÿ At the same time, the improved Monroe Doctrine he proposed pushed the United States further toward isolationism. In Buchanan's view, "The most immediate and serious problem facing the United States in the Western Hemisphere is mass immigration. "What is more important is to "maintain a country and a nation", and we must adopt new immigration restrictions to end illegal immigration, especially illegal immigrants from Mexico. The policy suggestion he gave is, "Deployment at the Mexican border "military" to prevent "terrible refugees, immigrants, and terrorists" and promote Cuba's transfer of power. ÿ He even advocated the separation of the United States from Latin America, believing that as long as "no hostile regime builds a fortress in this hemisphere," the United States should not care.

į

Governments of Central and South Americaÿÿ

President Trump's anti-globalization, anti-free trade, anti-immigration and return to the Monroe Doctrine ideas and practices are exactly the same as Buchanan's thoughts. In September 2018, Trump spoke at the opening ceremony of the general debate of the United Nations General Assembly in New York. Claiming to once again adopt the Monroe Doctrine principle as a formal foreign policy of the United States and rejecting other countries' interference in the Western Hemisphere and the United States' own affairs. In 2018, then US Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said in the question and answer session after giving a speech on Western Hemisphere issues at the University of Texas in 2018, "The Monroe Doctrine is an achievement." He believes that the Monroe Doctrine has maintained democratic values in the Western Hemisphere, \ddot{v} Bolton, who served as Trump's national security adviser, said in a speech to Cuban exile groups, "The Monroe Doctrine is still alive and well. Very good."ÿ At the same time, the Trump administration has adopted a Latin American policy with the characteristics of the old Monroe Doctrine or the traditional Monroe Doctrine. First, it has adopted a policy of exclusion and containment mainly targeting China, treating China as a threat to the United States. The biggest threat to the leadership position and U.S. interests in Latin America. The second is to re-strengthen the intervention policy in Latin America. On the Cuban issue, the Trump administration has overturned the policy of engagement with Cuba implemented during the Obama administration and increased its economic support for Cuba. sanctions, and in January 2021, the Cuban government was once again included in the list of countries supporting international terrorism. On the Venezuela issue, the Trump administration recognized the opposition government and exerted maximum pressure on the Maduro government. The third is on the immigration issue. Trump has adopted more extreme measures than Buchanan, such as building a border wall and deporting refugees on a large scale. Many Chinese and foreign scholars call Trump's Latin American policy the "New Monroe Doctrine"ÿ, but in fact his policies are more like traditional The Return of the Monroe Doctrine Although the Biden administration, which has high-profile criticism of Trumpism, rarely mentions the Monroe Doctrine directly, it still regards Latin

America as the sphere of influence of the United States. This is different from Trump, who likened Latin America to the backyard of the United States. He said
that "south of the Mexican border "Everything is the front yard of the United States." ÿIn its Latin American policy, the Biden administration has basically
maintained Trump's policy and excluded the influence of major foreign countries such as China. It has also basically continued its policy on Cuba, Venezuela, and other countries.

Marcos C. Pires, Lucas G. de Nascimento: "The New Monroe Doctrine and the Trilateral Relations between China, the United States and Latin America", published in "Latin

- ÿ "Ambassador Bolton Remarks to the Bay of Pigs Veterans Association Brigade 2506"ÿ U S Embassy in Cubaÿ April 17ÿ 2019
 https://mbassador bolton bay of pigs veterans ass occiation brigade 2506 / [2022-12-02] See Marcos C. Pires, Lucas G. de
 Nascimento: "The New Monroe Doctrine and the Trilateral
- ÿ Relations between China, the United States and Latin America", published in "Latin American Studies", Issue 4, 2020 ÿ Li Qingsi, Qiu Longyu: «U.S. "New Monroe Doctrine" Latin American Policy and Challenges», published in «Latin American Studies», Issue 2, 2020, "Joe Biden Says That Lat in Americals Not the
- ÿ Backyard of the US "but the front"

拉丁美洲研究 Issue 1, 2023

Policies in Latin America and Nicaragua

2. The evolution of U.S. hegemony and the characteristics of U.S. Latin America strategy

Many famous scholars who discuss "strategy" or "Grand Strategy" tend to start from the perspective of goals and means, defining it as the science and art of comprehensively using various means to achieve some grand goal, focusing on strategic goals. and strategic meansÿ. The core of the U.S. Latin America strategy is to use different policy means to achieve U.S. regional hegemony. But in essence, the definition of goals and the use of strategic means and resources are subject to the actual national strength and status. ÿ Therefore, the United States' Latin American strategy has evolved with its hegemonic status.

(1) Characteristics of the U.S. strategy toward Latin America in

the era of hegemony. For a long time after the Monroe Declaration was proposed, the U.S.'s goals of prevention and hegemonic expansion in the Western Hemisphere were mainly aimed at European powers, not Latin America. The original intention of the United States in building the Pan-American system in 1889 was "Prevent inter-American war" to avoid "inducing European invasion and thus jeopardizing the Monroe Declaration"ÿÿ In 1930, J. Reuben Clark, then the U.S. Under Secretary of State, complained in the "Clark Memorandum" written by his organization. ÿ The Monroe Doctrine was a U.S. policy directed toward Europe, not Latin America. ÿ

After World War I, the Western Hemisphere entered an era dominated by American hegemony. Since there were no hegemonic challengers and obvious internal threats, the United States carried out unscrupulous interference in Latin America, especially some neighboring countries. On the other hand, it ignored the development aspirations of Latin American countries. Because Latin America The country was generally dissatisfied with the interventionist policy of the Monroe Doctrine, and taking into account the international tensions before World War II, the Franklin Roosevelt (Franklin Delano Roosevelt) administration proposed the "Good Neighbor" in 1933. policy, which was the first U.S. attempt to go beyond the Monroe Doctrine of interventionist policy pull strategy?

After the Second World War, the United States further consolidated its hegemonic position in Latin America and the world. Latin America's status in U.S. diplomacy declined. The United States did not have a long-term, overall strategy for Latin America, especially the lack of a lasting strategy to lead the development of Latin America. Strategy. Only when U.S. hegemony is challenged, the United States will make a preventive and reactive response. The U.S.'s reactive policy toward Latin America is passive.

ÿ See William C Martelÿ Grand Strategy in Theory a nd Practice: The Need for an Effective American Policyÿ New York: Cambridge University Press ÿ 2015ÿ pp 31-37ÿ Li Jingzhi, Luo Tianhong et al.: «International Strategy» ÿ Beijing: Renmin University of China Pressÿ 2003, pages 12-13.

ÿ Edited by Hong Yuyi: "An Outline of the History of Latin American International Relations", Beijing: Foreign

ÿ Language Teaching and Research Press, 1998, Page 50, Joseph Smith, The Unite d States and Latin America: A History of America an Diplomacyÿ 1776-2000ÿ London and New York: Rout ledgeÿ 2005ÿ p 92ÿ Gene ÿ Sessionsÿ "The Clark Memorandu m Myth"ÿ in The Americasÿ Vol 34ÿ No 1ÿ 1977ÿ pp 4 6 - 58

and one-way, there are two main types of policy means: one is to increase aid or provide more trade preferences and other policies to promote development; the other is to impose sanctions or intervention on Latin American countries. These two approaches can be combined with "carrots and sticks" Corresponding to the traditional saying. After the victory of the Cuban Revolution in 1959, the "Alliance for Progress" promoted by President Kennedy mainly focused on aiding and promoting the development of Latin America. In the 1980s, In order to deal with the Soviet Union in Central America, President Root As a result, the country adopted a "carrot and stick" policy, and while increasing its intervention in Central American countries, it also implemented some aid and trade preferential policies for the region, such as the 1983 Caribbean Basin Plan (CBI), etc. However, when the external threat was eliminated, the U.S. policy towards Latin America returned to the old policy of neglect and interference, and thus fell into a cycle of neglect and stress reaction. In 1973, an American scholar published an article on "Foreign Affairs" The publication pointed out, "The United States has no Latin American policy, except for a policy of benign neglect." ÿ The United States' benign neglect of Latin America is determined by its hegemonic status, because benign neglect will not bring political or economic consequences to the United States. Negative consequences in areas such as security and security. In the era of hegemony, the United States' policy towards Latin America was

mainly based on realism. Intervention was the main means for the United States to implement coercive power in Latin America and one of the main features of the Monroe Doctrine. At the beginning of the Cold War, the European Recovery Plan was implemented, providing huge aid to Europe through the Marshall Plan, but there was no similar plan for Latin America, and telling Latin American countries to rely on trade rather than aid, which "caused deep resentment in Latin America"ÿ. In addition, The U.S. intervention in Latin America has led to tensions in U.S.-Latin America relations and strong anti-American sentiment in Latin American countries. "From independence to the mid-20th century, anti-American sentiment touched every major social group in Latin America: farmers, workers, middle classes, and elites. At some point, all members of the United States are dissatisfied with being exploited or looked down upon by the United States."ÿ However, the United States' interference in Latin America may not necessarily be beneficial to the interests of the United States. Sometimes, while safeguarding some of the interests of the United States, it infringes on other interests of the United States. ÿ The United States' intervention and invasion of small Central American and Caribbean countries such as Guatemala, Nicaragua, Cuba, Panama, and Haiti often led the United States into "dangerous whirlpools"ÿÿ The Cuban missile crisis in 1962 and the Reagan administration in the 1980s The competition with the Soviet Union in Central America almost dragged the United States into the vortex of war.

拉丁美海研究 Issue 1, 2023

The U.S. policy toward Latin America is often mired in contradictions. As former U.S. Ambassador John Bartlow Martin once complained: "If we continue to have relations with them, they will accuse us of interfering; if we ignore them, they will accuse us of caring about Bangladesh. "Rather than neighboring countries." "y Due to the huge inequality in the power structure between the United States and Latin America, although Latin American countries often express dissatisfaction with the United States, for a large part of the time, "the overall relationship between the United States and most Latin American countries is "Strong and cordial" "y. Due to Latin American countries' dependence on the United States and lack of strategic autonomy, the United States is both a problem and a solution for them. This also confirms the classic saying of the realist theorist Thucydides: "The strong can Do whatever they have the power to do, and the weak can only accept whatever they must accept." "y (2) Changes in the United States' Latin American

strategy in the post-hegemonic era. Entering the 21st century, new

changes have occurred in international relations around the world and in the Western Hemisphere, among which One major feature is that the hegemonic status of the United States has been challenged and weakened, which has also resulted in new characteristics of the United States' Latin American policy.

1 The Decline of U.S. Hegemony and the Effectiveness

of the Monroe Doctrine in the Post-Hegemony Era and the U.S.'s benign neglect of Latin America are based on the U.S.'s monopoly hegemony over Latin America. However, with the strengthening of the strategic autonomy of Latin American countries, foreign powers have With its growing presence in Latin America, the hegemony and dominance of the United States in Latin America is being challenged. In 2006, American scholar Peter Hakim published an article in the magazine "Foreign Affairs", warning that "Washington is losing Latin America"ÿÿ In May 2008, U.S. Foreign Relations The committee issued a report drafted by more than 20 well-known American scholars and politicians, declaring that "the era of U.S. hegemony in Latin America is over." Since then, the 2008 international financial crisis, China's accelerated rise, the COVID-19 epidemic, and U.S. domestic politics have The tearing apart will further have a strong impact on the global hegemony of the United States. Bolivian President Morales once stated that "Latin America is no longer a colony of the United States." ÿ Mexican President Lopez also made the latest assertion, "As far as the United States is concerned,

[Ancient Greece] Thucydides, translated by Xie Defeng: "History of the Peloponnesian War", Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2008, p.

— ÿÿ —

It is no longer possible to continue to pursue the Monroe Doctrine or the slogan 'America is American'." \ddot{y} Although there is still debate on whether the US hegemony has declined, it is recognized that the dominance of US hegemony has declined significantly at the global and regional levels.

Fact: In this sense, it can also be said that the U.S. Latin America strategy has entered the "post-hegemony era." 2. The adjustment of the focus of the U.S. Latin America

strategy in the post-hegemony era. The post-hegemony era was started by

the Obama administration. At this time, the focus of U.S. diplomatic strategy From major power cooperation and counter-terrorism to major power competition, China has become the most important target of the United States' great power competition strategy. In response to China's rapid rise, the Obama administration implemented a rebalancing strategy against China after taking office in 2009. However, in 2008, the international In the context of the financial crisis, the United States needs China's help. Therefore, the Obama administration has adopted a hybrid strategy (hybrid strategy) towards China: on the one hand, it adopts policies including contact, integration and inclusion; on the other hand, it adopts policies including implicit strategy of containment, balance or deterrence. In Latin America, although "China's rising role in Latin America was regarded by the United States as a new challenge it faced in the Western Hemisphere'ÿ, due to the limited influence of China in Latin America at that time, it was mainly concentrated in the field of trade . ÿ The Obama administration does not regard Sino-Latin America cooperation as a huge threat. It just takes a wait-and-see and vigilant attitude towards whether China can transform its economic influence in Latin America into political influence in the future. The Obama administration passed the China-US strategic consultation on Latin America affairs. Hoping to enhance China's transparency in Latin American trade and investment through engagement, William Burns, the Obama administration's deputy secretary of state, said in 2011, "We should not worry about Asia's (China's) economic interests in our Western Hemisphere. The relationship is transparent and the rules are followed." ÿ As the strategic competition and threat. The two parties in the United States

have basically reached a consensus on this. In 2017 On December 18, the first "National Security Strategy Report" released by the Trump administration proposed that "strategic competition among countries, not terrorism, is the primary issue of U.S. national security." At the same time, the United States has focused on China-Latin America relations. development as a threat to the United States. In 2018, then-U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson openly accused China of "pursuing short-term profits and long @hinadeption" states and long @hinadeption "states" and long @hinadeption" states are supported in the United States.

ÿ snowói a snowíb snow a snowyÿ "she's Share is a friend's friend: Share is a friend snow a snowflake snowfall a snowflake Yes?" ÿ s scientific scientific s scientific s analyzÿ no 7 (awesome analyze) 2014 20

超丁美洲研究 Issue 1, 2023

The United States is a "predatory actor in our hemisphere." ÿ The Biden administration has continued Trump's great power competition strategy and regards China as "a competitor that poses a serious challenge to U.S. prosperity, security, and democratic values." ÿÿ

In addition, the United States has always regarded the collective rise of left-wing forces in Latin America, especially the anti-American policies pursued by the Latin American radical left, the strategy of diversifying foreign relations, and the soft balancing policy against the United States (Soft Balancing)ÿ, as a threat to U.S. hegemony and interests. challenges. As the strategic autonomy of Latin American countries strengthens, the United States' control over Latin America's domestic and foreign affairs is weakening, and it is increasingly difficult for the United States to obtain the full cooperation of Latin American countries in its global strategy. Take the Russia-Ukraine conflict as an example. Although most Latin American countries It criticized Russia's military action against Ukraine, but did not closely follow the United States on sensitive issues such as sanctions against Russia and military assistance to Ukraine, and maintained a relatively independent stance. Therefore, in the post-hegemonic era, it strengthened its influence and control over Latin America and re-incorporated Latin America. The strategic trajectory of the United States is an important challenge facing the United States.

Non-traditional security issues such as immigration and drug smuggling brought to the United States by globalization are also important challenges currently faced by the United States. The immigration issue has caused not only security issues, but also political and cultural conflicts. Some conservatives are worried about the decline of the Latino population in the United States. The rapid growth of the United States has challenged the mainstream culture and national identity of the United Statesÿ. This has also led conservative politicians such as Buchanan and Trump to advocate the adoption of a more isolationist Monroe Doctrine. Since 2013, due to the continued economic downturn in Latin America and the As a result of the 2019 coronavirus pandemic and the ensuing economic recession, as well as the impact of the United States' maximum pressure policy on Venezuela, irregular migration to the United States has reached unprecedented

levels and has become an important issue affecting U.S. national

security. 3 Post-Hegemony Graham Alison, a scholar who proposed the "Thucydides Trap" for the contraction of the United

States' Latin America strategy in the era, believes that "the essence of strategy is to use resources to respond to overwhelming challenges."

5 With the growth of U.S. hegemony, As the country declines and resources are limited, the U.S. Latin America strategy is shrinking and becoming increasingly North American. Its policies are mainly reflected in two aspects: First, Mexico plays an increasingly important role in the U.S. Latin America strategy.

ÿ "National Security Strategy "ÿ White House ÿ Oc tober 2022 https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads [2022-12-23] Soft balancing refers to the use of non-military

means by small and medium-sized countries to improve the ability of a powerful country to use its hard power. The political cost of strength, ÿAnd limit its ability to achieve desired results.

ÿ [U.S.] Samuel Huntington, translated by Cheng Kexiong: "Who We Are: The Challenge to America's National Identity", Beijing: Xinhua Publishing

ÿ House, 2005, Graham Alison, "The New Sp heres of Information: Sharing the Globe with Oth erGreat Powers" 3

The United States has made the North American economy more and more integrated through the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994 and the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement revised in 2020. This not only basically meets the important concerns of the United States in industrial security and energy security, but also makes the North American economy more and more integrated. U.S.-Latin 76% of the country's imports come from this region , America trade and investment are increasingly concentrated in North America. In 2021, Mexico accounted for 61% of U.S. exports. ÿ In the economic competition between China and the United States, the U.S. strategy of reshaping the global industrial chain will make Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean near-shore. This will further promote North American economic integration. Second, the Greater Caribbean region has attracted the United States' security attention and most of its aid. After Obama came to power, the United States signed a number of agreements to promote development and security with countries in the region, and A large amount of funds has been provided. Among them, the United States provided US\$12 billion in aid to Plan Colombia in the fiscal year 2000-2021, and invested a total of US\$3.3 billion in the "Mérida Initiative" (Mérida Initiative) for Mexico and Central America in the fiscal year 2008-2021. US\$300 million After the expiration of the Merida Plan, the United States and Mexico renewed the "U.S.-Mexico Bicentenial Fra" agreement in October 2021. mework for Security mmunities)ÿ 2010 ÿ The United States separated Central America from the Merida Plan to implement

The Central American Regional Security Initiative (CARSI) and the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative (CBSI) were implemented. When

The Central American Regional Security Initiative (CARSI) and the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative (CBSI) were implemented. When Biden took office, he promised to provide at least US\$4 billion in aid to promote development in Central America and southern Mexico.

The contraction of the United States' Latin American strategy is a realistic reflection of the decline of American hegemony. The spatial scope of the Monroe Doctrine is determined by the hegemonic strength of the United States. When the Monroe Declaration was proposed in 1823, the United States' hegemonic goal "is not aimed at the entire continent, but only at North America." and the Caribbean."ÿThe famous American strategist and geopolitical theorist Alfred Thayer Mahan once proposed, "The security concerns of the United States end at the Amazon River, and there is no need to implement the Monroe Doctrine south of the Amazon river."ÿDue to geography, Up close, north The security and stability of the U.S. region has always been valued by the United States. During the Central American crisis in the 1980s, then-U.S. Secretary of State Shultz called this region the "third border" of the United States, saying "if This region (Central America) is ruled by a regime that is hostile to us, or if it becomes a long-term

 $[\]ddot{y}$ and the northernmost countries of South America such as Colombia and

超丁美洲研究 Issue 1, 2023

It will indeed have a great impact on our own economy and society."ÿÿ In 1997, U.S. President Clinton even declared that the United States is a "Caribbean country"ÿÿ After the "9 11" incident, Bush Jr. The "Third Border" has expanded to the Caribbean region. With the development of globalization, the geographical proximity of this region to the United States has increased the mutual influence of security factors. The political and economic instability in this region and the risks caused by climate change have Issues such as extreme weather and the spread of epidemics have expanded their mutual impact on countries in the region and have an increasing impact on daily life in the United States. They have become an "international domestic issue" for the United States . has become a priority area for the United States' Latin America strategy.

The U.S. Strategy toward Latin America in the Post-Three Hegemonic Era

In the post-hegemonic era, how to boost the hegemony of the United States in Latin America is a common task faced by the two political parties in the United States. The goal proposed by President Obama during the 2008 election was to "reshape the leadership of the United States in Latin America"y. The Trump administration The goal of "making America great again" is also projected to Latin America, with the goal of returning the Monroe Doctrine. The Biden administration emphasized the importance of the Latin American region to the United States, "Because of strong trade ties, common democratic traditions, and family ties, no one has The region has a greater impact on the United States than the Western Hemisphere." He proposed to revitalize the partnership with Latin Americaÿy

In the post-hegemonic era, the U.S. strategic framework for democracy, prosperity, and security in Latin America that has been formed since the end of the Cold War has not fundamentally changed. Although Trump pursues principled realism and isolationism and seeks to end the U.S.-led liberal order and leadership, Unilateral diplomacy with a strong tone, but the inertia of U.S. foreign policy makes it difficult for it to subvert this strategic framework. The Trump administration clearly stated in the "Western Hemisphere Strategic Framework" report released in 2020 that "the United States' engagement with the Western Hemisphere The main goal is to support a

A prosperous, secure and democratic region." ÿ But within this framework, the Obama, Trump and Biden administrations adopted different policies and strategies.

(1) Promoting democracy strategy

Promoting democracy is not only in line with the ideological characteristics of the Monroe Doctrine, but also one of the strategies of the United States to promote the global international liberal order in the post-Cold War period. Under this strategy, the United States is committed to building Latin America into a "potential democratic backstop." " (potential democratic backsliders), and implemented a series of actions to promote democracy through the Organization of American States, including in 2001 The "American Democratic Charter" adopted by the Organization of American States in September has created a collective institutional guarantee for democratization in the Western Hemisphere. Through this mechanism As well as its unilateral commitment to promoting democracy in the Western Hemisphere, the United States has played a "responsible steward" role in promoting democracy in the Americasÿÿ

However, the U.S. strategy of promoting democracy has also brought certain challenges to the U.S. strategy toward Latin America.

Since Venezuelan President Chávez won the election in 1998, a number of Latin American left-wing governments came to power through democratic elections, which has brought some political challenges to the United States. ÿ Although President Trump has expressed doubts about the benefits of promoting democracy to the United Statesÿ, conservatives in the United States still believe that promoting democracy in Latin America is in the interest of the United States. In 2022, Colombia, the main ally of the United States in South America, achieved a historic left turn, causing There is strong unease in the United States. However, conservative U.S. Senator Marco Rubio believes that "as long as there is democracy, Colombia will be fine. They may elect someone we disagree with, and we may not like every decision they make. But ultimately they will have to govern themselves through voter discipline, and voters will punish them and their parties. Without democracy, they can do whatever they want, which is often the cause of wars and crises." ÿ In addition, conservatives He also believes that promoting democracy in Latin America is a strategic choice that the United States has to make in the post-hegemonic era. In the era of globalization, strengthening economic ties between Latin American countries and external powers is an inevitable choice. The United States cannot ask Latin America with alternatives for trade, investment, and financial loans. When making a choice, the United States cannot ask Latin American countries to give up cooperation with China and other major powers outside the region. On the other hand, when Latin American countries interact with China, the United States supervises through anti-corruption initiatives, security cooperation, and security

超丁美洲研究 Issue 1, 2023

The narrative of "democracy" and "authoritarianism," or "democracy" and "autocracy," helps the United States suppress China and Russia, strengthen alliance unity, and attack Cuba, Venezuela, and Nicaragua, which Trump calls the "tyranny triangle." It provided an excuse to exert maximum pressure. The then US Secretary of State Pompeo said in his speech on December 2, 2019, "We are trying to clearly recognize, both morally and strategically, that authoritarianism is a threat in our hemisphere. "It is a threat to us in the United States. We cannot tolerate these regimes inviting bad people in and trying to turn allied democracies into dictatorships." ÿ In the strategy of promoting democracy, the United States particularly needs to win over Latin American countries in order to expand " camp of "democratic" countries. At the Global Democracy Summit convened by the Biden administration in December 2021, 25 governments and civil society activists from Latin American countries were invited to participate. The United States supported Costa Rica, Panama, and Dominica in 2021 to establish the Alliance for Democratic Development (ADD), in July 2022, the United States took the lead in signing an agreement to promote supply chains with the Democratic Alliance countries as "the most practical way to stimulate the growth of the Democratic Alliance for Development while promoting U.S. interests"ÿÿ

However, promoting democracy as a strategic tool of the United States in the global liberal order is also a double-edged sword.

Since democracy is the basis of political legitimacy on the American continent, the possibility of direct military intervention by the United States in the region has declined. Faced with the need to pass democratic elections With the Latin American leftist governments that came to power, the United States had to expand its tolerance to Latin America's diverse democracies. The United States has long been dissatisfied with the radical left-wing forces in Venezuela that have been in power for more than 20 years. However, the Obama administration was relatively

restrained towards the Chavez government. It was only in the later stages that Sanctions were launched against the Maduro government only after it was launched. In fact, the promotion of democracy strategy will not hinder the United States from interfering in Latin America and breaking its commitment to democracy. Since the beginning of the 21st century, many Latin American governments with left-wing tendencies have encountered "coups." or controversial political crises, including Venezuela (2002), Honduras (2009), Paraguay (2012), Brazil (2016), Bolivia (2019) and Peru (2022). Faced with these situations The United States often does not delve into the legality of the procedures. Instead, it supports governments that come to power after coups or crises based on U.S. interests to varying degrees.

The focus of the US democracy promotion strategy has shifted from promoting democratic elections to democratic governance. Strengthening judicial governance and fighting corruption have become the focus of the Biden administration to promote democratic governance in Latin America, especially in Central America.

The purpose of this shift is to improve the governance level of Latin American countries. ÿ Create a good environment for nearshore investment by U.S. and corporate companies

The most eye-catching thing is the Engel list launched by the United States in December 2020. It has become an important means for the United States to crack down on corrupt officials in Central America. Those who are included in the Engel list will not only be prohibited from entering. The United States may also be subject to additional sanctions such as freezing assets in the United States. The United States has imposed unprecedented judicial sanctions on corrupt officials in Latin America, including current senior government officials and former heads of government in Latin America, such as Paraguay's Vice President Ade Alberto (Hugo Alberto Velazquez Moreno), former President of Honduras Hernandez (Juan Or Lando Hernández ÿ 2014-2022), former Paraguayan President Horacio Cartes ÿ 2013-201 8 years in office) and former Panamanian President Ricardo Martinelli). However, the Biden administration's long-term goal of democratic governance has also caused tensions between the United States and its traditional allies such as El Salvador and Guatemala in the short term. (2) Promoting prosperity strategy Prosperity and stability in Latin American countries is in the interests of

the United States This is the

consensus of all U.S. governments. This is considered an important means to promote U.S. prosperity and reduce security threats such as illegal immigration and drug smuggling from Latin American countries to the United States. It is also a need to respond to the penetration and expansion of foreign powers into Latin America. Nonetheless, The United States still has not continued to pay attention to the development of Latin America, and the U.S. strategy of promoting Latin American prosperity serves more of the U.S. global strategy and domestic economic development. China is the largest external influence on the Latin American region, especially on the economic development of Latin America, other than the United States. One of the factors is that the main goal of the U.S. government's strategy to promote Latin America's prosperity is to respond to China's challenges.

The Obama administration regards free trade as a means to hedge against China's strategic competition. In November 2009 and June 2013, it successively promoted the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership Agreement (TTIP).) negotiations, hoping to establish cross-regional multilateral trade and investment arrangements that exclude China. As part of the U.S. global trade strategy, Obama hopes to include Latin American countries in U.S. cross-regional agreement arrangements, especially joining the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. Thus, "the fast-growing Asian market is connected to the powerful democracies of the Americas"ÿ. To this end, President Obama, who originally opposed free trade, pushed for the approval of the bilateral free trade agreements between the United States and Colombia and Panama (2012). The United States also supported The "Pacific Arc Initiative" (PAI, 2009) supports the establishment of the Pacific Alliance, a Latin American regional organization that favors free trade, and hopes to integrate Latin American and Pacific countries into the U.S.-led economic circle through them.

The Trump and Biden administrations' strategies for promoting Latin America's prosperity share many similarities, with both moving away from trade.

拉丁美海研究 Issue 1, 2023

Trump, who opposed globalization and free trade, withdrew from the Trans-Pacific Partnership immediately after taking office in 2017. This led to the failure of Obama's trade strategy. Ecuador and Uruguay negotiated free trade with the United States. The desire of the agreement has also failed. In order to cope with the development of China's "Belt and Road" initiative in Latin America, Trump proposed the "Goldh IN the AMERICAS) in 2018. ÿ Promote investment in Latin American energy and other infrastructure. At the Summit of the Americas in June 2022, the Biden administration proposed the "American Economic Prosperity Partnership" (APEP). On January 27, 2023, the United States, Barbados, and Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Ecuador, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Uruguay signed the Joint Declaration on the Americas Partnership for Economic Prosperity. Intership for Economic Prosperity) is committed to "strengthening the diversity, sustainability and resilience of supply chains by expanding regional trade links. ÿ Promote the construction of high-quality infrastructure" ÿ However, the resources invested by the United States are limited, and there are doubts whether it can compete with China's "One Belt, One Road" initiative. In addition, in order to improve the security of the U.S. industrial chain, it promotes decoupling from

China's industrial chain and promotes the reshoring of the manufacturing industry. In its strategy to promote the reorganization of
the global industrial chain, the United States considers Latin America as a hub for nearshoring (Nearshoring) outsourcing and Friendshore
outsourcing (Friendshoring or Ally - Shoring). In the late period of the Trump administration, the Trump administration planned to launch a
"promotion of production chain" The "Return to the Americas" plan is prepared to use financial incentives to encourage American companies
to move Asian production facilities to the United States and Latin American countriesÿ, but it has not been launched in time so far. In April
2022, U.S. congressmen proposed the "Western Hemisphere Nearshoring Act." (Western Hemisphere Nearshoring Act), the bill would
provide tax relief and funding from the Development Finance Corporation (DFC)) to obtain low-interest loans and encourage U.S. companies
to move their supply chains to Latin America. Latin American countries are near-shore and friendly-shore to the United States. Outsourcing
strategies have shown deep interest, hoping to benefit from the process of restructuring the global industrial chain, expand investment, and
promote domestic industrial development. However, whether near-shoring and friendly-shoring outsourcing can benefit Latin American
countries depends on many conditions, such as labor arbitrage, industrial supporting facilities, free trade agreements, investment conditions,
market size, etc. With the exception of Mexico and a few Central American countries, it is difficult for most Latin American countries to

The answer to huge short-term gains is no, with perhaps the exception of Mexicoÿ. (3) Security

Strategy Security is the

main pillar of the U.S. policy toward Latin America. Starting from the Obama administration, the United States no longer lists terrorism as a priority security issue. Non-traditional security issues such as drug smuggling, organized crime, and illegal immigration caused by open borders are important threats to U.S. security.

In resolving these non-traditional security issues, especially the issue of combating illegal immigration, Trump had great strategic conflicts with the previous Obama administration and the succeeding Biden administration. When the Obama administration came to power, it proposed to carry out immigration reform and illegal immigration. Regularizing immigration. The Biden administration is committed to establishing a fair, orderly and humane immigration system, strengthening assistance to immigrant-sending countries, and "addressing the root causes of human insecurity and irregular migration, including poverty, criminal violence and Corruption"ÿ. The Biden administration also signed the "Los Angeles Declaration on Immigration and Protection" with some Latin American countries in June 2022, seeking the support of Latin American countries in solving immigration issues and advocating responsibility sharing. However, the Trump administration has It has shown a strong isolationist tendency, promoted the construction of the US-Mexico border wall, tried to exclude immigrants from the US border, and adopted tough measures. For example, in 2019, it threatened to reduce immigration to the Central American "Northern Triangle" countries El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. aid, trying to force the governments of these countries to curb the flow of immigrants into the United States, and to sign third-party security agreements with the United States, allowing the United States to transfer refugee applicants from third countries to these countries. However, if the economic development problems between the United States and Latin American countries are not resolved, balance and the governance deficit problem in Latin American countries. No matter which strategy is adopted, it cannot solve the security problems plaguing the United States.

Four Conclusions

Since its birth nearly 200 years ago, the "Monroe Doctrine" has always been the core clue of the United States' Latin

American policy. In this sense, it is successful as a regional strategy of the United States. However, the success of the Monroe

Doctrine is difficult to replicate because it is Determined by special geopolitical conditions, the United States is geographically far away from the center of world politics. As the American offensive realist scholar Mearsheimer said, "It is difficult for external competitors to

拉丁美洲研究 Issue 1, 2023

Crossing the ocean to attack the United States'y, and the United States is surrounded by small and medium-sized countries and has no ability to challenge the United States. More importantly, the ideological background of the Monroe Doctrine is power politics, and interference and power are its essential characteristics. In globalization, countries have mutual interests. In today's era of dependence and the establishment of a global multilateral governance system, power politics has not been completely eliminated, but it has been spurned by most countries. The concept of win-win cooperation advocated by a community with a shared future for mankind is the correct path for the rise of great powers. y The United States has brought back the Monroe Doctrine. It is also against the trend of the times to rekindle great power competition.

The long-term vitality of the Monroe Doctrine is based on U.S. hegemony. With the decline of U.S. hegemony, the rise of emerging powers, and the enhancement of strategic autonomy of Latin American countries, the rationality of the goals of the Monroe Doctrine and the effectiveness of its means will face challenges. A major challenge. Since the Obama administration, the United States has wanted to revitalize its hegemony in Latin America. However, due to differences in political philosophies, policy conflicts between the U.S. governments have expanded. This conflict reflects the shift between liberalism and realism after the decline of U.S. hegemony. The conflict between these theories and the dilemma of the U.S. strategy toward Latin America. To get out of this dilemma, the U.S. strategy toward Latin America has two options: either to update its diplomatic concepts or to revive the United States' hegemony.

In the post-hegemonic era, the U.S. government has unanimously chosen the goal of reviving U.S. hegemony in Latin America and trying to restore the U.S.'s influence on Latin America's political economy. However, it is very difficult for the United States to achieve this goal.

First, it lacks interest motivation. With the exception of Mexico, Latin America has The status of the United States in the political economy has declined. Take mineral product exports as an example. Due to the hollowing out of the industry, the United States' demand for Latin American mineral products has declined. The United States' share of Latin America's total mineral product exports has dropped from 14.37% in 1990 to 2000. 951% in 2020 and 18% in 2020 ÿ. As the United States achieved energy self-sufficiency in 2019, the importance of Latin American energy to the United States has greatly declined, and its proportion of U.S. crude oil imports has dropped from 374% in 2005 to 22% in 2021. 7% ÿÿ The U.S.'s pull strategy lacks interest motivation, and it is difficult to maintain the continuity of the strategy. Although non-traditional security issues such as illegal immigration are important to U.S. geopolitical security, these problems are intertwined, accumulated, and difficult to resolve in the short term. ÿ Forcing the return of U.S. isolationism. Second, it is difficult for the United States to maintain a balance between global goals and regional goals. This will affect the U.S. investment in Latin American resources. The United States is launching strategic competition with China around the world. The Biden administration is involved in the Russia-Ukraine conflict. This creates uncertainty about how much resources the United States can provide to Latin America. President Biden clearly informed Mexico when he visited Mexico in January 2023

ÿ [US] Written by John Mearsheimer, translated by Wang Yiwei and Tang Xiaosong: "The Tragedy of Great Power Politics", Shanghai: Shanghai Century Publishing Group, 2008,

President, "Our responsibility is not limited to the Western Hemisphere, it is in Central Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Africa. We have multiple focuses." ÿ In the early days of taking office, President Biden promised to invest 4 billion US dollars to help the development of Central America to prevent illegal Immigration, but as of mid-2022, the United States has not yet cashed in on any investmentÿ, which is evident from the stretched U.S. policy toward Latin America. The return of the Monroe

Doctrine means the resurgence of U.S. power politics. And China, as the largest extraterritorial factor affecting the Western Hemisphere economy, is returning to The main target of the subsequent Monroe Doctrine. Therefore, China should avoid making China-Latin America cooperation fall into the geopolitical trap of the Monroe Doctrine. At the same time, we must also see that to a large extent, the United States regards China as a major player in the Western Hemisphere. The main threats are based on fear and strategic anxiety, rather than China's actual actions. China's main goal in Latin America is to promote economic and trade cooperation. It does not seek to establish hegemony in Latin America, nor does it hope to use Latin American countries to harm U.S. security. China-Latin America cooperation can Promote the prosperity and stability of Latin American countries, and the prosperity and stability of Latin America is in the interest of the United States. Therefore, strengthening the Sino-US strategic dialogue and striving to change the United States' perception rather than direct confrontation is more in line with the interests of China and the United States as well as Latin American countries.

(Editor-in-charge Wang Shuai)