

УДК: 327.54(73)

ПІБ: Худолій Анатолій Олексійович.

Науковий ступінь, звання: д. політ. н., доц.

Місце роботи: Національний університет “Острозька Академія”.

Стереотипи «холодної війни» та відносини між США та Україною

Худолій А.О. Стереотипи «холодної війни» та відносини між США й Україною.

Мета статті полягає у виявленні та описі стереотипів «холодної війни», які вплинули на розвиток американо-українських відносин. Проаналізовано традиційні уявлення американських політиків періоду «холодної війни». Розглянуто особливості політичної стратегії американського президента Дж. Буша-старшого. Описано вплив політичної риторики президента США на розвиток американо-українських відносин. Виявлено політичні стереотипи американського лідера. Відстежено кореляцію президентських промов з політичними кроками. Врахування елементу риторики у зовнішній політиці Сполучених Штатів поглиблює підхід і розуміння способу існування американізму, який підсилює її здатність бути суперпотугою. У ході дослідження було застосовано методи політологічного аналізу, зокрема контент-аналіз та івент-аналіз. Праксеологічний та системний методи уможливили аналіз процесу міжнародних відносин за певними форматами: США – Україна та США – Росія.

Ключові слова: політика США, «холодна війна», політичні стереотипи, незалежна Україна, зовнішньополітична діяльність президента.

‘Cold War’ Stereotypes and the Relationships between the USA and Ukraine

Khudoliy, A.O. ‘Cold war’ stereotypes and the relationships between the USA and Ukraine.

The purpose of the article is in distinguishing and describing of ‘cold war’ stereotypes that affected the development of American-Ukrainian relationships. Traditional ideas of American political circles during ‘cold war’ period are analyzed. Specifics of political strategy of American President G. Bush senior were reviewed. An affect of American President political rhetoric on the development of American-Ukrainian relations was described. Political stereotypes of American leader were distinguished. Correlation of presidential speeches with political steps was followed. President’s rhetoric as a component in foreign policy of the United States broadens the approach and understanding of Americanism which strengthens America as a superpower. Methods of political science analysis, such as content-analysis and event-analysis were applied in the research. Pragmatic and systemic methods were useful in analyzing the process of international relations according to the following formats: the USA and Ukraine, the USA and Russia.

Key words: policy of the USA, ‘cold war’, political stereotypes, independent Ukraine, presidential foreign policy course.

Стереотипы «холодной войны» и отношения между Соединенными Штатами и Украиной.

Худолий А.А. Стереотипы «холодной войны» и отношения между Соединенными Штатами и Украиной.

Цель статьи состоит в выявлении и описании стереотипов «холодной войны», которые повлияли на развитие американо-украинских отношений. Проанализированы традиционные представления американских политиков периода «холодной войны». Рассмотрены особенности политической стратегии американского президента Дж. Буша-старшего. Описано влияние политической риторики президента США на развитие американо-украинских отношений. Выявлены политические стереотипы американского лидера. Отслежена корреляция президентских речей с политическими шагами. Риторика как элемент внешней политики Соединенных Штатов углубляет подход и понимание способа существования американизма, который усиливает ее способность быть супердержавой.

В ходе исследования были использованы методы политологического анализа, в частности контент-анализ и ивент-анализ. Праксеологический и системный метод дали возможность проанализировать процесс международных отношений за определенными форматами: США – Украина, США – Россия.

Ключевые слова: политика США, «холодная война», политические стереотипы, независимая Украина, внешнеполитическая деятельность президента.

The problem raised in the article. The United States is a key player on the world arena. Studying the role of Washington in the global politics we should shift the attention to the factors that affect foreign policy of American presidents. One of the factors that influences on the interior and exterior politics of the United States is a set of stereotypical views that can be distinguished in the speeches delivered by American leaders.

The topicality of the article is the analysis of the foreign policy course in the Eastern Europe conducted by the 41st president of the USA G.H.W. Bush. We also studied political speeches delivered by the president and related to independent Ukraine.

Review of the studies related to the topic of the article. Numerous studies of American, Russian and Ukrainian scholars reflect different approaches to assessment of relations between the United States and Ukraine. They widely range from military plans of Pentagon to foresee dangers of the former Soviet Union to critical assessment of American-Ukrainian relations in terms of democratic development. The approaches are represented by works of D. Kramer [1], Th. Langston [2], B. Fischer [3], S. Call [4]. Among approaches some are evident ideologically-oriented works of Russian scholars such as S.N. Konopatov [5], V.O. Rukavishnikov [6], A. Utkin [7; 8], I. Panarin [9] who accuse America in its aggressive foreign policy course. Moderate approach is represented by studies of E. Ivanyan [10], I. Kharchenko [11], T. Shakleyina [12], Y. Shcherbak [13] who analyze American policy from historic, pragmatic, leadership points of view.

Despite numerous researches of different aspects related to the political sphere of the United States, the correlation between speeches of American leaders and the foreign policy course of Washington is still out of scholars' attention. Trying to correlate public discourse of American leaders with their foreign policy steps in Eastern Europe we see the task in studying American Ukrainian relations in the 90th of the 20th century.

The purpose of the article is to highlight the development of relations between independent Ukraine and the United States in the light of stereotypes preserved from "cold war" period of time.

The goal of the article presupposes the following tasks:

- To analyze foreign policy course of the USA during presidency of G.H.W. Bush;
- To describe American and Ukrainian relationships from 1990 up to 1991;
- To distinguish political stereotypes that affected the development of the above mentioned relationships;
- To study the speeches delivered by G.H.W. Bush dedicated to independent Ukraine.

People hold stereotypes, generalized beliefs and expectations about social groups and their members. Stereotypes, which may be negative or positive, are the outgrowth of human tendency to categorize and organize the vast amount of information people encounter in their everyday lives. All stereotypes share the common feature of oversimplifying the world: they view individuals not in terms of their individual characteristics, but in terms of their membership in a particular group [14: 532].

The most common stereotypes and forms of prejudice have to do with racial, religious and ethnic categorization. For instance, people from the former Soviet Union were called “cunning”, “mean” and “aggressive” due to the long standing confrontation sparked after the Second World War. Similar effect can be observed in attitude of some Russians and Ukrainians, especially those aged ones who suffered from the pressing Soviet ideology that imposed the image of ENEMY on the minds of people in the former USSR.

Although usually backed by little or no evidence, political stereotypes often have harmful consequences. Stereotypes, whether positive or negative, are inherently harmful for three reasons:

1. They neutralize our ability to treat each member of a group as an individual.
2. They lead to narrow expectations for behavior. It means that if Americans have stereotypes about citizens of the former Soviet Union, they expect them to behave in certain way. For example, for a long period of time American propaganda treated Soviets as aggressive, rude and unreliable. Logically seeing people from the former USSR Americans would treat them accordingly. Thus, stereotypes can be a limiting force for people while contacting other people.
3. They lead to faulty attributions. The theory is based on the idea that humans try to explain why things happen this or that way, that is, attribute them to some cause. One of the things people are mostly fond of doing is explaining behavior, both others and their own. According to attribution theory, people tend to attribute all behavior to some cause [Lahey, 15: 624].

Analysis of ‘anti-Sovietism’ and ‘anti-Americanism’ go back to the times of Cold War confrontation. Social and political attitudes towards another state, nationality and society, towards a global political actor are invariably complex, shaped by historical context and the prevailing constellation of political forces. Even at the height of the Cold War when leaders in the United States and the Soviet Union were predisposed to view each other through diametrically opposed ideological lenses, one can find nuances and shifting boundaries in the definition of what the “other” really was like.

Admittedly, the label ‘anti-Americanism’ and ‘anti-Sovietism’ can function as quick shorthand to encapsulate a cluster of criticism about what

the United States and the Soviet Union stand for. Moreover, total ‘anti-anything implies phobia: an inability to tolerate, understand or accept. Outright condemnation and rejection follow.

The origin of above mentioned terms go back to the Second World War. By 1947, the post-war world was sharply bipolar. Leaders in the United States and the Soviet Union both saw themselves as heads of peaceful and morally upright systems threatened by the aggressive intentions of the other one. International tension, hostility and mistrust prevailed from 1947 up until Stalin’s death in 1953 [16:112]. But periods after 1953 were not less dramatic for the relationships of two countries.

In those years leaders and citizens of the USA were potentially anti-Soviet. Soviets were behaving in ways American administrations found unpalatable for American security. So, black context of fear, accusation and apparent threats that characterized the Cold War stimulated development of new anti-Soviet phobias and stereotypes. The fears and ideological hatred led to the formation of the image of ENEMY in the minds of American people.

The image of ENEMY is a complex one. The enemy can be seen as: 1) a stranger; 2) an aggressor; 3) faceless; 4) enemy of God. War is seen as applied theology; 5) the barbarian; 6) a greedy creature; 7) a criminal; 8) a beast; 9) death; It is perceived as the ultimate threat; 10) the worthy opponent [17: 180].

Castigating another group of people as enemy indicates that ‘they’ are unlike us. Calling Soviets ‘enemies’ during the period of Cold War meant that Americans needed no sympathy and as a result no guilt destroying them. In all American propaganda, the face of enemy is designed to provide a

focus for hatred. The Soviets were different from Americans. They were aliens. They were outsiders. They were not humans.

Enemy making and warfare are social creations rather than biological ones. Unfortunately, nations create a sense of social solidarity and membership in part by systematically creating enemies. The corporate identity of most peoples depends on dividing the world into a basic antagonism [17: 17]: ‘Us versus Them’, ‘Insiders versus Outsiders’, ‘The tribe/nation versus the Enemy’.

The hostile imagination begins with a simple but crippling assumption: what is strange or unknown is dangerous and it means evil. The unknown is untrustworthy. Around the basic antagonism between insiders and strangers the tribal mind forms an entire myth of conflict. The mythic mind, which still governs modern politics, is obsessively dualistic. It splits everything into polar opposites. The basic distinction between insiders and outsiders is parlayed into a paranoid ethic and metaphysic in which reality is seen as a morality play, a conflict between: ‘The tribes/nation versus The enemy’, ‘Good versus Evil’, ‘The sacred versus The profane’ [17: 18].

The primary function of this paranoid metaphysic of Homo Hostilis is to justify the killing of outsiders and to rationalize warfare. Myth, besides telling us who we are, where we came from, and what our destiny is, sanctions the killing of strangers who are considered nonhuman and profane. Myth makes killing or dying in war a sacred act performed in the service of some god or immortal ideal. Thus, the creation of propaganda is as old as the hostile imagination.

Talking about American-Soviet confrontation during the ‘Cold War’, we can conclude that both peoples only saw and acknowledged those negative aspects of the enemy that supported the stereotypes they had

already created. Thus, American television mainly reported bad news about the Russians, and vice versa. Americans remembered only the evidences that confirmed their prejudices.

American presidential tirades against Soviet state control and lack of individual property reflect an unconscious anger at the real loss of individual freedom under corporate capitalism. American propaganda and speeches, delivered by American presidents from H. Truman to G. Bush, the junior is incurably dualistic, a moralistic Manichean:

We (Americans) are innocent – They (Soviet) are guilty

We tell the truth – inform. – They lie – use propaganda.

We only defend ourselves – They are aggressors.

We have a defense department – They have a war department.

Our missiles and weapons are designed to deter – Their weapons are designed for the first strike.

In the case described above Americans are victims, passively-aggressive who are obsessed with power, who have given the enemy, the USSR power of initiation and aggression. The purpose of propaganda whether we are talking about the United States or the Soviet Union is to paralyze thought, to prevent discrimination, and to condition individuals to act as a mass. The art of propaganda is to create a portrait that incarnates the idea of what we wish to destroy so we will react rather than think, and automatically focus our free-floating hostility, indistinct frustrations, and unnamed fears.

Enemy is portrayed as enemy of God. God and country may be quite separable in theory, but in day-to-day politics and religion they are fused. God sanctifies social order, way of life, values and territory.

The stereotypes rooted during ‘cold war period’ are effective within time. They work in the minds of people again and again. We try to answer the question whether the above-mentioned stereotypes affect the relationships between the USA and independent Ukraine.

Analyzing American-Ukrainian relationships we can distinguish few periods. One of them is the Russia-oriented approach which covers the period from 1991 till 1994 [11].

In the 1990th the United States were shocked by the separation of Ukraine and its appeal to independence, so President Bush made steps to support the Soviet leader Michael Gorbachov in his efforts to preserve the Soviet Union that was falling apart.

G.H.W. Bush administration couldn’t decide and take the foreign policy strategy towards Ukraine because there were two approaches: Russia-oriented approach (it mostly considered by liberals and proponents of the idea of a block of countries united around Russia) and realists (predominantly consisted of conservatives and representatives of the school of political realism). Decisive idea in shaping “new Ukrainian foreign policy” was the fact that Ukraine was the third country in the world by the amount of strategic nuclear weapons directed against the West.

After 1990s the situation changed and the official line of Washington was oriented to develop relationships with former Soviet republics. Explaining the policy and perspectives for the course of independence the counselor of the State Department Robert Zelick mentioned: “We do not support the dissolvent of the USSR” [18: 36].

American Congress was more receptive to the efforts of Ukrainians become independent. On the one hand the idea to support ethnic communities was traditionally appealing. On the other hand American

congressmen were active participants of human right protection process that took place in Ukraine in 70-s-80-s. American Congress passed few laws connected with Ukraine and among them: the letter from Senate to President Bush on the 15th of November of 1989 and the Resolution of two Houses about the Memory week dedicated to the victims of Ukrainian famine in 1932-1933.

Among the speeches that reflected foreign policy of the USA towards Ukraine was the one delivered by President Bush in Kyiv in July of 1991. Proclamation of independence and changes in domestic and foreign policy of Ukraine pushed G.H.W. Bush to visit Ukraine in 1991. This step was interpreted as a sign of support in favor of Ukrainian independence. President Bush delivered the speech called later as the «Chicken Kiev Speech». The speech itself was unsuccessful, because it included compliments to M. Gorbachov whose popularity was quite low by that time. While delivering it President Bush called Ukrainians to give up the course of independence and get back to the USSR [13].

Having analyzed Bush’s speech [19], we distinguished two block of notions used by American President. The first group includes notions connected with the former USSR. Below is the table of main notions that represent the Soviet Union.

Table 1.

Perception of the USSR Reflected in the Speech of President G. H.W. Bush
in 1991

American assistance	6
Democracy	9
Isolation	2
Economic reforms	9
Restriction of freedom	3
Supporting Gorbachov	6

Political confrontation in the USSR	2
Soviet people	8
Republics of the USSR	5
Freedom	14
Cooperation	2
The USSR	7
Tyranny	3

Key notions are the notions of Freedom (14 of them), Democracy (9 of them), Economic reforms (9 of them), the USSR (7 of them), Republics of the USSR (5 of them). There were 76 notions connected with the former USSR and it indicates that Bush's administration paid too much attention to the USSR preservation and was interested in its renewal.

The second block (table 2) enhances the notions connected with Ukraine. The table of the notions is given below.

Table 2.

Perception of Ukraine in the Speech of the President G.H.W. Bush
in 1991

American assistance	8
Democracy	6
Chernobyl victims	2
Kyiv	7
People of Ukraine	5
Independence	2
New World Order	1
Support of Ukraine	3
Freedom	12
Cooperation	3
The USA against independence of Ukraine	1
The USA	3
Tyranny	2
Ukraine	8
Ukrainian nationalism	3

There were 66 notions connected with Ukraine. In comparison with the first table there were fewer Ukraine oriented notions. The most numerous

were the notions such as follows: Freedom (12 notions), People of Ukraine (5 notions), Ukraine (8 notions), American assistance (8). But at the same time we came across few pejorative notions such as Ukrainian nationalism (2 notions), the USA against independence of Ukraine (1). The speech itself is rather contradictory.

While speaking in Ukrainian Parliament, President G.H.W. Bush called Ukraine ‘a chain that connects Europe and Asia’. But when he raised the issue about independence of former republics and the USSR, he supported the Soviet Union and its leader M. Gorbachov who was paving way for democracy and economic independence. Unfortunately the ideas expressed in the speech were unacceptable for Ukrainian audience:

- There were compliments to the soviet leader M. Gorbachov;
- President G.H.W. Bush supported the Soviet government with M. Gorbachov at its head;
- There was a call to give up the idea of Ukraine independence. The call sounded as a threat;
- In his speech President Bush called Ukrainians the Soviet people despite the fact that Ukrainians were making efforts to become independent and get rid of the Soviet legacy;
- G. Bush expressed solidarity with the Soviet people, but not with Ukrainian people [19].

This speech delivered in Ukrainian Parliament didn’t make sense from the political point of view.

Political failures of Bush administration in relationships with Ukraine were logical consequences of shortsighted foreign policy of the United States. It was mentioned by Z. Brzezinski: “Everything that is taking place

here (in Ukraine) concerns reshaping of Europe and the greatest risk of this situation is in the consequences because Ukraine, Georgia or Balkan countries can be left apart from Europe and as a result of democratic countries. In political sense Ukraine is going to play the role as Poland did it during 1990-s. Ukraine is the key for understanding of the post soviet countries” [20: 20].

The main problem the White House encountered at that time was the development of relationships with M. Gorbachov. President G. Bush, C. Rice as the counselor of State Department, Brent Scowcroft, James Baker and Collin Powell were in favor of supporting of M. Gorbachov and his idea regarding reforming of the USSR. There were only one idea that scared Bush administration and it was the idea that the USA would deal not with one country but with 15 new independent countries with nuclear arsenals at their disposal. That’s why the main enemy for these American politicians was nationalism and in particular Ukrainian one.

Despite all drawbacks of Bush administration there were some positive moments. We should remember that G. Bush on the 27th of November 1991, on the eve of meeting with representatives of Ukrainian Diaspora, made a decision to recognize independence of Ukraine. The news spread around Ukraine and became a fact of high moral support for Ukrainians [13].

At the meeting with representatives of Ukrainian Diaspora in the White House G.H.W. Bush mentioned that the United States will recognize independence of Ukraine after referendum planned on the 1st of December.

The speech, delivered by G. Bush senior in Ukrainian Parliament, and his desire to support M. Gorbachov indicate the American administration was politically shortsighted.

Besides we come to the conclusion that political activity of G. H.W. Bush is a reflection of cold war stereotypes that are deeply rooted in the minds of American politicians. Even after the dissolvent of the Soviet Union the United States perceived post soviet countries as offspring of their former ideological enemy. The stereotype of enemy subconsciously highlights its typical characteristics such as untrustworthiness, aggression, hatred etc. All these things affected foreign policy of Bush administration during the period of 1991-1994.

Perspective of further study is in the analysis of dynamics of American foreign policy in post-soviet space, i.e. American-Russian and Russian-Ukrainian relationships.

End notes

1. Kramer David. A Key Moment in Ukraine-American Relations, Deputy Assistant Secretary for European and Eurasian Affairs. Lecture on U.S.-Ukrainian Relations, Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute / David Cramer. – Cambridge, Massachusetts, December 7, 2007. – Режим доступу: <http://iipdigital.usembassy.gov/st/english/texttrans/2007/12/20071210164545xjsnommis0.6570856.html#axzz2pnxvffJk>.
2. U.S. Relations with the Soviet Union, National Security Directive 23, Sept. 22, 1989 // Langston Thomas. The Cold War Presidency: a documentary history. – Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2007. – P.499–501 p.
3. NIE 11-3/8, August 1991, Soviet Forces and Capabilities for Strategic Nuclear Conflict Through the Year 2000 / Benjamin B. Fischer (Ed.). At Cold War's End: US Intelligence on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, 1989-1991. Center for the Study of Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency, 1999. – Режим доступу: <http://www.cia.gov/csi/books/19335/art-1.html>
4. Колл С. Відродженій Україні важко розраховувати на повагу світу // Стіві Колл // “Спостерігач”. – № 37–38, серпень 1993. – Режим доступу: <http://www.ucipr.kiev.ua/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=523>

5. Конопатов С.Н. Военно-политическая ситуация в современном мире: Истоки состояние, перспективы / Конопатов С.Н. – Москва: Комкнига, 2005. – 240 с.
6. Рукавишников В.О. Холодная война, холодный мир. Общественное мнение в США и Европе о СССР / России, внешней политике и безопасности Запада / Рукавишников В.О. – М.: Академический проект, 2005. – 864 с.
7. Уткин А.И. Американская стратегия для XXI века / А.И. Уткин. – Москва: Логос, 2000. – 272 с.
8. Уткин А. Американская империя / Анатолий Уткин. – Москва: ЭКСМО «Алгоритм», 2003. – 736 с.
9. Панарин И.Н. Информационная война и геополитика / Панарин И.Н. – М.: Изд-во «Поколение», 2006. – 560 с.
- 10.Иванян Э.А. История США / Иванян Э.А. – М.: Дрофа, 2006. – 571 с.
- 11.Харченко І. Україно-американські відносини (1991-2002), еволюція, характер, основні проблеми / Ігор Харченко. – 2009. – Режим доступу: <http://referat.atlant.ws/?set=referat&mc=39&cm=2868>.
- 12.Шаклеина Т.А. Политика США в меняющемся мире: монография / Шаклеина Т.А.: Под ред. П.Т. Подлесного. – М.: Наука, 2004. – 333 с.
- 13.Щербак Ю. Україна на шахівниці Буша-старшого / Юрій Щербак // День. – № 87. – 21 травня 2004 р. – Режим доступу: <http://www.day.kiev.ua/30460/>.
- 14.Feldman Robert S. Essentials of understanding Psychology / Robert S. Feldman. – N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 2000. – 656 p.
- 15.Lahey B. Benjamin. Psychology. An Introduction / B. Benjamin Lahey. – Madison: Brown and Benchmark, 1998. – 723 p.
- 16.Anti-Americanism. History, Causes, Themes. – Volume 3. – Comparative Perspectives / Edited by Brendon O'Connor. – Oxford / Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood World Publishing, 2007. – 360 p.
- 17.Keen Sam. Faces of the Enemy. Reflections of the Hostile Imagination / Sam Keen. – San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986. – 199 p.
- 18.U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. Subcommittee on European Affairs. Soviet Disunion: The American Response. Hearings. 102 Cong., 2nd session, Feb. 28 and March 6, 1991. — 190 p.
- 19.Промова Дж. Буша у Верховній Раді України 1 серпня 1991 р. – Режим доступу: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Chicken_Kiev_speech.
- 20.Brzezinski Z. Post-Communism Nationalism / Zbigniew Brzezinski // Foreign Affairs.—Vol. 68.—№ 5 (Winter, 1989/ 1990). – P. 10–25.