

UDC 327
DOI: 10.46493/2663-2675.33(3).2023.28-35

Antony Miller

Associate Professor

Department of International Relations, Olgontenger University

325205, Jukov Str., Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7827-9716>

Nataliya Galunets*

Senior Lecturer

Mykolaiv National Agrarian University

54000, 9 Georgiy Gongadze Str., Mykolaiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7709-9238>

The establishment of the countries of “American friends” to the USSR and their current role in world politics

Abstract. The relevance of this study is that the foreign policy of countries in different regions of the world in the 21st century is a significant determinant that affects the overall international political process and world politics and is the consequence of past international relations. One of the consequences of the development of Brazil and Argentina and the rapid deterioration of Venezuela was international relations with the Soviet Union in the 20th century. The purpose of this research is to identify and analyse the influence of the Soviet Union on the establishment and current role of Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela in world politics, based on the literature search. The study used the bibliographic method, analysis and synthesis, comparison and induction. It was established that the Soviet Union's international relations with its “American friends” were designed to deplete resources, develop dependence and achieve hegemony in the region, compared to the United States. It is determined that the USSR, in pursuit of leadership over the Latin American region, tried to introduce the ideas of socialism to South America, using mainly commodity relations. Proof of this influence is the establishment of Venezuela, which was influenced by the Soviet Union, followed its ideas and is now the worst-developed country in the region, in contrast to Brazil and Argentina, which, due to alienation, were able to develop both their economic and political position and role in the international arena. The practical significance of this study is manifested in the fact that the results of this work allow an understanding of some aspects of political phenomena for the final use of positive experience in modern political transformations

Keywords: Latin-Soviet relations; international relations; socialism; “cold war”; hegemony

Introduction

South America has undergone significant changes in recent decades. The history of the region's establishment has left the countries of South America with many political and economic problems that have resulted in their current position and role in the current political and economic system. Currently, South America, like in the 20th century, is still an arena for contemporary events. Thus, the relations between South American countries and the Soviet Union in the 20th century and the consequences of such relations for the countries examined in the 21st century are of considerable interest.

South America – a region with great political and economic potential, where the US and the USSR fought for

influence during the Cold War. Now that conditions have changed and the Cold War, with its sense of mistrust and secrecy, is history, a more realistic and critical look at Soviet foreign policy, its motives, logic, and actions can be taken. Thus, it is advisable to present and summarise 70 years of Soviet relations with Latin America and the significant consequences of these relations in the current realities for three countries, namely the Federative Republic of Brazil, the Republic of Argentina, and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

A considerable amount of research has been conducted on the role of South American countries in world politics, their establishment and development in the

Received: 12.02.2023, Revised: 02.05.2023, Accepted: 02.06.2023

Suggested Citation:

Miller, A., & Galunets, N. (2023). The establishment of the countries of “American friends” to the USSR and their current role in world politics. *Foreign Affairs*, 33(3), 28-35. doi: 10.46493/2663-2675.33(3).2023.28-35.

*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

international arena, and the causes and consequences of their current situation. For example, Ukrainian researcher B. Kudelko (2022) emphasises the role of the United States in the formation of Latin American countries, namely the US hegemony in the region from the 18th century to the beginning of the 21st century, which was one of the reasons for the current situation of the countries. The American researcher C. Gaffey (2020) noted that Soviet influence caused significant losses for South American countries and emphasised other consequences and the current situation of countries in avoiding communism both in the region and anywhere in the world.

Y. Yordanov (2021), in his study, highlighted the international relations between Cuba and the USSR, noting that the countries have come a thorny way from the “warm” beginning of sugar trade relations in 1960 to tense relations in the 80s the 20th century, which the USSR authorities tolerated to preserve the Cuban revolution, which was the centre of socialism in the Western Hemisphere. The researcher noted that after 1980, the structural reforms adopted by the new leadership of the USSR concerning Cuba resulted in the end of its cooperation with European countries and the subsequent rapid decline of the country’s economy.

V. Saeki-Serna (2021) determined that the main purpose of Soviet leaders towards Latin American countries was to preserve and consolidate absolute power, expand it, and destroy the governmental mechanism and structure of society in non-Soviet countries. T. Harmer (2021) focused his research on one of the countries of South America – Chile. For example, the researcher established that with the intervention of the USSR and the United States, the country achieved growth due to the successful abandonment of communism and development in the opposite way to those neighbouring countries that supported the ideas of the USSR.

However, the subject has not yet been thoroughly researched regarding the impact of the so-called “friendship” between the USSR and the countries examined and the consequences that such relations have caused, which still exist today. The relevance of this research is primarily conditioned upon the absence of similar research studies specialising in this subject in the context of modern political international relations.

To better understand the problem, this study was designed to identify general trends in Soviet influence for countries that followed their ideology and partially cooperated with the USSR as “American friends”. Such countries were, for example, Venezuela, Argentina, and countries that, after their relations with the USSR, took a different path of development, such as Brazil, etc.

The purpose of this study is to scrutinize the main aspects and stages of relations and to explore the current role in world politics of South American countries, namely Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela, by analysing their economic development and the political consequences of international relations with the Soviet Union, which determine the role and place of these countries in world politics today.

Materials and Methods

To achieve this purpose, the bibliographic method was initially used, in the form of a qualitative selection of some

literary material, to determine the relevance of the study of the issue in a particular region. In addition, previous studies by English, Ukrainian, American, Spanish, and Argentine authors are studied. First of all, to perform the primary tasks of the study, the method of analysis and synthesis of information was used to identify the beginning and root causes of relations between Venezuela, Argentina and Brazil, and the Soviet Union. The study analyses the development of the countries examined, starting from the first 20th century and ending with the second decade of the 21st century, to identify the consequences of international relations of the countries examined. To confirm the economic processes in the countries examined, changes in statistical data were carefully analysed and explored. To achieve this task, the following indicators were explored using the method of statistical data analysis: gross domestic product (hereinafter – GDP) of the region examined for the period 1960-1984 to analyse positive or adverse changes in the development of South American countries. In addition, using the method of comparison and analysis, the author examines in more detail the GDP of Argentina for the period 1870-1914. Thus, before the commencement of international relations with the Soviet Union, and in comparison, with the same indicator of other countries of the world, the level of development of Argentina in the period 1870-1914 was much better compared to other modern leading countries of the world. For this comparison, per capita income levels among other countries were used. The study analyses in detail Venezuela’s GDP for the period 1963-2022, i.e., from the beginning of international relations with the Soviet Union to the present day, and the growth rate of Venezuela’s GDP for the period 1986-2022. To fully reflect the economic situation of Venezuela in recent years, the country’s prospective development index was probed in comparison with its closest neighbours. In addition, notably, by applying the method of analysis and synthesis of information, the author identifies the periods of foreign relations of the investigated countries and studies the levers of influence on Latin American countries by the USSR. Separately, the comparison method was used to identify the problems faced by the countries examined during and after cooperation with the Soviet Union, both in the economic and political aspects. The main choice in determining the research plan was to focus on an inductive research approach, which is appropriate for the work being done. The method of induction and comparison was used for the analysed countries (Venezuela, Argentina, and Brazil) to establish the economic and political consequences of international relations with the USSR. In addition, the method of induction was used to explore the reasons for the current position of Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela in the international market. The method of analysis and comparison of the obtained results was used to depict the problems considered in the study and to interpret them in the current realities of international political relations, which allowed concluding on the practical significance of the conducted research.

Results

For many years, South America played the role of a fringe of world politics until it became an object of interest for

the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. There were no controversial issues between the USSR and the Latin American states that would have hindered the development of their ties (Kudelko, 2022). However, in the second half of the 1940s, the Cold War, launched by the then US and UK leadership, intervened in this process, involving the Soviet Union and many Latin American countries that continued to be highly economically and politically dependent on the United States (Gaffey, 2020).

Notably, Latin-Soviet relations were designed gradually, passing through several stages of development. Perusing the course of the USSR's foreign policy relations, one can conclude that the main strategic and economic interests of the Soviet Union were focused on Eurasia, but after the end of World War II, starting in the 1960s, the USSR began to pay considerable attention to Latin America, despite the long distance separating the two regions and the limited common interests throughout their history (Riikkamari, 2022). Official ties between the USSR and the Latin American region flourished in the late 1950s and 1960s. Before that, the relationship was sporadic and insignificant. The only exception was Argentina – the first country on the South American continent with which the USSR established diplomatic relations and with which contacts later developed mainly through the Communist International (Comintern), but for a short period, as the country changed its development path oppositely from the ideas of the USSR. Soviet-Latin American relations acquired new aspects after the Cuban revolution, which resulted in the establishment of diplomatic relations: between Brazil (1961) and Venezuela (1970). However, notably, by the early 1980s, the USSR had diplomatic relations with 18 governments of the South American continent.

The answer to the question of what caused such a change in foreign economic relations was partly provided by such a scholar as K. Blasier (2002) in his research, who noted the most important reason. The ideas advocated by communist figures were quite relevant in the societies of the countries examined in the 20th century: poverty, governmental rigidity, and a large number of social problems. The global economic recession of 1929-1933 harmed South America, exacerbating the crisis trends that had been developing within the countries and had come to light in the post-war period. Attention should be devoted to the statistical data indicating that the countries of this region lost the dynamism of economic growth in the 20th century. Between 1960 and 1984, the total GDP of the countries in the region decreased by 2.3% (from 6.2% in 1961 to 3.9% in 1984), and in some years, such as 1983, it declined sharply and amounted to – 1.9% (The world bank..., 2021). Namely, this trend was accompanied by hyperinflation, unemployment, progressive degradation of the labour market, and an increase in the external debt of countries (Cardoso, 1989).

Communist policies designed to eradicate such problems were frequently discussed in the leading countries of South America at the time – Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela – after the Soviet Union's collapse. The Bolshevik Revolution, which occurred on the territory of the countries that later became part of the Soviet Union, was a

symbol of social justice for the countries under analysis, and, therewith, a utopia. Thus, the penetration of the Soviet economy into South American countries increased dramatically at a time when these countries were fighting for their independence and the opportunity to develop and improve, struggling with pressing social problems.

Each of the analysed countries was of some interest to the USSR. First of all, notably, Argentina's GDP in 1870-1914, before the arrival of the Soviet Union, grew by 5.61% on average, while in Canada this figure was 3.77%, in the USA – 3.66%, and in Australia – 3.35% (Cachanosky, 2006).

Thus, all three countries examined are located in a region of strategic geographical importance. However, Argentina and Chile shared a common border, which is an important point, since, as T. Harmer (2021) notes, the USSR tried to influence neighbouring countries. In the case of Venezuela, the country shared borders with Brazil, respectively, and Brazil with Argentina. Notably, the relations between these states and the USSR were mostly economic. Weak support for communist ideology and indecision about provoking a US response limited this aspect of their relations, particularly with Argentina and Brazil. For the most part, it can be concluded that Soviet relations with the three countries mentioned above were largely motivated by political and economic purposes to expand Soviet influence in the region, which was strategically important in achieving hegemony due to its significant resource deposits and favourable geographical location.

After reviewing a considerable amount of literature, the author concludes that during the Soviet period, the USSR expanded its contacts with Latin America with the main purpose of transforming developing countries into Marxist-Leninist states, thereby strengthening its status both as the leader of the world communist movement and as a "great power" capable of competing with and defending itself against the United States. Such actions were primarily designed to establish hegemony in South America. At the beginning of the Cold War, the Soviet Union considered Latin America as a region where the US government had severely limited communist expansion opportunities. A study of Soviet actions and purposes in Latin America demonstrates that they were not to establish pro-Soviet regimes or gain Soviet bases but rather to undermine the US position. Soviet planners viewed Latin America as the "strategic rear" of the United States and noted the US dependence on Latin America for raw materials (Leiken, 1982). Thus, for example, in 1989, as a result of many studies by R. Schmidt (1989), it was established that the Soviet motives for improving relations with South America were economic and political but not strategic.

In particular, Argentina was an alternative source of grain for the USSR, a potentially important source of oil and minerals, and a successful commercial fishing area. In addition, notably, the Soviet Union openly spoke of its desire to dominate South America. A striking example of this was publications in various Soviet journals, but the most notorious was the 1978 publication "America Latina", which repeatedly mentioned the dream of "turning the wet pampas (plains) of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, and Paraguay, the central valley and area of German settlement,

into a major world and grain market" (Saba, 1980). International relations between the analysed countries began based on trade and economic relations in the form of "economic friendship". The Soviet Union supplied South America with machinery for production, cars, chemicals, and parts and mechanisms for the construction of hydro-electric power plants. In turn, the Soviet Union bought conventional products from Latin America, such as coffee, cocoa, bananas, rice, sunflower oil, meat, leather, and, in some years, large quantities of wheat. Since the 1970s, some types of finished goods have been purchased from this region: footwear, woollen goods, and metal pipes. In addition, the USSR was significantly involved in the military affairs of the region, as it was a supplier of military equipment, outselling even the United States in terms of sales to Latin America. In this case, it can be concluded that the USSR's tactics were manifested through comprehensive influence on society (government, press, popular movements) against US rule in the region.

Soviet priorities changed rapidly after 1985. Perestroika and internal problems meant that less attention could be paid to low-priority areas such as Latin America, and the USSR could not afford to continue its assistance at the same high level. The crisis of the populist regimes' policies brought the South American country to a historical dead end, the solution to which, due to specific socio-political conditions, lay in the establishment of military dictatorships, in which the Soviet Union was closely involved. Thus, Brazil was the first country to implement economic reforms, but under the auspices of the USSR, this country increased production and labour productivity by 56% in 1965-1974 by increasing capital (Cachanosky, 2006), but the result was alienation from economic progress, which worsened overall development.

The new powers established in Latin America were groups that sought to move beyond Marxist-Leninist efforts to achieve economic equality and democracy to embark on social reforms and address problems unique to Latin America. Therewith, the performance of left-oriented governments in different Latin American countries varied significantly.

Brazil and Argentina, having experienced a series of internal shocks of various kinds, are now members of the G20 and are among the world's most powerful economies, leaders in international politics, and influential subjects in the region. However, notably, Argentina's per capita income was among the ten highest in the world a century ago, when it was 92% of the average of the 16 richest economies. According to the latest research data, per capita income is now 43% of the 16 richest economies (OECD Review of..., 2018). Thus, Brazil, having abandoned the ideology and patronage of the Soviet Union, has achieved the greatest success and managed to raise the level of economic development, reduce poverty, and push back the threat of hunger from millions of citizens and become one of the "twenty" countries of the world. The situation was more complicated in Argentina, where the country's leadership, under pressure from the Soviet Union, led the country to incur significant social obligations and to a decline in both economic and political importance in the international arena.

The 1960s and early 1970s witnessed unstable growth and inflationary processes, including the first hyperinflation in 1975. During the 1970s and 1980s, the country struggled with the crisis and the lack of a competitive export sector. After decades of import-substituting industrialisation, Argentina as a country has undergone a significant transformation and is very different from what it was decades earlier. Subsequently, the influence of the USSR on the country weakened, dictatorships disappeared, and democratic regimes with fairly transparent electoral processes were established (Brown, 2000). Despite periodic crises, Argentina's growing performance since 1990 has allowed the country to begin the process of convergence with the developed world (OECD Review of..., 2018).

However, the worst situation was observed during the analysis in Venezuela. It was in the 70s of the 20th century that political processes in the country examined underwent transformations, which were based on the deterioration of relations with the United States. The country had an anti-American foreign policy orientation (Pilash, 2020), admiring the ideas of socialism under the aggressive influence of the USSR, and continued to develop in this area. In the context of the country's development, its economic situation is of interest, as it influences the country's political role in the international space. Thus, notably, Venezuela's GDP in 2022, which is USD 82.15 billion, is close to the 1963 value of USD 60.88 billion, with a GDP growth rate of 34.94 % for the period 1986-2022 (Venezuela: Gross domestic..., 2022).

The economic collapse is a significant economic crisis in modern history. Thus, the country that was one of the richest in Latin America and had the world's largest oil reserves after the Bolivarian Revolution under the auspices of Hugo Chavez and Nicolas Maduro, whose policies caused significant hyperinflation and economic decline. Venezuela is currently the only underdeveloped country in South America (Messner *et al.*, 2020). The Venezuelan people are suffering from food shortages, hyperinflation, and a healthcare crisis caused by the Maduro regime's corruption and mismanagement. As of July 2020, more than 5.2 million Venezuelans have fled the man-made disaster, and more than 3.2 million remaining citizens face food insecurity. At present, considering Venezuela in terms of development dynamics, based on the prospective rating index, notably, this country ranks 132nd in the ranking. Therewith, the dynamic processes in Venezuela are estimated at 26 out of 100, while, for example, Mexico's score is 62/100 (Barabash, 2018).

Summarising, note that in the process of establishing relations with South American countries, the USSR focused only on its own national interests and urgent needs, which influenced the further development of the countries.

Discussion

It is in South America that the process of finding the most effective model of socio-political and economic development is currently underway. Such processes have happened in the past and have had significant consequences for South American countries, which they are still experiencing and observing today. Having begun long before the

20th century, these processes have reached their peak in this period (López *et al.*, 2021). In particular, relations with the Soviet Union played an important role in the establishment of the countries examined, and the consequences of these relations are still felt today. Based on the study, notably, in a constantly changing world order, different states are building and striving to achieve a specific foreign policy strategy based on national interests. A striking example of this situation is the relationship between the Soviet Union and the countries of South America.

Some researchers describe South America as a “lost continent” (Moisés, 2006), but in this paper, the authors are inclined to the opinion of researcher T. Field (2020): although the region has a stable historical and geographical barrier, the region is unique compared to other regions of the world, as all historical events, although occurring indirectly, have global consequences in the framework of international relations. The epicentre of geopolitical rivalry has been South America, not Europe or the Middle East, for a long time now (Berg & Hal, 2022). Notably, in the 21st century, this region of the world includes a large number of countries, with a population of about 660 million people (Number of inhabitants..., 2022), contains a mixture of people from Asia, Africa, and Europe, and is increasingly becoming a significant part of international political relations.

Currently, Brazil and Argentina play an important role in both regional and international political relations, as they participate in most international organisations and have a significant impact on the pace and efficiency of developing the global political system, contrary to Venezuela. In the 21st century, Latin America is increasingly emerging as a permanent feature of the emerging polycentric system of international relations. For example, Brazil and Argentina are among the world’s top 20 countries. As of 2018, Brazil is the first largest economy in South America, while Argentina is the second (OECD Review of..., 2018). In addition, Brazil is seeking to become a member of the Security Council. Despite the wave of progressive governments, they are still the most unequal societies in the world in terms of wealth distribution, and most countries, according to the UN, still have underdeveloped economies, which determines the political place of these countries in the world. A striking example is Venezuela.

The study has established that the current situation and level of development of the scrutinized countries is a consequence of the constant struggle between the US and the USSR for hegemony in the region. The US purpose was to prevent local communists from gaining power by peaceful or violent means and turning South America into a springboard for the Soviet military and political regime (Berg & Hal, 2022). The analysis of previous studies has allowed for several conclusions about the current role of Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela in the political system and the overall development of the region, in particular, that the desire of the two superpowers to establish their order over the region has provoked mostly adverse consequences for its development. However, notably, the differences between this study and the previous ones are as most researchers studied the situation from a different perspec-

tive than this study – they found the consequences of US influence on the region or analysed the current political and economic situation of each country separately, but without comparing them with each other and without exploring the consequences of the Soviet Union’s influence.

Among contemporary researchers who directly or indirectly study the issue, mention should be made of B. Kudelko (2022). The Ukrainian researcher, having outlined the stages of development and relations between Latin America and the United States, established that after the collapse of the USSR, the presence of the United States in the region decreased, but it continues to actively interfere in the internal politics of Latin American countries, although to a lesser extent than their predecessors. The primary reason for the intervention was the active attempts of the USSR to be present in the region, and the consequences of establishing a logistical and financial centre for the rebels could have been threatening for both continents of the Americas (Berg & Hal, 2022).

However, the researcher A. Varas (2008) noted in his study that Argentina’s relations with the USSR served as a counterbalance to the country’s relations with the US economic presence and pressure from the UK. Similarly, Brazil’s relations with the USSR indicated a bilateral interest in establishing a more independent position in the international arena. However, the researcher emphasised that it was Latin America that benefited from the presence of the Soviet Union. In this area, V. Jeifets, & L. Jeifets (2022) conducted a study emphasising the dualism of Soviet diplomacy towards Latin American governments of those countries that did not recognise the Bolshevik state but sought to benefit economically from trade with the USSR, which was not considered in the current study and is a limitation of this research.

In his study, the Ukrainian scholar O. Romanyuk (2021) focused only on the establishment and development of Venezuela and highlighted several important aspects of this process. Firstly, Venezuela has been an important participant in international relations through the oil factor, namely hydrocarbon resources and oil models. Secondly, the beginning of Venezuela’s cooperation with the USSR was supposed to increase the country’s role in international politics, but it never happened, which is consistent with the results of this research.

Thus, various researchers from many countries have explored the issues discussed in this research. As a result of this research, some aspects were not confirmed by the results of previous studies, but the following aspects were common: the South American region is quite significant in the framework of international cooperation, economy, and politics, and the superpowers of the USSR and the USA tried to establish power over it in different eras during the development of the South American subsystem of international relations, lagging behind Europe, East Asia, and even the Middle East. Due to geographical proximity, and political and economic influence, the United States was a more natural partner for Latin American countries than European countries located far across the ocean. The USSR’s international relations with the Latin American region had inevitable consequences that are still visible

today. Having used the government and resources of South American countries, the USSR soon ceased to exist, leaving many adverse consequences and problems for the countries. Brazil and Argentina, moved away from Soviet influence faster and managed to achieve better development and occupy their place in the global political system, while Venezuela has not yet solved a significant number of problems and does not have a significant voice in the international economy and politics.

As noted by A. Bredykhin and M. Zelinska (2009) in their study, although it is too early to make final predictions, they believe that the example of the emerging Latin American countries, namely Argentina, may become the most likely prospect for the new democracies of Eastern Europe and those states that emerged from the former Soviet Union. The experience of the rather complicated development of the political system of South America is of considerable interest to Ukraine, as similar problems can be traced in the economy and politics of Ukraine in the 20th century. Notably, the paths are taken by Ukraine and the analysed South American countries are quite different, as the former suffered explicit consequences after leaving the USSR (Ghorbal, 2006), while the latter were indirectly affected by the adverse effects of the rivalries for power in the region. Therefore, the concept of “living in the past” and its consequences for the development of the post-Soviet states are traced in the example of three Latin American countries (Czyż, 2021). What can now be analysed and interpreted about the countries that became part of the Soviet Union, including Ukraine.

Conclusions

The Soviet Union began to exert significant pressure on South American countries in the late 1960s. In addition to the economic situation, the USSR had a significant impact on the political regime of the examined South American countries. The main determinants of the Soviet Union's interest in the South American region were the idea of hegemony on the continent compared to the United States and the favourable geographical location of the countries. The intervention of the USSR plays a significant role in the establishment and development of the three states. The

influence of the USSR on the development of countries and their current position in the world, both economically and politically, is not a decisive factor, but it is quite significant.

Based on the study, notably, relations between the USSR and South America were dynamically developing, but their basic essence has never changed: The USSR tried to establish hegemony in the region with the purpose of subjugation. It is established that in the case of the studied South American countries, namely Brazil, Argentina, and Venezuela, the Soviet Union was not a friend, but only another superpower, like the United States, from which they should keep away. An example, in this case, is Brazil and Argentina, which were biased against the Soviet Union's attempts to dictate new orders and establish their dependence on it. However, the ideology of the USSR had already penetrated the military, economic, and political systems of the countries examined, which supported and imitated it. In particular, this situation was observed in Venezuela. Paying attention to the current role of each country analysed in this research, it can be determined that the consequences of such relations with the Soviet government are still visible and tangible today. Thus, the collapse in Venezuela's development now exceeds that of the former Soviet Union, which suggests that socialism in the 21st century may follow the path of its predecessor in the 20th century since authoritarianism and a one-party system in the absence of healthy competition, lack of understanding of the nature of new challenges and time-appropriate solutions cannot be effective for the country's development.

The relevance of this subject and issues prompts further analyses. Therefore, the prospect for further work is to conduct more detailed research on the experience of current approaches to leadership in Brazil and Argentina in the South American region and interpret the results to Ukraine to activate the state and strengthen its role in the European regional community and cooperation.

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

Reference

- [1] Barabash, O.V. (2018). Trajectories of political regimes and general transformational processes in Venezuela and Mexico: Features of development and contours of changes. *Modern Society*, 2(16), 4-28. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.2537742.
- [2] Berg, R.C., & Hal, B. (2022). The return of geopolitics: Latin America and the Caribbean in an era of great-power rivalry. *Global Security Review*, 2, 3. doi: 10.25148/GSR.2.009782.
- [3] Blasier, C. (2002). The soviet global impact: 1945-1991. *Soviet impacts on Latin America*, 29(2-4), 481-597. doi: 10.1080/02604027.1989.9972118.
- [4] Bredykhin, A., & Zelinska, M. (2009). *Peculiarities of the transformation of the political system in Argentina*. *Political Management*, 3, 92-100.
- [5] Brown, A. (2000). *Transnational influences in the transition from communism*. *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 16(2), 34.
- [6] Cachanosky, R. (2006). The Argentine syndrome: From the state of crisis to the crisis of the State. *Buenos Aires*, 91, 103.
- [7] Cardoso, E.A. (1989). Hyperinflation in Latin America. *Taylor & Francis*, 32(1), 11-19. doi: 10.1080/05775132.1989.11471303.
- [8] Czyż, A. (2021). Post-soviet area in the foreign policy of the russian federation. *ATHENAEUM. Polish Political Science Studies*, 71(3), 151-164. doi: 10.15804/athena.2021.71.09.
- [9] Field, T. (2020). *Latin America and the global Cold War*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

- [10] Gaffey, K. (2020). The lasting effects of U.S. Intervention in Guatemala. *Portland State University*, 51. doi: [10.15760/honors.861](https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.861).
- [11] Ghorbal, B. (2006). *Latin America under construction*. Madrid, 138.
- [12] Harmer, T. (2021). Towards a global history of the Unidad popular. *Radical Americas*, 6(1), 1-14. doi: [10.14324/111.444.ra.2021.v6.1.004](https://doi.org/10.14324/111.444.ra.2021.v6.1.004).
- [13] Jeifets, V., & Jeifets L. (2022). *Rethinking post-cold war russian-Latin American relations*. New York: Routledge. doi: [10.4324/9781003183372](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003183372).
- [14] Kudelko, B. (2022). The influence of the USA on the politics of Latin American countries. *Historical and Political Problems of the Modern World*, 45, 86-91. doi: [10.31861/mhpi2022.45.86-91](https://doi.org/10.31861/mhpi2022.45.86-91).
- [15] Leiken, R.S. (1982). *Soviet strategy in Latin America*. Washington: The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University.
- [16] López, C.B., Grajales, J.F.V., & Galeano, M.S.M. (2021). Dictatorships in Latin America and their influence on left and right movements since the century XX. *Ratio Juris*, 16(32). doi: [10.24142/RAJU.V16N32A1](https://doi.org/10.24142/RAJU.V16N32A1).
- [17] Messner, J.J., Haken, N., Taft, P., Maglo, M., Fiertz, C., Wilson, W., Cockey, S., Grathwohl, F., & Iuliano, K. (2020). *Fragile states index annual report*. Washington: The Fund for Peace.
- [18] Moisés, N. (2006). *The lost continent*. *Foreign Policy*, 157, 40-47.
- [19] Number of inhabitants in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2021, by country or territory. (2022). Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/988453/number-inhabitants-latin-america-caribbean-country/>.
- [20] OECD Review of the corporate governance of state-owned enterprises: Argentina. (2018). <https://www.oecd.org/daf/ca/Argentina-SOE-Review.pdf>.
- [21] Pilash, D.M. (2020). The evolution of conflictogenicity in the relations between Venezuela and Guyana: Past and present. *Regional Studies*, 57-63.
- [22] Riikkamari, J.M. (2022). *«Good friends” for the Soviet Union: The peoples’ friendship university in soviet educational cooperation with the developing world, 1960-1980*. Budapest: Central European University.
- [23] Romanyuk, V.O. (2021). Peculiarities of the historical development of Venezuela: Past and present. *Problems of World History*, 1(13), 107-132. doi: [10.46869/2707-6776-2021-13-5](https://doi.org/10.46869/2707-6776-2021-13-5).
- [24] Saba, P. (1980). Soviet Penetration of Latin America. *Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line*, 3(6). Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-5/lrs-soviets-latin-america.htm>.
- [25] Saeki-Serna, V. (2021). *Mexico’s Cuban connection*. *Penn History Review*, 28(1), 81-106.
- [26] Schmidt, R. (1989). *U.S. and soviet relations with Argentina. Obstacles and Opportunities for the U.S. Army*. Rand Note, 69.
- [27] The world bank GDP growth (annual %) - Latin America & Caribbean. (2021). Retrieved from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG?locations=ZJ>.
- [28] Varas, A. (2008). Ideology and politics in Latin American-USSR relations. *Global Politics and Strategy*, 26(3), 114-121. doi: [10.1080/00396338408442171](https://doi.org/10.1080/00396338408442171).
- [29] Venezuela: Gross domestic product (GDP) in current prices from 1986 to 2023. (2022). Retrieved from <https://www.statista.com/statistics/370937/gross-domestic-product-gdp-in-venezuela/>.
- [30] Yordanov, R. (2021). Bittersweet solidarity: Cuba, sugar, and the soviet bloc. *American History Journal*, 161, 215-240. doi: [10.35424/rha.161.2021.855](https://doi.org/10.35424/rha.161.2021.855).

Ентоні Міллер

Доцент

Департамент міжнародних відносин, Університет Отгонтенгер

325205, вул. Жукова, Улан-Батор, Монголія

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7827-9716>

Наталія Галунець

Старший викладач

Миколаївський національний аграрний університет

54000, вул. Георгія Гонгадзе, 9, Миколаїв, Україна

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7709-9238>

**Становлення країн «американських друзів» до СРСР
та їхня сучасна роль в світовій політиці**

Анотація. Актуальність даного дослідження полягає в тому, що зовнішня політика країн різних регіонів світу у XXI сторіччі виступає значним детермінантом, який впливає на загальний міжнародний політичний процес та світову політику, є наслідками минулих міжнародних відносин. Одним із наслідків розвитку Бразилії та Аргентини та стрімкого погіршення стану Венесуели є міжнародні відносини із Радянським Союзом у XX сторіччі. Метою даної статті є, спираючись на літературний пошук, виокремлення та аналіз впливу Радянського Союзу на становлення та сучасну роль Бразилії, Аргентини та Венесуели у світовій політиці. Під час проведеного дослідження було використано бібліографічний метод, а також аналізу та синтезу, порівняння та індукції. Було встановлено, що міжнародні відносини Радянського Союзу із «американськими друзями» відбувалися із ціллю виснаження ресурсів, розвивання залежності та досягнення гегемонії в регіоні, порівняно із США. Визначено, що СРСР у погоні за лідерством над латиноамериканським регіоном, використовуючи здебільшого товарні відносини, намагалися впровадити ідеї соціалізму до Південної Америки. Доказом такого впливу є становлення Венесуели, яка була під впливом Радянського Союзу, наслідувала його ідеї та нині є найгірше розвиненою країною в регіоні на противагу Бразилії та Аргентині, які завдяки відчуженню змогли розвинути як економічне, так і політичне становище та роль на міжнародній арені. Практична значущість даного дослідження проявляється в тому, що результати даної роботи дозволяють зрозуміти окремі аспекти політичних явищ задля підсумкового використання позитивного досвіду в сучасних політичних трансформаціях

Ключові слова: Латино-радянські відносини; міжнародні відносини; соціалізм; «холодна війна», гегемонія