

Relations between the United States and Peru began when José Luis Bustamante y Rivero assumed the presidency of Peru from 1945 to 1948 with the support of the APRA party, which caught the attention of the American administration, which saw in his election an opportunity to promote democracy in Latin America. Although relations began positively, they soon became strained due to the reforms launched by Bustamante, which threatened the interests of American companies investing in Peru, especially in the mining and agricultural sectors. Internal tensions escalated as a result of the conflict between leftist forces and the conservative opposition, and ended with a coup led by Manuel Odría in 1948. The American administration preferred not to intervene to protect Bustamante, preferring stability that served its economic interests over supporting the democratic experiment. During the rule of Peruvian President Manuel Odría (1948-1956), American-Peruvian relations witnessed a strong rapprochement driven by economic and strategic interests in the shadow of the Cold War. The United States supported the Peruvian administration. In 1949, the US administration sent a mission from Julius Klein to make economic recommendations aimed at promoting stability and attracting foreign investment to Peru. With the outbreak of the Korean War (1950-1953), Peruvian exports of raw materials (such as copper and zinc) flourished to support the US war effort. When Eisenhower came to power in 1956, US policy continued to focus on stabilizing Peru as a strategic and economically important country in Latin America. As for Odría, he decided not to run for another presidential term and handed over power peacefully. US-Peruvian relations also witnessed close economic cooperation under Peruvian President Manuel Prado (1956-1962), especially with the increase in US investments in the mining and oil sectors. However, the control of US companies over natural resources aroused widespread popular discontent, leading to protests against economic dependency and lack of social justice. These tensions escalated into a Peruvian explosion represented by demonstrations and labor unrest, which later paved the way for the rise of nationalist governments hostile to the influence of the United States of America.

Between 1962 and 1968, under US Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, US policy towards Peru during the period (1962-1968) focused on combating communist influence and promoting economic development through the Alliance for Progress. US administrations provided economic and military aid to support Peru in confronting communist movements. This aid aimed to improve the economic situation in Peru and prevent it from sliding towards communism, despite the challenges in implementing development projects within the country.

During the years 1968 and 1972, relations between the United States of America and Peru witnessed significant tension due to the political and economic changes that occurred in Peru under the rule of General Juan Velasco Alvarado. After the 1968 coup, the Peruvian military government took power and launched a series of reforms aimed at strengthening national sovereignty and social justice, including the nationalization of American oil companies. The most prominent of these companies was the American International Petroleum Corporation (IPC), which was nationalized in 1968. This move greatly angered Washington, as it posed a threat to American economic interests in Peru. When President Richard Nixon took office, he faced challenges in dealing with the situation in Peru. The US administration was concerned that nationalization could be the beginning of the spread of leftist tendencies in Latin America, which could affect its strategic and economic interests in that region. In response, the US administration moved to use economic and political pressure tools on Peru. President

Nixon then sent a special envoy, John Irwin, the US Secretary of Defense, who was interested in maintaining military cooperation between the United States and Peru despite economic tensions. Irwin sought to maintain the US military presence in the region and security cooperation with Peru in the face of potential threats from leftist movements. On the other hand, President Nixon sent US Treasury Secretary John Connally as a representative of the US administration, who was more focused on using economic sanctions as a means of pressuring the Peruvian administration to reverse the nationalization decision. He believed that these sanctions might help reduce leftist influence in Peru. Despite these US pressures, the Peruvian administration did not back down from its policy, but rather stuck to its plan to nationalize IPC. This situation exacerbated tensions between the United States and Peru, which greatly affected economic relations. However, despite the tensions, cooperation between the two countries continued in other areas, such as military cooperation, as the US administration saw the importance of continuing this cooperation within the framework of a larger strategy to combat common threats in Peru. In addition, tensions arose over the tuna issue due to a dispute over maritime rights in 1972, which prompted the two sides to negotiate maritime policies. This was followed by the James Green negotiations in 1973, which focused on improving relations and enhancing economic cooperation between the two sides. By February 1974, an agreement was signed between the US administration and Peru to enhance cooperation in trade and development. With the 1975 coup, relations changed radically, as the coup led to diplomatic tensions with the United States. In short, Peru experienced a unique economic experiment between 1968 and 1975 led by the military junta headed by General Juan Velasco Alvarado. This period was marked by deep military intervention in the economy, launching a series of wide-ranging reforms that redistributed ownership of assets in favor of the public sector. It strengthened the role of the state as a major player in directing the economy. These policies were based on nationalist and populist principles common in Latin America, namely that a reform-oriented state is able to direct economic activity in the service of national interests and reduce dependence on external powers, by implementing strict central policies that even included control over foreign trade. What made this experience exceptional was the ability of the army to implement these radical changes without facing significant institutional, political or legal obstacles, which is rare in such contexts. The reforms were also intended to achieve long-term effects, and they partially succeeded in doing so until the emergence of pro-market liberal policies during the 1990s. In this way, this era represented a practical model for testing the economic hypotheses adopted by nationalists in Latin America about the effectiveness of state intervention in leading economic development. When President Carter assumed the presidency of the United States during the years (1977-1981), American policy changed to focus on human rights and development, but the economic and political challenges in Peru continued, which affected bilateral relations. Finally, the relationship between the United States and Peru during the years 1945-1981 was one of dependence and asymmetry. This relationship was based on an unbalanced distribution of economic and political power between the two parties, which made Peru increasingly dependent on Washington. This disparity was not limited to the administrative level, but was also reflected in the cultural and social communication between the peoples of the two countries, where relations were characterized by ambiguity and fluctuation, and between convergence at times and differences in fundamental positions such as the concepts of freedom and equality. Since the United States was the stronger party, it exercised an unequal influence on Peru, as it was able, through its economic and political tools, to direct Peruvian policies in a way that served its interests. As for

American decisions - whether at the administrative level or through companies and investors - they had a profound impact on Peru, while Peru's influence on the United States remained very limited. This disparity in influence was driven by mutual interests, as each country sought to achieve its goals, although often at the expense of the other party. At times, the United States supported Peru, as during the War of the Pacific, while at other times it imposed economic policies that made it hostage to American debt and investment. In this way, Peru found itself in a web of economic and political dependence that reinforced its dependence on the United States, making it difficult for it to escape the sphere of American influenc