Ethos 32, no. 4 (128) (2019): 273–285
DOI 10.12887/32-2019-4-128-14

Jakub SADOWSKI

PERESTROIKA AND A SHORT HISTORY OF THE CONCEPT OF HOPE IN SOVIET OFFICIAL DISCOURSE

In Gorbachev's texts and speeches, 'hope' appears not only next to 'expectations,' but also next to 'fear.' The three concepts are adjacent to each other in the context of the criticism of the Stalinist 'deformations of socialism' and they contribute to a euphemistic characterization of the social moods of the period. Various tools for building this veiled description are exciting. The 'fear/alarm and hope' seems to be a very strong figure (considering that it is pronounced in front of the elite of the party nomenclature by the Secretary-General, and thus also by a successor of Stalin).

If one counts the last breaths of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev's farewell TV speech on December 25, 1991, will be one of them. In a way, this event could be regarded as a 'breath of hope.' The historical process of the collapse of the Soviet Union was obviously connected to such reactions as uncertainty, enthusiasm or shock. Nevertheless "hope" was one of the themes closing Gorbachev's farewell address. "I am very much concerned as I am leaving this post," said the first and the last president of the USSR. "However, I also have feelings of hope and faith in you, your wisdom and force of spirit. We are heirs of a great civilization and it now depends on all and everyone whether or not this civilization will make a comeback to a new and decent living today."[1] "I am positive that sooner or later, some day our common efforts will bear fruit and our nations will live in a prosperous, democratic society," said Gorbachev, wishing everyone (and these were his last public words as president) "all the best."[2]

It is worth adding an important detail: all those who base their impressions of this text on the above translation by Reuters would not guess that in the original version, while speaking about the end of his mission, Gorbachev uses the category of 'fear' (Russian *trevoga*) rather than merely expressing the state of 'being concerned.' And it was 'fear' that 'hope' was adjacent to in his speech. It is worth noting, though, that both categories were rare in the official discourse of the USSR (and in the discourse of its leaders).

[1] Reuters, "Text of Gorbachev's Farewell Address," *The New York Times*, December 26, 1991, 12.
[2] Ibidem.

In the dictionary of the Russian language edited by Dmitry Ushakov, the noun "hope" is defined as "the desire, the expectation of something joyful, pleasant, combined with confidence in the feasibility of implementation."[3] These terms are followed by quotations from precedent texts, patterns of the normative use of the term. Alexander Pushkin, Alexander Griboyedov, and Anton Chekhov are quoted. Why do I pay attention to the names of the three Russian classics? The answer is: Because the fact that the lexical unit in question was illustrated only by examples from 19th century literature proves that 'hope' was not a word related to the most extreme, totalitarian Soviet public discourse (i.e., a discourse of a deeply polarized and politically mythologized language, having an exclusive sanction to be in operation in a specific area).[4] Ushakov's four-volume dictionary, published between 1935 and 1940, documents the state of the Russian language of the period when it was severely petrified by ideology and political mythology.[5] It is a valuable source which enables us not only to trace the links between lexical and ideological units but also to develop a view of the degree to which the Russian language had become ideologized. For this purpose, one does not need to look for words such as "party" or "revolution." The density of the network of lexical–ideological connections is evidenced above all by the slogans referring to words that seem to be devoid of a political context. Thus, if one of the meanings of the Russian noun *mir* (in this case "peace") is defined as "absence of war, armed struggle in international relations," the quotation that illustrates it comes from Stalin: "We stand for peace and defend the cause of peace."[6] Similar is the case of the noun "method." Its definition goes as follows: "Way, method, or technique of theoretical research or practical implementation of something." The precedent text that illustrates the word 'method' is again from Stalin: "Lenin's method is not only a restoration but also a concretisation and further development of Marx's critical and revolutionary method."[7] The reader is referred to almost all the classics of Marxism–Leninism: to Lenin and Marx by content, and to Stalin by authorship.

Although Khrushchev's Thaw put an end to the domination of totalitarian discourse in the public sphere, totalitarian language—in a form not far

[3] Entry "Nadezhda," in *Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka*, ed. D. N. Ushakov, vol. 2, Gosudarstvennoye izdatelstvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarey, Moskva 1938, 334. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

[4] See Michał G ł o w i ń s k i, "O dyskursie totalitarnym," in Michał Głowiński, *Dzień Ulissesa i inne szkice na tematy niemitologiczne* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2000), 37–41.

[5] Ushakov's dictionary—seen as a document recording the state of the totalitarian language—received an excellent linguocultural analysis by Nataliya Kupina. See Nataliya K u p i n a, *Totalitarnyy yazyk: Slovar' i rechevyye reaktsii* (Yekaterinburg and Perm': Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta, 1995).

[6] Entry "Mir[2]," in *Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka*, 224 [working translation].

[7] Entry "Metod," in: *Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka*, 224 [working translation].

removed from its state as documented by Ushakov—remained a fundamental component of political discourse until the mid-eighties.[8] Neither 'hope' nor 'fear' were desirable categories in this discourse, and they rarely appeared in the statements of the Soviet leaders.

In fact, they were simply unnecessary. In the Lenin era, the shape of official discourse was determined by the phenomenon of utopian consciousness: there was a space in it for the certainty of achieving the ideal 'here and now,' although there were numerous visions of the ideal in question (while in a universe of certainty the category of 'hope' is not useful). In the Stalinist era, there was only one official communist ideal and it was established in the dogmas of the system of state mythology.[9] In the light of the mythological worldview created by the state, the party's 'only right path' towards the ideal was the guarantee that this desired state of social reality would be achieved. 'Hope' again did not fit into that scheme. In official discourse, the Khrushchev era was a return to utopian certainty, best illustrated by the famous enunciation concluding the so-called third program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: The "Party solemnly proclaims: the current generation of the Soviet people will live under communism!"[10]

The situation changed radically during Gorbachev's perestroika. Paradoxically, the appearance of 'hope' was accelerated by the Cold War and the arms race, the demands of which the anachronistic Soviet economy was no longer able to meet. Probably this single factor helped the new Soviet leader discern an ideological perspective unknown to his predecessors: a general human perspective. "Humanity is no longer immortal,"[11] says the title of a chapter of Gorbachev's memoirs, accurately reflecting the rhetoric the Soviet leadership was beginning to consistently articulate. The significance of those words was tragically confirmed by the Chernobyl disaster. Developing his thought, Gorbachev stated, "There is a class interest, a national interest, a group interest, a corporate interest, but there are also human interests. We must recognize that they are a priority, because, in the event of nuclear risk and global environmental crisis, it is first and foremost that the life of mankind is given a priority."[12]

The world first heard such rhetoric from the Soviet leader in December 1988, when he spoke to the United Nations General Assembly. Claims of disar-

---

[8] See K u p i n a, *Totalitarnyy yazyk*..., 53.

[9] See Jakub S a d o w s k i, *Między Pałacem Rad i Pałacem Kultury: Studium kultury totalitarnej* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Libron, 2009), 80–94.

[10] *Programma Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza* (Moskva: Politizdat, 1961), 142 [working translation].

[11] Mikhail G o r b a c h e v, *Nayedine s soboy* (Moskva: Grin strit, 2012), 456 [working translation].

[12] Ibidem, 473 [working translation].

mament as "the main problem of the coming century"[13] were preceded by calls for "de-ideologization of interstate relations,"[14] declarations of "inadequacy of attempts to look down on others,"[15] and statements of the values of "unity in diversity."[16] Such a language was undermining the logic of the Soviet ideology, which remained virtually unchanged since the proclamation (at the 14th Party Congress in 1925) of the concept of 'socialism in one country.'

New openly articulated priorities in international relations became the original content of 'New thinking,' the ideological slogan of Gorbachev's team. "'New thinking' expressed the consciousness that there were values higher than those of the communist system, namely, universal values, such as the salvation and survival of mankind, the prevention of the threat of nuclear war," recalls Boris Makarenko, today professor at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, at that time an activist at the Soviet Peace Committee. "And then, as the country came into motion— continues Makarenko—someone grasped the fact that since communist values and ideals are not absolute in relations with the U.S., they may not be ideal in all other areas."[17]

Indeed, emphasizing the importance of universal values (and without the ambition that universal values should be identified with the communist ones) was a sign of gradual resignation from the use of the hermetic ideological language in the discourse of power. As it soon turned out, it was also a sign of a certain change in the rhetoric of Gorbachev himself, with time departing more and more clearly from Marxist–Leninist inspirations. It also marked the beginning of an unprecedented pluralism of public discourse in the post-war USSR, which by its very presence undermined the logic of the existing one-party and mono-ideological system.

It is worth noting that the nuclear threat was one of the contexts in which the term 'hope' began to appear in the statements and writings of the Soviet leader (and subsequently in the official discourse). Although the term was still consistent with the rhetoric of political and ideological confrontation, the rhetoric, as I have stated above, ceased to convey the message with the conviction of an absolute, undeniable (due to the fact that it was articulated by the Secretary-General of the CPSU) reasoning. For example, in his speech on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, Gorbachev

[13] Mikhail G o r b a c h e v, *Vystupleniye v Organizacii Ob"edinënnykh Naciy. 7 dekabrya 1988 goda*, in Mikhail Gorbachev, *Izbrannyye rechi i stat'i*, vol. 7 (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1990), 199.

[14] Ibidem, 189.

[15] Ibidem, 188.

[16] Ibidem, 189.

[17] Interview with Boris Makarenko, conducted on October 10, 2016, in Moscow, audio recording available in the author's archive, duration: 1 hour 43 min. [working translation].

wondered, "How realistic is our hope that the awareness of the terrible threat the world is facing—and we know that this awareness is making its way even into the higher echelons of the Western ruling elite—will become part of practical policies?"[18] Answering his own question, he expressed a reflection, "The question is whether capitalism can adapt itself to the conditions of a nuclear-weapon-free world, to the conditions of a new and equitable economic order, to the conditions in which the intellectual and moral values of the two world systems will be compared honestly."[19] Therefore, the Soviet leader shifted the responsibility for achieving disarmament to partners representing the capitalist world, but at the same time the statement of the "honest comparison" suggested being open to the values represented by the opponent in the dispute.

In this context, it is worth noting that in the Stalin, Khrushchev and Brezhnev years, the term 'values,' which appeared in official discourse in relation to the capitalist world, should be taken in quotation marks. Within totalitarian language, there is no room for the suggestion that the category of 'value,' positively characterized by the language of communist power and related to such concepts as 'internationalism' or 'equality,' could be used to describe any element of the world considered as hostile.[20] Some of the contexts in which the category of 'hope' appears in Gorbachev's writings also indicate that the previous language of power was being deconstructed. Let us quote a passage from the book *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World* of 1987. "It is probably not easy for a foreign reader to understand many of our difficulties. It is only natural. Each people and each country have a life of their own, their own laws, their hopes and misconceptions, and their ideals."[21] In the above statement, the phrase "foreign reader" should not be surprising: unprecedentedly, the book by the Soviet leader was published almost simultaneously in the USA and in the USSR (moreover, it was the American readers who could read it first!). The expression "our difficulties" was not used randomly: Gorbachev indeed conducted a critical analysis of the state of the economic and social affairs in the USSR, which (in the sense of conveying such message to both foreign and domestic readership) would have been impossible under his predecessors' rule. Likewise, it would have been impossible to say to an external

[18] Mikhail G o r b a c h e v, *October and Perestroika: The Revolution Continues* (Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1987), 63.

[19] Ibidem.

[20] See Victor K l e m p e r e r, *The Language of the Third Reich: LTI—Lingua Tertii Imperii. A Philologist's Notebook*, trans. Martin Brady (London, New Delhi, New York and Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2013), 75–6; Vladimir P a p e r n y y, *Kul'tura Dva* (Moskva: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, 2006), 284; S a d o w s k i, *Między Pałacem Rad...*, 64–6.

[21] Mikhail G o r b a c h e v, *Perestroika. New Thinking for Our Country and the World*, Harper & Row, Cambridge and New York 1987, 131.

audience that the Soviet people might have their "hopes" and "misconceptions," thus implying a situation far removed from the propaganda ideal. With regard to the internal readership, however, the word "ideals," could not be used in reference to the West without being put in quotation marks. Nevertheless, let us note that 'hope' as it is used in the analyzed extract appears as an element of mediation discourse: it is an attribute of both the socialist and the capitalist worlds and, as such, the common denominator for the two worlds. Therefore, 'hope' is instrumental in creating a space for debate.

However, such a conclusion does not come up on every occasion the term 'hope' appears in Gorbachev's speeches or writings. The most common context in which he refers to 'hope' is international relations—and it is precisely in such cases (albeit infrequently) that the category in question is used by Gorbachev in the way typical of the Soviet language of power. Such was, for instance, the case with his criticism of US conduct, where 'hope' appeared as a component of a typical phraseological construction ("the United States is not ready to part with its hope of winning nuclear superiority"[22]). On other occasions, the concept of 'hope' he used might serve as a building block of a sharp, confrontational message, echoing totalitarian discourse, for instance, when he said, "Hopes of using any advantages in technology or advanced equipment so as to gain superiority over our country are futile. To act on the assumption that the Soviet Union is in a 'hopeless position' and that it is necessary just to press it harder to squeeze out everything the US wants is to err profoundly."[23] The rhetoric and structure of the above statements are reminiscent of the Stalinist construction of an ideological conclusion[24], while the phrase "hopeless position" is put in quotation marks, as in standard texts of the totalitarian language. This emphasizes the distance of the sender from the formulation used by him and blocks the possibility of referring it directly to the situation of the Soviet Union (to which—from the viewpoint of political mythology—the attribute of 'hopeless situation' simply does not apply).

We shall now look at other contexts in which the category of 'hope' appears in texts by Mikhail Gorbachev. Due to their high status and the institutional authority of the Secretary-General, the texts in question provide models and primary references for others functioning within the official discourse. In other words, we shall focus on program manifestoes of perestroika in which the crea-

[22] Ibidem, 239.

[23] Ibidem, 220.

[24] Compare: "To drag the party back after it has gone ahead, to bypass the resolution of the 14th party conference, after it has been confirmed by the Central Committee plenary session, means to get lost in contradictions, not to believe in the cause of building socialism, to get out of Lenin's way and to sign off on your own defeat." Iosif V. S t a l i n, "K voprosam leninizma," in Iosif V. Stalin, *Sochineniya: Tom 8, 1926, Yanvar' – noyabr'*, (Moskva: OGIZ, Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1948), 65 [working translation].

tor of the policy of that name explains and justifies its main assumptions. Two such manifestoes have already been mentioned in this article. The first one is the book *Perestroika: New Thinking...*, which has an indisputable significance: in his memoirs, Gorbachev speaks about it in terms of his political creed.[25] Equally crucial for the analysis seems to be the text of the report he delivered at the joint session of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR held on the commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the Revolution. In the USSR, the contents of the speech were published, also in the English language version, in a separate booklet entitled *October and Perestroika: The Revolution Continues*. The third programmatic text proposed here for analysis is Gorbachev's political report delivered at the 19th Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1988), which laid the foundations for the political changes in the Soviet Union in the years to come. The report is entitled *On the Progress in Implementing the Decisions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the Tasks of Deepening Perestroika*.[26]

Interestingly, the noun 'hope' usually appears in the above programmatic texts in the context of the justification of perestroika policy as such. Although the period of the implementation of perestroika turned out to be the beginning of the political, economic, social and cultural transformation, its main objective was the healing of the socialist system. And it was precisely with the ideas of healing socialism that the 'hope' articulated in Gorbachev's texts was connected. The Soviet leader was aware of the existence of the view that the political line he was pursuing led to a departure from Soviet socialism in the form known to date. That is why he admitted: "Does perestroika mean that we are giving up socialism or at least some of its foundations? Some ask this question with hope, others with misgiving."[27] Whoever cherished "hope" and whoever had "misgivings" could hear Gorbachev's firm answer: the goal of perestroika is the "reestablishment of Lenin's conception of socialism."[28] The goal expressed in the quoted statement in fact repeated Khrushchev's theses from the 20th Congress of the CPSU, held in 1956. Gorbachev's "hope" was associated (in any case, in his texts) with a deep belief in the potential of the current system. "Our hope of achieving revolutionary purification and renewal—wrote the author of perestroika— requires tapping the enormous

[25] See G o r b a c h e v, *Nayedine s soboy...*, 493.

[26] See "O khode realizatsii resheniy XXVII s"ezda KPSS i zadachakh po uglubleniyu perestroyki. Doklad General'nogo sekretara TsK KPSS tovarishcha Gorbacheva M. S.," in *XIX Vsesoyuznaya konferentsiya Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza. 28 iyunya – 1 iyulya. Stenograficheskiy otchet. V dvukh tomakh. Tom 1* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1988), 19–92.

[27] G o r b a c h e v, *Perestroika. New Thinking...*, 31–2.

[28] G o r b a c h e v, *October and Perestroika...*, 42.

social potentialities of socialism invigorating the individual, the human factor. As a result of perestroika socialism can and must make full use of its potentialities as a truly humanitarian system serving and elevating man."[29] Gorbachev clearly remained a participant in the Soviet intellectual tradition, which saw socialism as a mechanism activating the possibilities inherent in every human being.[30] The belief that the goal thus set is possible to obtain, marked by a utopian attitude in the case of the reality of early Soviet culture and, as such, different from its Stalinist interpretation embracing a political myth, and still different in the 1980s, nevertheless now seemed merely a figure of official rhetoric. Perhaps it was the reason why articulating such theses was associated with hope rather than certainty.

In Gorbachev's view, the "purification of socialism" was a declaration very clearly inscribed in the context of the pluralization of public discourse, which was triggered by the 'glasnost' policy. It resulted in an unprecedented process of reevaluating the Soviet historical legacy, including, above all, the legacy of Stalinism. This process could be observed in the areas of literature and cinema, literary and film criticism, political and historical journalism. In addition, the administrative, management and economic stagnation of almost two decades of the rule of Brezhnev' became the subject of mass criticism. "Yes, we reject everything that deformed socialism in the 1930s, and everything that led to its stagnation in the 1970s," wrote Gorbachev. "But we want a socialism that would be cleansed from the layers and perversions of the past decades and that would inherit the best of what was born of the creative thought of the founders of our doctrine, of what was accomplished by the work and efforts of the people, reflecting their hopes and expectations."[31] We must not overlook the fact that the rhetorical figure "hopes and expectations" appears here in a context implying a broader picture of the unfulfilled obligations of socialism towards its potential beneficiaries. This conclusion is confirmed by the Soviet leader, who, on another occasion, stressed that "the ideas of perestroika have been prompted not just by pragmatic interests and considerations but also by our troubled conscience."[32] While justifying the need to reconstruct socialism, Gorbachev also invoked the authority of writers, cinematographers, and men of culture, recognized to "boost people's belief in the ideological achievements of socialism and hope for spiritual revival of society."[33] Thus the area of culture could become a "carrier of people's hopes."[34] At the same

[29] Ibidem.
[30] See S a d o w s k i, *Między Pałacem Rad*..., 148–59.
[31] *O khode realizatsii*..., 89 [working translation].
[32] G o r b a c h e v, *Perestroika: New Thinking*..., 25.
[33] Ibidem.
[34] See *O khode realizatsii*..., 39

time, the party leader openly admitted that, in the former Soviet Union, such a cultivation of hope would have caused persecution.[35]

In Gorbachev's texts and speeches, 'hope' appears not only next to 'expectations,' but also next to 'fear'—in the combination we have already observed in the case of his farewell speech. The three concepts are adjacent to each other in the context of the criticism of the Stalinist 'deformations of socialism' and they contribute to a euphemistic characterization of the social moods of the period. Various tools for building this veiled description are exciting. On the one hand, Marxist-Leninist theoretical tools are used for the purpose. Stalinism is defined as "a contradiction between the way our society has become and previous methods of leadership"[36]: the category of contradiction clearly implements the concept of the so-called antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions, which is an element of class conflict theory. On the other hand, however, in describing the years following the end of the war, Gorbachev states: "People were devotedly working, studying, seeking new knowledge, accepting difficulties and shortages, but sensing that alarm[37] and hope were building up in society."[38] The 'fear/alarm and hope' formulation in relation to the reality after 1945 is, of course, a euphemistic one. And at the same time this seems to be a very strong figure (considering that it is pronounced in front of the elite of the party nomenclature by the Secretary-General, and thus also by a successor of Stalin).

The co-existence of 'fear' and 'hope' was noted already in Psalm 56: "In God, I will praise his word, in God I have put my trust; I will not fear what flesh can do unto me" (Ps 56:4).[39] It is hard to imagine, however, that the Bible could be an inspiration for the words of the CPSU Secretary-General. In the reality of the USSR of the 1980s, 'fear and hope' was not a phrase from the Book of Psalms, but from a dissident dictionary. This was due to Andrei Sakharov, the most famous Soviet dissident and a Nobel Peace Prize laureate, whose collection of speeches, appeals and letters was published in New York in 1977 under the title *Trevoga i nadezhda* [Fear and Hope]. The essay opening the collection (and bearing the same title), indeed accusing the USSR, was also an appeal to the political elite of the West. Sakharov proposed they should implement a political line towards the countries of the communist bloc which would assume "disarmament, building international confidence, overcoming the closed nature of the socialist system,

[35] See G o r b a c h e v, *Perestroika: New Thinking...*, 25.

[36] Ibidem, 33.

[37] In the original Russian text, the concept is rendered as, again, *trevoga.*

[38] Ibidem, 33–4.

[39] I use King James Version. In this translation, both terms seem to be the most clearly exposed.

and protecting human rights throughout the world."[40] It should be noted that the list of the above priorities resembles the demands articulated by Gorbachev as Secretary-General, perhaps with the exception of "overcoming the closed nature of the socialist system." However, although the phrase in question was not part of Gorbachev's political dictionary, it might be considered as a postulate he implemented—in his international activity—in practice. And although it is impossible to verify the extent to which the Soviet leader, in his reference to 'fear and hope,' consciously referred to Sakharov or the dissident tradition, it is worth recalling that it was Gorbachev who in 1986 decided to end the seven-year exile of Sakharov in Gorky. Moreover, he personally communicated his decision to the Nobel laureate by calling him on the phone at his apartment. The phone was specially and without notice installed by the Soviet services at Sakharov's home the day before.

One should not think that the cases of Mikhail Gorbachev's use of the term 'hope' quoted in this article would determine the essence of his speeches and writings. 'Hope' does not belong among the words with which the reader is confronted on every page. However, it is worth emphasizing once again that against the background of the Soviet authorities' discourse the last leader of the USSR used it in an extraordinary, courageous manner, testifying to a qualitative change in the way political messages were formulated. It would be difficult to defend the thesis that the way the term 'hope' was used by him had a significant impact on the political or journalist discourse in the years of perestroika. It can be said, however, that the presence of the concept of hope was part of the socio-cultural climate of the epoch[41] for which Gorbachev laid the foundations with his personality and political decisions. Indeed, the second half of the 1980s was a time today's Russians often talk about in terms of hope, and just as often in terms of unfulfilled hope.[42] Hopes were associated with Gorbachev himself—the youngest secretary-general of the CPSU for decades—and with

[40] Andrei S a k h a r o v, "Trevoga i nadezhda," in Andrei Sakharov, *Trevoga i nadezhda: Odin god obshchestvennoy deyatel'nosti Andreya Dmitriyevicha Sakharova* (New York: Khronika Press, 1978, 13 [working translation].

[41] It was this climate that entitled Gorbachev's wife, Raisa, to name her memories *I Hope*. The book, published in Moscow in 1991, was immediately translated into English and then into a number of other languages, including Polish. The hopes formulated in the book concerned the success of the author's husband's mission and the fate of the entire USSR. Commenting on the USSR-wide referendum of March 1991 on the preservation of the USSR, Raisa Gorbachev wrote about her "belief and hope" that the Soviet people would "have the strength, self-control and patriotism and ... the common sense" to overcome all the difficulties and obstacles on the way to a "great, renewed, democratic Soviet Union." Raisa G o r b a c h e v, *I Hope*, trans. David Floyd (London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1991), 201.

[42] I am referring here to conclusions from my research on Russian social memory. See Jakub S a d o w s k i, "Perestroyka: eskiz k portretu epokhi v sotcial'noy pamyati rossiyan," *Slavia Orientalis* 68, no. 1 (2019): 101–21.

the dynamically changing reality under his rule: an explosion of freedom of speech, pluralization of politics, and first steps towards the marketisation of the economy. The shock of the end of perestroika and the transformation in the Yeltsin era were all the more painful. "Under Yeltsin, it became clear that the old life was over, under Gorbachev nobody understood it yet."[43] Some remember "hopes gradually turning into rage," others "disappointed hopes" and a lie inscribed in those years. Nevertheless, reminiscences of perestroika as a "time of hope," a time of pluralism and freedom of speech, are a bright feature of the historical memory of the contemporary Russian intelligentsia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Głowiński, Michał. "O dyskursie totalitarnym." In Głowiński, *"Dzień Ulissesa" i inne szkice na tematy niemitologiczne*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie, 2000.

Gorbachev, Mikhail. *Nayedine s soboy*. Moskva: Grin strit, 2012.

———. *October and Perestroika: The Revolution Continues*. Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1987.

———. *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World*. Cambridge and New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

———. "Vystupleniye v Organizacii Ob"edinënnykh Naciy: 7 dekabrya 1988 goda." In Gorbachev, *Izbrannyye rechi i stat'i.* Volume 7. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1990.

Gorbachev, Raisa. *I Hope*. Translated by David Floyd. London: HarperCollins Publishers, 1991.

Klemperer, Victor. *The Language of the Third Reich. LTI—Lingua Tertii Imperii: A Philologist's Notebook*. Translated by Martin Brady. London, New Delhi, New York and Sydney: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Kupina, Nataliya. *Totalitarnyy yazyk: Slovar' i rechevyye reaktsii*. Yekaterinburg and Perm': Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta, 1995.

"O khode realizatsii resheniy XXVII s"ezda KPSS i zadachakh po uglubleniyu perestroyki. Doklad General'nogo sekretara TsK KPSS tovarishcha Gorbacheva M. S." In *XIX Vsesoyuznaya konferentsiya Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza. 28 iyunya – 1 iyulya: Stenograficheskiy otchet. V dvukh tomakh.* Vol. 1. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1988.

Papernyy, Vladimir. *Kul'tura Dva*. Moskva: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, 2006.

Programma Kommunisticheskoy partii Sovetskogo Soyuza. Moskva: Politizdat, 1961.

Reuters. "Text of Gorbachev's Farewell Address." *The New York Times*, December 26, 1991: 12

[43] Interview with D. V., age 48, a resident of Moscow, conducted in Moscow on October 10, 2016, audio recording available in the author's archive, duration: 1 hour 63 min.

Sadowski, Jakub. *Między Pałacem Rad i Pałacem Kultury: Studium kultury totalitarnej*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Libron, 2009.

———. "Perestroyka: eskiz k portretu epokhi v sotcial'noy pamyati rossiyan." *Slavia Orientalis* 68, no. 1 (2019): 101–21.

Sakharov, Andrei. "Trevoga i nadezhda." In Sakharov, *Trevoga i nadezhda: Odin god obshchestvennoy deyatel'nosti Andreya Dmitriyevicha Sakharova*. New York: Khronika Press, 1978.

Stalin, Iosif V. "K voprosam leninizma." In Stalin, *Sochineniya: Tom 8, 1926. Yanvar' – noyabr'*. Moskva: OGIZ, Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1948.

Ushakov, Dmitriy N., ed. *Tolkovyy slovar' russkogo yazyka*. Vol. 2. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoye izdatelstvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarey, 1938.

ABSTRACT /ABSTRAKT

Jakub SADOWSKI, Perestroika and a Short History of the Concept of Hope in Soviet Official Discourse

DOI 10.12887/32-2019-4-128-14

The article analyses contexts in which the category of hope appears in the texts of Mikhail Gorbachev's speeches and writings. His main programmatic texts and political manifestoes, in which the creator of the perestroika policy explained and justified its main assumptions, have been taken into account. Although "hope" does not belong among words with which Gorbachev's reader is confronted on every page his writings, considered against the background of the Soviet authorities' discourse, the last leader of the USSR uses this term in an extraordinary, courageous manner, testifying to a qualitative change in the way of the formulation of political messages in the Soviet Union.

Keywords: Mikhail Gorbachev, perestroika, Soviet Union, language

Contact: Institute of Eastern Slavonic Studies, Faculty of Philology, Jagiellonian University Jagielloński, ul. Romana Ingardena 3, 30-060 Cracow, Poland
E-mail: jakub.sadowski@uj.edu.pl
Phone: +48 12 6632510
http://www.ifw.filg.uj.edu.pl/en_GB/jakub-sadowski

Jakub SADOWSKI, Pierestrojka i krótka historia pojęcia nadziei w oficjalnym dyskursie radzieckim

DOI 10.12887/32-2019-4-128-14

W artykule analizowane są konteksty, w których kategoria nadziei pojawia się w tekstach przemówień i pism Michaiła Gorbaczowa. Uwzględniono główne

teksty programowe i manifesty polityczne ostatniego sekretarza generalnego KPZR – teksty, w których twórca polityki pierestrojki wyjaśnia i uzasadnia jej główne założenia. „Nadzieja" nie należy przy tym do słów, z którymi czytelnik Gorbaczowa styka się na każdej stronie jego pism. Na tle dyskursu władz radzieckich ostatni przywódca ZSRR wykorzystuje jednak ten termin w sposób niezwykły, odważny, świadczący o jakościowej zmianie sposobu formułowania przekazów politycznych.

Słowa kluczowe: Michaił Gorbaczow, pierestrojka, ZSRR, język

Kontakt: Instytut Filologii Wschodniosłowiańskiej, Wydział Filologiczny, Uniwersytet Jagielloński, ul. Romana Ingardena 3, 30-060 Kraków
E-mail: jakub.sadowski@uj.edu.pl
Tel. 12 6632510
http://www.ifw.filg.uj.edu.pl/pl_PL/jakub-sadowski