

THE EVOLUTION OF THE “ENEMY IMAGE” IN AMERICAN-SOVIET RELATIONS FROM 1979 TO 1991

Valeriia POKLIATSKA

State Institution “Institute of the World History
of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine”,
Kyiv, Ukraine
lera_nvk@mail.ru

Rezumat: Evoluția «imaginii dușmanului» în relațiile americano-sovietice din anii 1979-1991.

Articolul prezintă principalele schimbări în atitudinile politice ale SUA și URSS, în anii 1979-1991, urmărind evoluția imaginii “celeilalte superputeri”. Autorul explorează rolul retoricii oficiale în perioada Războiului Rece, determinând etapele transformării reprezentărilor superputerii-rivale în discursurile publice ale liderilor SUA și URSS. Articolul evidențiază caracteristicile comune și deosebiri retoricii oficiale ale superputerilor, ca și domeniile fundamentale în care a fost ilustrată imaginea “rivalului”. Deoarece adevărata schimbare în reprezentarea “celeilalt” a început în anul 1988, autorul arată cum a evoluat imaginea superputerilor rivale, de la «principali dușmani externi» la «parteneri».

Résumé: L'évolution de “l'image de l'ennemi” dans les relations américano-soviétiques des années 1979-1991.

L'article ci-joint présente les principaux changements des attitudes politiques des Etats-Unis de l'Amérique et de l'URSS pendant les années 1979-1991, tout en suivant l'évolution de l'image de “l'autre superpuissance”. L'auteur y explore le rôle de la rhétorique officielle durant la Guerre Froide, tout en déterminant les étapes de la transformation des représentations de la superpuissance – rivale dans les discours publics des leaders des Etats-Unis et de l'URSS. L'article met en évidence les traits communs, ainsi que les différences de la rhétorique officielle des superpuissances, ainsi que les domaines fondamentaux où on illustre l'image du “rival”. Comme le véritable changement dans la représentation de “l'autre” commença en 1988, l'auteur y montra comment évolua l'image des superpuissances rivales, de “principaux ennemis externes” à “partenaires”.

Abstract. The article presents the main changes in the political attitudes of the USA and the USSR, during 1979-1991, analyzing the evolution of the image of “the other superpower”. The author explores the role of the official rhetoric in the age of the Cold War,

determining the stages of transformation of the rival-superpower's appearances in the American and Soviet leaders' public speeches. The article highlights similarities and differences in the official rhetoric of the superpowers, as well as the basic areas in which the image of "the rival" was depicted. Since the real change in the representation of the "Other" started in 1988, the author indicates how the rival superpowers' image has evolved from «main external enemies» to «partners».

Keywords: USA, USSR, "enemy image", official rhetoric, American-Soviet relations, Cold War, partner, cooperation.

Introduction

After the Cold War, scientists have an opportunity to rethink the events of the second half of the twentieth century, because of the opening of previously classified documents. The increased scientific interest to these events enabled the researchers to write a "new Cold War history".

The manifestation of such interest is the activity of large number of research centers and groups aimed at studying of the various aspects of this confrontation during the Cold War. Such centers were established in the USA, Europe (UK, Italy, Russia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czech Republic, Romania), Asia (China, Mongolia). Usually the main area of research in these centers are determined by the role of country in the Cold War and its place in international relations, as well as the interest of historians of each country in the creating of own national history.

Nowadays American researchers are mostly focused on the history of the Third World and the Eastern Europe, during the Cold War, the issues of ideology. The American-Soviet relations are the leading area of research in Russian centers. European scholars paid their attention mainly to Europe during the Cold War and the history of the Third world. In the countries of the post-Soviet space, the main attention is focused on inter-Soviet issues.

In recent years, scientists show a particular interest concerning the image of the "Other" in American-Soviet relations. This causes the increased popularity of the imagology studies, which focuses on the study of the image of the "Other", the "Alien". This direction of research was formed within the framework of Comparative Literature, and then – in the 1990s began to be used in other sciences, in history is well. The imagology of international relations is focused on the study of transnational images, stereotypes of perceptions and comparison of "Own" and "Alien".

Of particular note is the last phase of the Cold War. The first half of the 1980s was marked by the escalation of American-Soviet conflict, when the world was on the brink of nuclear catastrophe. In the second half of the 1980s, this global confrontation decreased and Cold War finished. These changes in American and Soviet foreign policy were reflected in the ideology of both superpowers. As a result, stereotypes in the public consciousness towards the opposite side began to break.

The various aspects of the Cold War were studied by J.L. Gaddis, M.P. Leffler, S.J. Walker, O.A. Vestad, F. Holliday, A. Filitov, A. Fateev, A. Utkin and others. M. Kramer pointed on the key role of ideology in this global confrontation. In the Russian historiography there are few publications dedicated to issues American-Soviet confrontation and the “Enemy image” in particular. For example, we can name such researches, who examined certain area: O. Fedorov, O. Kolesnikova, O. Ryabov (the study of cinematography), O. Sitnikova, A. Byelokonyeva (newspapers), O. Tretyachenko (literature). In Ukraine the issues of the Cold War and American and Soviet foreign policy are explored by A. Tumashov, A. Rudiuk, D. Krysenko, but there are no imagological studies in this field yet. Generally, the great majority of researches of the “Enemy image” in the USA and the USSR concern mostly the initial phase of the Cold War.

This article is an attempted to explore of the “Enemy image” in the United States and the Soviet Union in 1979-1991.

The development of American-Soviet relations during the last stage of the Cold War (1979-1991) makes it possible to divide it into two periods, when the image of the opposite country was different. In 1979 the intervention of Soviet troops in Afghanistan caused the new wave of aggravation of the American-Soviet confrontation. In 1985, when M. Gorbachev came into power, the great changes in American-Soviet relations occurred and finally the Cold War ended.

The image of the opposite superpower as “the main external enemy” during the Cold War was the most important part of the ideological policy both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

The basic means of forming the “Enemy image”

Before we examine the evolution of the “Enemy image” in the United States and the Soviet Union in 1979-1991, let’s focus on the basic means of forming the “Enemy image” that was used by both superpowers during the entire Cold War, among which we can name such as the media, the education system, the cinema, cartoons and more.

The newspapers were one of the most popular means of formation of the

“Enemy image” during the Cold War, and occupied a special place in the ideological confrontation, because they were powerful resource of the official information. In addition, the press was widespread and easily accessible mean of obtaining information. On the pages of both American and Soviet press stereotypes were formed with the help of text and visual images (cartoons, photos).

In the press, strong negative characteristics were often used towards the opposite superpower in order to form a hostile attitude of it. In the American newspapers and magazines there were used such expressions against the USSR such as “the path to despotism”, “totalitarianism”, “aggressive policy”. Similarly in the Soviet press the USA were depicted as “lighteners of new war”. The image of the opponent country was formed on the background of constant reminders about the military threat and the expansion of opposing superpower’s influence on other countries.

Very important tool of visualization of the “Enemy image” through the press were cartoons. Visual propaganda had a very strong potential impact on the society through its focus on human emotions and feelings. Among the most frequently used elements for describing the opposite side both in the American and Soviet cartoons were official and unofficial national symbols (in the USSR – mark “US”, symbolic person “Uncle Sam”, stars and stripes, in the USA – the hammer and sickle, the Kremlin). There were also the identification of the enemy country with the certain animal (the USSR in American cartoons was depicted as a Bear, and the USA in the Soviet – as an Eagle).

The next extremely important mean of forming of the “Enemy image” was the education system, which was very influential in this sphere. A special role was played by the school and high school history textbooks. There were present many accents on the aggressive, expansionist nature of the opposite country’s foreign policy, the issues about the increase of military funding, undemocratic political and social structure in the other side, the criticism of the economic system.

The cinematography also had important influence on shaping mass stereotypes during the Cold War. Films were characterized by vivid emotional coloring, the impact on the subconscious of the person. Films directed their viewers to self-identification with the characters of the movies. They were encouraging to feel sympathy to positive heroes – usually representatives of their own country, and hostility to negative heroes – always the representatives of the opposite side. Among the main problems, which were highlighted in the movies during the Cold War, we have to mention the espionage, preparation of a secret nuclear attack, suppression of the people in the opposing superpower with undemocratic regime, inciting regional military conflicts and so on.

However, the most influential mean of the forming of the “Enemy image” during the Cold War was the official rhetoric. It reflects the official position of the government on various issues of the international situation and internal political life. During the global confrontation of the United States and the Soviet Union it was one of the main sources of distribution of the opposite superpower’s image as the main external enemy. Official rhetoric most vividly reflected the “Enemy image” and allowed to trace its specificity during a particular stage of bipolar confrontation, covered facts about military sphere, human rights, and political, economic, cultural and other issues.

The “Enemy image” in the official rhetoric in 1979-1985

The main field of confrontation between the superpowers in the 1979-1985 was the military sphere. The aggravation of confrontation between the USA and USSR was manifested in rampant arms race and involvement of both superpowers in regional conflicts. Superpowers needed to position itself as a defender of the national interests and values in order to ensure public support for its foreign military policy.

The official rhetoric of both superpowers was characterized by the presence of accusations of the other side in aggression, expansionism and attempts to establish hegemony in the whole world. For example, in Soviet leaders’ speeches, concerning the USA, there were often used such ideological clichés as “aggressive intrigues of imperialism”¹, “pushing of world for war”², “course on undermining détente”³, “ideology and politics of hegemony”⁴, “illusion of power advantages”⁵, “aggressive, reckless policies”⁶. In the American official rhetoric there were also used the ideological stamps for similar characteristics of the Soviet Union, among which it is worth noting: “the main

¹ Юрий Андропов, *Избранные речи и статьи* [Favorite speeches and articles], Москва, Политиздат, 1984, p. 215.

² *Ibid.*, p. 200.

³ *Материалы XXVI съезда Коммунистической партии Советского Союза* [The materials of the XXVI Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], 23 февраля-3 марта 1981 года, Стенографический отчет, Москва, Политиздат, 1981, Т.1, p. 20.

⁴ *Материалы XXVII съезда Коммунистической партии Советского Союза* [The materials of the XXVII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], Москва, Политиздат, 1986, с. 4

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

source of aggression in the world”⁷, “Soviet adventurism”⁸, “imperialist expansionism of totalitarianism”⁹, “imperial adventures”¹⁰ etc.

The active involvement of the opposing superpower in regional conflicts was also emphasized in official American and Soviet speeches. Soviet leaders accused the United States in conducting the colonial policy toward the countries of the Third World. In the American official rhetoric, the main emphasis was made on establishment of Soviet military bases, the supply of arms, financial aid, sending of military advisers to the Third World countries. The accusation of the unilateral arms race, led by the opposite side, was an important component of the “Enemy image” too. This was also used by both authorities to rise a question of the necessity to improve the level of own self-defense and to develop new weapons for the defense and protection of the state interest. We also have to mention that it was mutual for both superpowers to proclaim their own peace initiative.

The specific feature of the American rhetoric in this area was an appeal to such topic as espionage, aimed primarily on stealing of secret Western scientific and high technology by the Soviet Union. This can be explained by the fact that in 1949 by the initiative of the USA the Western countries created a Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls, known as CoCom – an international organization. Primarily there were 17 member-states, but soon their member increased and CoCom existed till 1994¹¹. The purpose of this organization was to prevent selling strategic goods and technology to the Soviet Union.

The sphere of human rights and their violation was another important area in which the image of the opponent country was present. It should be mentioned that there was put a different content to the explanation of the human rights in the USA and the USSR.

⁷ Ronald Reagan, *Radio Address to the Nation on the Bonn Economic Summit*, May 4, 1985 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=38587> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

⁸ Idem, *Radio Address to the Nation on National Security and Administration Goals*, March 14, 1987 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=33972> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

⁹ Idem, *Radio Address to the Nation on Soviet-United States Relations*, August 29, 1987 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=34747> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls and the Wassenaar Arrangement* in “Encyclopedia of Business”, 2nd ed., in <http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/encyclopedia/> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

In Soviet rhetoric the emphasis on the human rights violations in the United States was primarily in the sphere of social rights. This was due to the fact that the main principle of the existence of Soviet society was collectivism. For example, American trade unions were characterized in the USSR as those, which were “exposed to persecution and economic blackmail, adoption of anti-labor laws”. The Soviet leaders used such phrases as “army of unemployed”, “millions of people had thrown out of the gate factories”, “millions of people are unemployed” and so on to underscore the plight of American citizens. It was constantly reminded about the deepening of the social stratification in the United States.

In the speeches of American presidents, in turn, the attention was focused on violations of personal and political rights in the USSR. The reason was the perception of freedom as a priority value on the state level in general and for each individual in particular, because the main feature of American society was individualism. The American President R. Reagan constantly emphasized in his speeches that the human rights violations in the Soviet Union – was one of the four key issues that must be addressed for in conducting any negotiations with the Soviet Union. Soviet policy towards human rights was characterized as “communism’s unrelenting assault on human freedom”¹². It was noted that in the Soviet Union were persecuted and sent to prison “those who speak in opposition to official policy, who seek to worship according to their religious beliefs, or who represent diverse ethnic minorities and nationalities”¹³. Besides, the USSR was accused in increasing of anti-Semitism, the ban of travel abroad of those who wished to obtain religious freedom and so on.

One of the main accusations of opposite country was the lack of the democracy development. However, it should be noted that the official rhetoric of the USSR paid less interest to this issue. The Soviet leaders interpreted democracy as equality among equals and emphasized that in the United States the idea of the “right of the strong to fight for survival” was cultivated and this led to the spread of the “the amorality, hatred to all of the democratic manifestations”¹⁴. In the American official rhetoric an interest to the coverage of

¹² Ronald Reagan, *Radio Address to the Nation on Armed Forces Day and Defense Spending*, May 18, 1985 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=42346> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

¹³ *Republican Party Platform of 1980*, July 15, in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25844> (Accessed in 10. 11. 2014).

¹⁴ Материалы XXVII съезда Коммунистической партии Советского Союза [The materials of the XXVII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], Москва, Политиздат, 1986, с. 14.

the Soviet deficiencies in the political sphere was especially great. An important component of public speaking of American leaders was a constant reminder of the democratic foundations of the political system of their own state, based on liberalism, freedom, and human life priority over the public interest, individualism. In contrast R. Reagan emphasized totalitarian, despotic nature of the Soviet state system, where the main features of the functioning of the state was censorship, repression, the advantage of state interests over the interests of an individual, devaluation of human life.

In addition to the above-mentioned spheres that were common to the official rhetoric of both superpowers, in the speeches of the Soviet leaders was often illuminated the information about the “main enemy” in socio-economic and cultural contexts. The representatives of Soviet authorities in their speeches systematically reminded about the inflation in the American economy, an increase in the number of unemployed. As for American culture, M. Gorbachev in his report at the XXVII Congress of the CPSU noted its “bourgeois expansion”, “vandalism”, impoverishment under the onslaught of “unbridled mercenarines and the cult of violence, preaching racism, propaganda lowland instincts, customs of underworld and the “bottom” of society”¹⁵.

It should be mentioned that in official rhetoric both leaders of the USA and the USSR often used the same terminology, but interpreted it differently. So, the main stylistic method, which was used – it was antithesis a comparison of opposing images and values. Antitheses illustrated the different meanings that fit to the concept of “democracy”, “freedom” in both superpowers.

In Soviet official political discourse there were used such antitheses as: “democracy” – “imperialism”, “colonialism”; “freedom” – “the exploitation of the workers”; “free state which helps its allies” – “the state of “imperial ambitions, which pursues a policy of the plunder of developing countries”¹⁶; “peace proposals to reduce the number of weapons” – “the United States are unwilling to enter into agreements and they increase the number of weapons”.

In American official rhetoric as the main antitheses we can find the following: “democracy” – “communism”, “totalitarianism”; “freedom” – “censorship”, “tyranny”, “dictatorship”, “repression”; “free state which helps its allies” –

¹⁵ *Материалы XXVII съезда Коммунистической партии Советского Союза* [The materials of the XXVII Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], Москва, Политиздат, 1986, p. 19

¹⁶ *Заявление Генерального секретаря ЦК КПСС М.С. Горбачева по советскому телевидению* [Statement by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Gorbachev on Soviet television], 18 августа 1986 года, Москва, Политиздат, 1986, с. 9.

“the empire that spreads its influence and power, enslaves other nations”; “compliance with contracts and reducing the number of weapons” – “the Soviet Union violates, never adheres agreements, increases the number of weapons”.

So, in 1979-1985, until M. Gorbachev came into power, the main means of depicting of the opposite side as the main enemy didn't change.

The changes of the opposite superpower's image during 1985-1991

The second period began in 1985 and lasted until 1991, when with the collapse of the Soviet Union took place the end of the Cold War. This stage was marked by gradual debugging of the American-Soviet relations, which led to the phasing out of the traditional characteristics of the opposite country as the main external enemy.

The research of the official rhetoric shows that the real changes in the image of the opposing state's image occurred much later. In this regard, in the second period (1985-1991) it seems appropriate the allocation of two main stages in the official rhetoric superpowers, during which the opposing side's image differed considerably.

The first phase covered the 1985-1987. During these years, the first evidence of the changes in the official rhetoric of the USA and the USSR were the calls of both superpowers' leaders to establish a dialogue in order to preserve peace.

In the speeches of leaders, it was primarily emphasized the need for dialogue about the issues in the military sphere – namely, the reduction of nuclear weapons and prevention of the nuclear disaster. It should be noted that the understanding of the necessity to stop the arms race and the inability of any party to win a nuclear war didn't cause any serious changes in the overall negative image of the opposite superpower. M. Gorbachev in his public speeches continued to use the traditional expressions in relation to the USA as “imperial ambitions of the United States”, “American militarism – the first lines of military threat”, “American imperialism”, “American ruling circles seek social revenge”, “discriminatory policy of Washington” in the trade and economic relations, “reactionary, aggressive US circles”. In R. Reagan's speeches of that time it can be also found traditionally negative characteristics of the Soviet Union: “Communist dictatorship”, “Soviet adventurism”, “communism – is a prison”, “imperialist expansionism totalitarianism”, “imperial adventure”, “aggressive strategy”.

The more noticeable changes in the image of another superpower started in 1988. So, we can consider this as the beginning of the second stage. The period 1988-1991 was characterized by the gradual abandonment of the traditional

lighting of the opposite side as the main enemy. From now on the other superpower was positioned as a potential partner not only in the military, but also in all other spheres of activity.

The turn emerged after the Washington summit (December 8, 1987), the result of which was the signing of INF treaty. As the evidence of this there were both leaders' statements which were announced within a few days after the talks. On December 10, 1987, during the communication with the business community in Washington the Soviet leader noted that there were new conditions in which the space for cooperation was opened not only in reducing nuclear weapons, but also in economic, scientific, environmental spheres etc.¹⁷. On December 12, 1987 the American President in his weekly radio address to the nation while talking the results of the negotiations and relations with the USSR described them as the beginning of a "long road for common journey"¹⁸.

The specific changes in the coverage of the opposite country in public speeches and statements by leaders of the USA and the USSR started from the middle of 1988. Henceforth the key words in the American and Soviet official rhetoric in respect of other superpower were "hope" and "trust". It was an important indicator of changes in relations between the superpowers, because the distrust of the other side was one of the key causes of the arms race and gain of confrontation.

During the 1988-1991 R. Reagan and his successor as American President – George H.W. Bush in their public speeches repeatedly noted "the birth of hope" for a brighter future and the establishing of trust with respect to the USSR: "Seeds of freedom and greater trust were sown"¹⁹, "there is the hope of an era in which the terrible nightmares of the postwar era, totalitarianism and nuclear terror, may diminish significantly and – please God – someday fade away"²⁰, "the

¹⁷ *Хроника внешнеполитических событий в СССР 1987 г.* [The chronicle of events in the foreign policy of the USSR in 1987] in http://www.gorby.ru/archival/expocenter/vneshpolitika/show_29324/ (Accessed in 14.03.2015).

¹⁸ Ronald Reagan, *Radio Address to the Nation Following the Soviet-United States Summit Meeting*, December 12, 1987 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=33816> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

¹⁹ Idem, *Radio Address to the Nation on the Soviet-United States Summit Meeting in Moscow and the Toronto Economic Summit*, June 4, 1988 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=35911> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

²⁰ Idem, *Radio Address to the Nation on Soviet-United States Relations*, December 3, 1988 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=35227> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

winds of change are bringing hope to people all around the world" etc.²¹.

In his public speeches during the 1988-1991, while describing the international situation and relations between the USSR and the USA, M. Gorbachev said: "The winds of the Cold War changed by the winds of hope"²², "range of trust broaden far beyond the usual ideological spectrum"²³, "new thinking and based on its policy rekindled hope, opened the way for the qualitative changes in human consciousness"²⁴ etc. In the 1988-1991 the usage of the term "Cold War" became the characteristic feature of official statements and speeches of leaders of the USSR and the USA if to compare with previous years.

In addition, in 1988-1991 for the official rhetoric of both countries concerning the bilateral relationship it was inherent the usage of such characteristics as "cooperation" and "partnership". In June 1988, after the Summit with M. Gorbachev in Moscow, R. Reagan noted the importance of "cultural exchanges to expand the American-Soviet cooperation"²⁵. M. Gorbachev at the meeting with representatives of the American intelligentsia in May 1990, revealing changes in American-Soviet relations, said: "We go from confrontation to competition, from rivalry to partnership"²⁶.

In the context of changes in the official rhetoric of the Soviet Union and the United States in 1988-1991 also became visible the change in the depiction of people of other superpower. In May 1988, during a dinner in honor of the arrival of R. Reagan to Moscow, M. Gorbachev said that they have to lose the old antipathy and traditional stereotypes associated with the "Enemy image": "The traits of other people became more visible"²⁷. In June 1988, during the

²¹ George H.W. Bush, *The President's News Conference in Paris*, July 16, 1989 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=17301> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

²² *Хроника внешнеполитический событий в СССР 1988 г.* [The chronicle of events in the foreign policy of the USSR in 1988] in http://www.gorby.ru/archival/expocenter/vneshpolitika/show_29325/ (Accessed in 23. 03. 2015).

²³ Ronald Reagan, *The President's News Conference Following the Soviet-United States Summit Meeting in Moscow*, June 1, 1988 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=35903> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

²⁴ *Материалы XIX Всесоюзной конференции Коммунистической партии Советского Союза* [The materials of XIX Union Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union], 28 июня – 1 июля 1988 г., Москва, Политиздат, 1988, с. 160.

²⁵ Ronald Reagan, *op. cit.*

²⁶ *Хроника внешнеполитический событий в СССР 1990 г.* [The chronicle of events in the foreign policy of the USSR in 1990] in http://www.gorby.ru/archival/expocenter/vneshpolitika/show_29327/ (Accessed in 23. 03. 2015).

²⁷ *Хроника внешнеполитический событий в СССР 1988 г.* [The chronicle of events in

President's News conference on the question "Is there something in Soviet-American relations that you would advise your successor to leave behind? And is there something that you would especially advise to take to the future?" R. Reagan answered: "I'll tell him that he will find the Russian people most warm and hospitable and friendly"²⁸.

However, despite the positive changes in the image of the other superpower, the official rhetoric of the USA and the USSR continued to include a reminder about keeping the fundamental differences between them. The American leaders in their public speeches emphasized the difference between the superpowers. However, in their view it wouldn't make obstacles to the establishment of the intergovernmental cooperation in all possible areas. For example, at the President's News conference in June 1989, George H.W. Bush said: "I think the relationship is going in the right general direction, albeit we have tremendous differences with the Soviet Union, still"²⁹. In turn, in the Soviet leader's statements on the difference between the United States and Soviet Union also had notable changes. In May 1990, M. Gorbachev positioned these differences not as a disadvantage, but as a positive moment, considering them as "the basis for discussions, to share, to reach a higher level of knowledge"³⁰.

Conclusions

Since 1985 a new accents appeared in the official rhetoric of the USA and the USSR in the interpretation of American-Soviet relations. They were reflected in the appearance of calls for the establishment of cooperation in the military sphere, in particular in the reduction of nuclear weapons. However, the actual changes in the "Enemy image" started in 1988 when the other side was already positioned as a potential collaborator in various spheres of life. So, gradually the image of the opposite superpower evolved in 1979-1991 from the "Enemy" to the "Partner".

the foreign policy of the USSR in 1988] in http://www.gorby.ru/archival/expocenter/vneshpolitika/show_29325/ (Accessed in 23. 03. 2015).

²⁸ Ronald Reagan, *The President's News Conference Following the Soviet-United States Summit Meeting in Moscow*, June 1, 1988 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=35903> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

²⁹ George H.W. Bush, *The President's News Conferences*, June 27, 1989 in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=17216> (Accessed in 09. 11. 2014).

³⁰ *Хроника внешнеполитический событий в СССР 1990 г.* [The chronicle of events in the foreign policy of the USSR in 1990] in http://www.gorby.ru/archival/expocenter/vneshpolitika/show_29327/ (Accessed in 23. 03. 2015).