AUTHOR	<i>Igor A. Istomin</i> — PhD (Political Science), Acting Chair, Department of Applied International Political Analysis, MGIMO University (e-mail: iaistomin@gmail.com; ORCID: 0000-0002-8334-6343).
TITLE	JUSTIFICATION FOR INTERFERENCE? THE ROLE OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE IN THE STIGMATIZATION AND LEGITIMATION OF INTERVENTION IN THE US FOREIGN POLICY IN THE 19th AND EARLY 20th CENTURIES
SUMMARY	Despite the growing academic attention to the problem of interference in internal affairs, rhetorical techniques the state uses to legitimize interventions in the eyes of foreign counterparties, remain somewhat understudied in the Russian IR studies. In this regard, the case of the Monroe Doctrine, a landmark ideological construct in the history of international relations and US foreign policy, provides a unique framework for an indepth study of the practices of legitimization and stigmatization of interventions. The paper examines the role of the doctrine in denouncing the interference of European powers in the domestic affairs of Latin American countries and justifying US actions in the region. The author outlines a set of issues related to legitimizing, both externally and internally, the actions of the state in the international arena. It is shown that the appeal to national interests suitable for solving the problems of domestic political legitimization, turns out to be ineffective in justifying interventions in the eyes of the international community and therefore gives way to references to established traditions and historical narratives. The paper examines the historical background of the 1823 presidential address and the ways how the US foreign policy establishment appealed to it later on, both to promote the idea of the inadmissibility of European interference in the affairs of the Countries of the Western Hemisphere, and, subsequently, to justify American interventionism. Special attention is paid to the so-called Roosevelt Corollary, since it allows one to better understand the specifics of the US leaders' perception of the Monroe Doctrine and to separate them from the distortions and stereotypes formed during the ensuing public debates and uncritically replicated in many academic studies. The author concludes that, though the Monroe Doctrine is regarded as a cornerstone of US foreign policy, in fact it played a limited role in both diplomatic justification and stigmatization of interventions. In th
KEY WORDS	<i>Keywords:</i> Monroe Doctrine, US foreign policy, armed intervention, interference, interventionism, legitimacy, state in America, imperialism, neocolonialism, Roosevelt corollary
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	The research has been accomplished with a financial support from the Russian Science Foundation, project No 22-18-00723 (https://rscf.ru/project/22-18-00723/). Certain parts of the research were discussed at the Yasin International Scientific Conference at the Higher School of Economics and Round Table 'Imperialism and Great Power Rivalry' organized by the School of World Politics, Lomonosov Moscow State University. Author expresses his gratitude to I. Bolgova, A. Livia Esteves, I. Ferguson, A. Iserov, G. Ivanov, M. Kharkevich, D. Korchemnaya, N. Lipunov, E. Maslova, A. Nesmashnyj, K. Petrov, O. Shakirov, M. Suchkov and D. Zhabina for their valuable comments on the preliminary drafts of the manuscript.
FOR CITATION	Istomin I.A. 2023. Justification for interference? The role of the Monroe Doctrine in the stigmatization and legitimation of intervention in the US foreign policy in the 19th and early 20th centuries. <i>Lomonosov World Politics Journal</i> , vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 11–55. DOI: 10.48015/2076-7404-2023-15-3-11-55. (In Russ.)