"GOOD FRIENDS" FOR THE SOVIET UNION:

THE PEOPLES' FRIENDSHIP UNIVERSITY IN SOVIET EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION WITH THE DEVELOPING WORLD, 1960-1980

Riikkamari Johanna Muhonen

A DISSERTATION

in

HISTORY

Presented to the faculties of the Central European University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor in Philosophy

Budapest, Hungary/Vienna, Austria

2022

Supervisors:

Charles Shaw

Alfred Rieber

I hereby declare that this dissertation contains no materials accepted for any other degrees in any other institutions and no materials previously written and/or published by another person unless otherwise noted.

Abstract

The dissertation looks at Moscow-based Peoples' Friendship University as a case of Soviet cooperation with the developing world during the Cold War. Founded in 1960 by the order of Nikita Khrushchev, the university was an important part of the new internationalist Soviet foreign policy of the Thaw era, portraying values such as friendship, cooperation and modernity to audiences in the newly-independent countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. The dissertation analyzes changes taking place in the university's activities in 1960-1980, demonstrating transformation occurring in Soviet educational cooperation and the changing position of the university during these years, as the enthusiasm and active networking with local political organizations of the target countries in the 1960s turned into a more stabilized form of state-level bilateral cooperation between the USSR and countries of the developing world in the 1970s.

The dissertation analyzes the ways in which the Soviet state administration aimed to fulfill both the educational and ideological goals set for the university activities: educating qualified professionals needed in countries of the developing world that would possess pro-Soviet political views and create Soviet-led global networks. The dissertation follows the study path of foreign students at Peoples' Friendship University from the process of selecting new students to graduation and returning home. It analyzes how the Soviet state aimed to influence "the hearts and minds" of foreign students through activities taking place in the classrooms and outside them. Activities organized in the leisure time of students both in Moscow and during holiday times in other parts of the Soviet Union had an important pedagogical meaning for the ideological goals of the education project.

The dissertation also contextualizes Soviet goals set for the education project by analyzing experiences of students, discussing the features of everyday life in the Soviet Union, and forms of student activism that contested the image of Soviet society and socialist modernity produced during classes and excursions. At the same time, it notices the different backgrounds and interests of students arriving to the Soviet Union that significantly affected outcomes of the project. In conclusion, the dissertation sees this specific case of Soviet educational cooperation as a playground of different interests of the Soviet state, state administrations of the target countries, and the students themselves. While analysis of different activities brings forward the Soviet interests concerning desired outcomes of the project, the realized outcomes are more diverse and demonstrate the influence different interests and political orientations of the target countries had throughout the education process, from student selections to alumni careers after graduation.

Key words: Soviet Union, Cold War, Third World, global south, internationalism, transnationalism, education, development aid, Soviet foreign policy, international relations, public diplomacy

Table of Contents

Introduction

> *At the Patrice Lumumba Peoples' Friendship University students truly prepare for war against poverty and ignorance, against pain and illness, against the backwardness to which Asia, Africa and Latin America have been forced through colonialism. The weapons in this war are book and scalpel, microscope and electronic machine, logarithmic ruler and drawing board….[1]*

Peoples' Friendship University in Moscow was the single most important Soviet educational institution promoting cooperation between Soviet Union and the newly independent countries of the developing world in Africa, Asia, and Latin America since its foundation in 1960. The dissertation analyzes this flagship institution of Soviet educational cooperation as a case connected to wider themes of transnational history of the Cold War era. By analyzing activities starting from student selection, following the students' path through lectures and holidays to the graduation day and beyond, the university is conceptualized not only as a space of transnational encounters and education, but also as an institution dedicated to an ambitious task of creating new masses of Soviet-minded world leaders.

Globalizing socialism through education

Welcoming thousands of foreign students to Moscow, providing them university education, and sending them back home to develop their countries was a process deeply connected to the wider context of Soviet global foreign policy during the Cold War era. The Thaw opened the Soviet Union to new influences and brought internationalism back to the center of Soviet state ideology. The new Soviet leadership sought to relax international tensions and open channels through which people, ideas, and goods could circulate. Simultaneously, decolonization process taking place around the global south

---

[1] G. Gurkov, "Dom v nachale puti," *Ogonek* 16/1963.

1

created new independent states that were potential partners for cooperation and territories for spreading the Soviet sphere of influence. Education was a peaceful way of bringing these varying interests together.

Turning socialism into a global system

In the 20th Party Congress of CPSU in 1956 the first secretary of the Party Nikita Khrushchev[2] noted that time had come to turn socialism into a global system and spread it beyond the borders of the Soviet Union. Ideologically, this signified a return to internationalism of the 1920s Leninist socialism, and from the mid-1950s onward, alliances with the developing world became a major interest of the Soviet Union.[3] The process was tightly connected to decolonization that had started after the Second World War, which created competition between the Soviet Union and the United States for new spheres of influence.[4] Since the beginning of the 1950s a whole new set of connections, interactions and trade links rapidly came into being.[5] In other words, the period of idealism in Soviet history coincided with the globalization of the Cold War.[6]

---

[2] Throughout this dissertation, the Library of Congress standard is employed for the transliteration of Russian names and terms.

[3] *XX s''ezd Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza. Stenograficheskii otchet.* T. 1 (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo politicheskoi literatury, 1956), 9-28. Similar tones of voice were present five years later in the 22nd Party Congress, which promoted strong anti-imperialist views and stressed the role of education in creating social change around the developing world. *XXII s''ezd Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza. Stenograficheskii otchet.* T. 3, (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo politicheskoi literatury, 1962), 231, 260-274, 315-316, 320, 322. On Bandung conference and its importance for the Third World movement, see: Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and The Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 97-109; Vijay Prashad, *The Darker nations. A People's History of the Third World* (New York: The New Press, 2008).

[4] Tobias Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin: Interaction and Exchange between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 2.

[5] Constantin Katsakioris, "L'union soviétique et les intellectuels africains: Internationalisme, panafricanisme et négritude pendant les années de décolonisation, 1954-1964," *Cahiers du monde russe* 47, no. 1-2 (2006): 18-19. Constantin Katsakioris, "Burden or Allies?: Third World Students and Internationalist Duty through Soviet Eyes," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 18, no.3 (2017): 539-540..

[6] Abigail Judge Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge: The Peoples' Friendship University and Soviet Education for the Third World," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2

This new openness towards the developing world signified broadening the Soviet concept of revolution, which was no longer tied to the Leninist notion of a communist party. Instead, state-driven industrialization, progressive domestic political agenda, and friendly stance toward the Soviet Union were sufficient markers of progress towards socialism. This did not mean that Soviet activities in the developing world were de-ideologized, but that the Soviet Union was willing to work with a wider spectrum of regimes than before and develop new strategies to strengthen its international influence. In other words, transition to socialism could take many forms and the Soviet Union was actively supporting these different forms of transition.[7] In the eyes of Soviet theorists and policy makers, Soviet history provided the most adequate model to be carried over to the newly independent nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. A fundamentally anti-imperialist "national consciousness" instead of a class struggle was the most important factor for transition to socialism. Thus, African and Asian intellectuals played a major role in strengthening the national conscience of their peoples against Western imperialism, embodied by the United States, and by aligning with the Afro-Asian movement that the Soviet Union hoped to reform and coordinate.[8]

Considering the priorities of Soviet foreign policy, Soviet theorists created the theoretical scheme of "noncapitalist path of development" [nekapitalistitseskii put' razvitiia], which could be implemented in countries where capitalism was still at a very

---

(2013): 254. For literature on the Thaw and the Khrushchev era see: Yuri Aksiutin, *Khrushchevskaia "ottepel'" i obshchestvennie nastroeniia v SSSR v 1953-1964 gg.* (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2010); Stephen Bittner, *The Many Lives of Khrushchev's Thaw. Experience and Memory in Moscow's Arbat*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008); Denis Kozlov, "Writing about the Thaw in Post-Soviet Russia," *Russian Studies in History* 49, No. 4 (2011): 3–17; Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd, *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013); Jeremy Smith, and Melanie Ilic (eds)*, Khrushchev in the Kremlin. Policy and Government in the Soviet Union, 1953–1964* (London: Routledge, 2011). See also chapter 3 of Vladislav Zubok, *Zhivago's Children: The Last Russian Intelligentsia* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2011).
[7] Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge,"242; Westad, *The Global Cold War*, 67.
[8] Katsakioris, "L'union soviétique et les intellectuels africains," 18-19.

early stage. The theory suggested that with the economic, scientific, and technological support of the Soviet bloc, the less developed countries could avoid the capitalist stage of development and proceed immediately to construction of socialism. Socialist modernization could help these countries achieve their ultimate goals of national development, sovereignty, and social justice.[9] Soviet foreign policy towards the developing world combined a strong rhetoric of support for national liberation with the practical aim of installing socialist, or at least friendly, regimes. By the 1960s Soviet ideology had reached a stage where competition for influence in the developing world was an essential part of the existence of socialism.[10]

International higher education epitomized the "battle for hearts and minds" in the developing world, but at the same time it was a part of a wider field of Soviet aid and cooperation that had come to existence due to the new internationalist Soviet foreign policy.[11] By the beginning of 1960s, approximately 250 Soviet-directed aid projects in industry and agriculture had been established globally. The ideological component of Soviet foreign policy went through different channels, from revolutionary parties and military training camps to bilateral friendship treaties.[12] The Soviet Union also notably increased its presence in the developing world through publications, radio broadcasts,

---

[9] Constantin Katsakioris, "Soviet Lessons for Arab Modernization: Soviet Educational Aid towards Arab Countries since 1956," *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no. 1 (2010): 90. Similar kind of international solidarity was also present in the public sphere of the countries of Eastern bloc, as Mark et al. have noted. James Mark, Péter Apor, Radina Vučetić, and Piotr Osęka, "'We Are with You, Vietnam': Transnational Solidarities in Socialist Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia," *Journal of Contemporary History* 50, no. 3 (2015): 439-464.

[10] Westad, *The Global Cold War*, 72.

[11] See: James Mark et. al, *Alternative globalizations: Eastern Europe and the Postcolonial World.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020), 6. During this period the Soviet Union also joined several UN organizations, which created new connections and increased Soviet presence within the international community.

[12] Julie Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow: Race, Politics, and the Cold War," *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 47, no. 1-2 (2006): 39.

and activities of friendship and solidarity organizations.[13] At the same time the Soviet Union was donating millions of US dollars through different UN-controlled development aid projects, Soviet experts and teachers were sent abroad, and several large-scale building projects took place.[14]

The decision to grant educational aid was taken by the CPSU under the Khrushchev leadership between 1957 and 1960, as education was considered a field where the Soviet Union could compete successfully with the West. It was also a peaceful way to build ties with postcolonial countries.[15] The goal of this cooperation was not only to connect with the elites of the developing world, but also to promote new elites from both non-privileged social groups and circles sympathetic to the communist ideology. Soviet educational cooperation was inseparable from the aims of the Soviet foreign policy in the context of East-West rivalry at the time of decolonization, which transformed the scene of international politics. The Soviet Union heavily invested in the developing world to interrupt North-South relations between ex-colonies and metropolises and replace them with East-South relations, which ultimately aimed at linking these regions to the Soviet sphere of influence.[16]

Development of Soviet educational cooperation

The Soviet Union had established international universities to provide anti-colonial education soon after the October revolution. While the role of educational aid provided

---

[13] RGANI f.4 o.16, d.469, 73-75; RGANI f.5, o.30, d.273, 177-182; RGANI f.3, o.14, d.354, 73-77. See also: Simo Mikkonen, "To control the world's information flows: Soviet Cold War broadcasting," in *Airy Curtains in the European Ether: Broadcasting and the Cold War,* ed. Alexander Badenoch, Andreas Fickers and Christian Henrich-Franke (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2013), 241-269.

[14] RGASPI f.M-3, o.2, d.112, 33-41.

[15] Tobias Rupprecht, "Gestrandetes Flaggschiff. Die Moskauer Universität der Völkerfreundschaft," *Osteuropa* no. 1 (2010): 95-96.

[16] Constantin Katsakioris, "Transferts Est-Sud. Échanges éducatifs et formation de cadres africains en Union soviétique pendant les années soixante," *Outre-mers* 94 no. 354-355 (2007): 86-87.

in these institutions during the interwar period was to a certain degree similar to those of Cold War era universities, there were also significant differences concerning the ideological nature of education provided. From its earliest years, the Soviet Union had modeled itself as the leader of the global anti-imperialist struggle.[17] In the Second Congress of the Comintern in 1920, the theoretical foundations of communist policy concerning the colonial areas were established with Lenin demanding all Communist parties to provide support for the revolutionary movements of liberalization among nationalist bourgeoisies of the colonies.[18] This Soviet involvement was partly carried out through the establishment of international institutions of higher education providing military and ideological training for future revolutionaries on Soviet territory.[19]

There were several universities aimed at both domestic minorities and international students in the interwar Soviet Union. The Comintern established the Communist University for Toilers of the East [Kommunisticheskii universitet trudiashchikhsia

---

[17] Maxim Matusevich, "An Exotic Subversive: Africa, Africans and the Soviet Everyday," *Race&Class* 49, no.4 (2008): 59-60. In another article Matusevich has pointed out the Soviet lack of hope concerning the revolution in Africa and limited understanding of the situation in Africa. Maxim Matusevich, "Revisiting the Soviet Moment in Sub-Saharan Africa," *History Compass* 7, no.5 (2009): 1259-1268. This view is somewhat contradictory to what has been argued by Woodford McClellan in his research concerning African students in interwar USSR, see: Woodford McClellan, "Africans and Black Americans in Comintern Schools, 1925-1934," *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26, no.2 (1993): 371-390.

[18] For an overview on the complex discussions and negotiations concerning race and nationalism within the Comintern, see: Oleksa Drachewych and Ian McKay, "Introduction: Left Transnationalism? The Communist International, the National, Colonial, and Racial Questions, and the Strengths and Limitations of the 'Moscow Rules' Paradigm," in *Left Transnationalism: The Communist International and the National, Colonial, and Racial Questions*, ed. Oleksa Drachewych and Ian McKay (Montreal: McGill University Press, 2019), 3-45.

[19] On Soviet universities during the interwar period, see: Michael David-Fox, *Revolution of the Mind: Higher Learning among the Bolsheviks 1918-1929* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997); Michael David-Fox, "Russian Universities Across the 1917 Divide," in *Universities under Dictatorship*, ed. John Connelly (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005), 1-30; Sheila Fitzpatrick, *Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union 1921-1934* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Vera Tolz, "The Formation of the Soviet Academy of Sciences: Bolsheviks and Academicians in the 1920s and 1930s," Michael David-Fox, "The Assaults on the Universities and the Dynamics of Stalin's 'Great Break', 1928-1932," Paul Josephson, "Stalinism and Science: Physics and Philosophical Disputes in the USSR, 1930-1955," all three chapters in Michael David-Fox and György Péteri (eds.), *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe.* (Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000).

vostoka, KUTV] in 1921 to train cadres from the "East." First, this meant students from the Central Asian and Caucasian regions of the Soviet Union, but already by 1922 KUTV had enrolled students also from Iran, Korea, China, Japan, Algeria, and India.[20] Other international schools established included the Lenin International School [Mezhdunarodnaia leninskaia shkola, MLSh], opened in 1926 to educate foreign revolutionaries, the Communist University for National Minorities of the West [Kommunisticheskii universitet natsional'nykh men'shinstv zapada, KUNMZ], established in 1921 for students from minority groups in the USSR, such as Poles, Volga Germans, and Finns, and the Communist University of Chinese Workers [Kommunisticheskii universitet trudiashchikhsia Kitaia, KUTK], established in 1925 to train Chinese revolutionaries.[21] The curriculum in these schools was openly stressing the need to train new militant revolutionaries, with hundreds of hours spent on ideology, practical political work, and military training.[22]

This interest in providing education for foreign revolutionaries was disrupted during the Stalinist period, which was marked by conservatism and isolation. While the ideals of anti-colonialism were not abandoned, they were no long in the focus of Soviet foreign policy interests. The war experiences also deepened Russian nationalism and the period of late Stalinism was marked by intense xenophobia.[23] The work of interwar universities

---

[20] For discussion on the concept of East and the position of KUTV students as both insiders and outsiders of the Soviet society, see: Masha Kirasirova, "The 'East' as a Category of Bolshevik Ideology and Comintern Administration: The Arab Section of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 18, no.1 (2017): 33-34. The methods of educating foreign students were copied and applied from the Soviet state administration's approach to its own minorities. On early Soviet nationalities' policy, see: Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire. Nations and Nationality in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939* (Ithaca & New York: Cornell University Press, 2001); Francine Hirsch, *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005).

[21] Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge," 240-241.

[22] McClellan, "Africans and Black Americans in Comintern Schools, 1925-1934," 375-376.

[23] Maxim Matusevich, "Probing the Limits of Internationalism: African Students Confront Soviet Ritual," *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 27, no.2 (2009): 20. On late Stalinist xenophobia and its influence

that aimed for a world revolution was continued in post-WWII Soviet Union by institutions that were specifically training political and trade union cadres. [24] These included the Komsomol School for political activists founded in 1945, the School of the Central Committee of Soviet Trade Unions founded in 1961, and the Institute of Social Sciences at the Central Committee of the CPSU founded in 1962. These institutions received hundreds of foreign students, many of whom later became activists in trade unions and political organizations in their countries of origin.[25] In other words, in the Cold War period educational institutions aimed specifically to answer the practical needs of international political activists were separated from universities that stressed practical educational goals of training new specialists.

In comparison to the interwar institutions, Cold War era Soviet international education was a process different from the promotion of a world revolution through education of communist militants. Education provided during the Cold War period did not concentrate on struggle and revolution, but on internationalism, anti-colonialism and support for economic progress and national independence. These ideas were incorporated into the concept of friendship that was actively used in the public rhetoric describing the goals of educational cooperation: students were expected to return home

---

on Soviet tourism and travel, see also: Anne E. Gorsuch, *All This is Your World: Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad after Stalin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 28-30.

[24] Models of Soviet higher education were also imported to Eastern Europe after the Second World War and students from these countries were admitted to Soviet universities. On socialist universities during this period, see: Ralph Jessen, "Between Control and Collaboration: The University in East Germany," John Connelly, "Polish Universities and State Socialism, 1944-1968," Jan Havranek, "Czech Universities under Communism," György Péteri, "The Communist Idea of the University: An Essay Inspired by the Hungarian Experience," all four chapters in *Universities under Dictatorship*, ed. by John Connelly (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005); John Connelly, "The Sovietization of Higher Education in the Czech Lands, East Germany, and Poland during the Stalinist Period 1948-1954," Nikolai Krementsov, "Lysenkoism in Europe: Export-Import of the Soviet Model," György Péteri, "Science Between Two Worlds: Foreign 'Models' and Hungary's Academia, 1945-1949," all three articles in Michael David-Fox and György Péteri (eds.), *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe* (Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000).

[25] Katsakioris, "Transferts Est-Sud", 89.

as "good friends" of the Soviet Union. Some of these ideological elements had been present also in the 1920s, as the post-revolutionary Soviet state stressed its "colorblind internationalism" and opposition to racialism and colonialism.[26] While certain elements of the rhetoric of the 1920s were present also in Thaw-era cooperation, the changing political situation had decreased militant tendencies widely present in the earlier cooperation.

Education as public diplomacy during the Cold War

Educational and scientific exchanges often are considered an important part of public diplomacy[27] or soft power.[28] In the field of Cold War studies, most of the research on this theme has concentrated on both US and Soviet attempts to spread their spheres of influence to new territories through cultural and educational exchanges. However, public diplomacy relates to modern states' desire to manage their external image on a

---

[26] Maxim Matusevich, "Journeys of Hope: African Diaspora and the Soviet Society", *African Diaspora* 1, no.1-2 (2008): 57-58.

[27] The terms cultural diplomacy and public diplomacy are often used interchangeably, though some authors have stressed that public diplomacy consist of state-sponsored programs that aim to influence public opinion in other countries, while cultural diplomacy is a subset of this phenomenon. Jessica C.E. Gienow-Hecht, "The Model of Cultural Diplomacy: Power, Distance and the Promise of Civil Society," in *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, ed. Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and M. C. Donfried (New York: Berghahn, 2010): 13-14. On the plurality of these concepts, see: Pia Koivunen and Simo Mikkonen, "Kulttuuridiplomatian näkökulma kylmään sotaan," *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 120, no. 2 (2022): 133-140. On cultural contacts between the Soviet Union and countries of the developing world, see: Rossen Djagalov, *From Internationalism to Postcolonialism: Literature and Cinema between the Second and Third Worlds* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2020); Rossen Djagalov and Masha Salazkina, "Tashkent '68: A Cinematic Contact Zone," *Slavic Review* 75, no. 2 (2016): 279-298; Rossen Djagalov, "The Afro-Asian Writers' Association and Soviet Engagement with Africa," *Black Perspectives* 2 (2017), https://www.aaihs.org/the-afro-asian-writers-association-and-soviet-engagement-with-africa/, accessed 8.7.2021. Constantin Katsakioris has also noted the importance of cultural connections between the USSR and Arab and African states in the 1950s as the first step towards educational cooperation that was established in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Constantin Katsakioris, "The Soviet-South Encounter. Tensions in the Friendship with Afro-Asian Partners, 1945-1965," in *Cold War Crossings. International Travel and Exchange across the Soviet Bloc, 1940s-1960s*, ed. Patryk Babiracki and Kenyon Zimmer (Arlington: Texas A&M University Press, 2014), 134-165.

[28] Joseph Nye's definition of soft power concentrates largely on creating attraction among large masses of people to incline them to support wider political goals of the state practicing soft power. However, as this research project concentrates on an attempt to influence a very specific group of people through education, I have preferred to use the term public diplomacy instead of soft power to describe the Soviet education project. Nye, Joseph S., *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004), 5-18.

more general level, and its definitions vary depending on cultural and political factors as well as on the degree of state control. In the Soviet case, tensions between propaganda and diplomacy are especially visible, but even in this case, public diplomacy efforts depend on non-governmental actors who might have their own interests concerning the cooperation. In the case of education, these would be university faculty, Soviet students and even Soviet citizens that the foreign students would meet outside the university. In other words, the transcultural encounters on the grass-root level as well as the aim to influence foreign publics by means that come close to propaganda are both present in the field of Soviet public diplomacy.[29]

Since the late 1950s, the Soviet state started to believe in the effectiveness of public and personal diplomacy. Wide-scale establishment of friendship societies and other activities coordinated by the Union of Soviet Societies for Foreign Cultural Relations [Soiuz sovetskikh obshchestv druzhby i kulturnoi sviazi s zarubezhnymi stranami, SSOD] were a sign of this development. Since the founding of SSOD in 1958, the importance of personal connections was highlighted as a form of public activism in international affairs. Ordinary people, personal connections, word-of-mouth and first impressions became important diplomatic tools.[30] This belief in personal diplomacy is also visible in educational cooperation, where the students experienced life and studies in the Soviet Union first-hand and could later share their positive impressions after

---

[29] Jessica C.E. Gienow-Hecht, "What Are We Searching for? Culture, Diplomacy, Agent, and the State," in *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, ed. Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and M. C. Donfried (New York: Berghahn, 2010), 9-10. See also: Nigel Gould-Davies, "The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy," *Diplomatic History* 27 no.2 (2003): 193-214. See also: Jan Melissen, ed. *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International relations* (New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2005); Nicholas J. Cull, "Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (2008): 31–54.

[30] Eleonory Gilburd, "The Revival of Soviet Internationalism in the Mid to Late 1950s," in *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960,* ed. Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 373-374, 389-390.

returning home. However, as the students stayed in the Soviet Union in most cases for 5-7 years, this also created problems for the public diplomacy goals of positively shaping the students' perceptions about life in a socialist state. While other events of public diplomacy, such as the Festival of Youth and Students organized in Moscow in 1957, lasted for a relatively short period of time, turning students into "good friends" of the Soviet Union during their study years was a challenging task due to the deeper and more multisided understanding about realities of everyday life in a socialist society that the students gained during their study years.

Another problem that can be identified in Cold War era Soviet public diplomacy towards the developing world were the hierarchical positions between the education provider and the target countries. Imageries of exoticism were widespread and characteristic to the Soviet gaze especially on Africa, which was the most common example of global anticolonial battle, demonstrating that orientalism as a justification for intervention was not the monopoly of the West. Thus, Soviet public diplomacy efforts could also be seen as a paternalistic mission of guiding peoples and societies of the developing world towards the superior social and cultural model governed by scientific socialism that could get them out of primitivism.[31] However, despite certain similarities with Western Orientalist gaze, the experiences of students from the developing world in countries of the socialist bloc were still distinct, as they lacked

---

[31] Constantin Katsakioris, "L'union soviétique et les intellectuels africains," 26. On the other hand, in their work discussing the case of socialist Hungary James Mark and Péter Apor have noted that images of the Third World not only shaped the understanding about these countries, but also "a new socialist political culture at home —one in which the revolutions in Latin America or freedom struggles in Africa and Southeast Asia played an increasingly important role in enabling socialist citizens to develop new political subjectivities and identities." James Mark and Péter Apor, "Socialism Goes Global: Decolonization and the Making of a New Culture of Internationalism in Socialist Hungary, 1956–1989," *The Journal of Modern History* 87, no. 4 (2015): 856.

connections between former colonial subjects and former master societies.[32] Thus, Soviet education provided a viable alternative to previous international education connections that were largely stemming from the colonial era.

The Cold War era expansion of the socialist world and the global networks it created can be considered a form of globalization, as socialist states were connected both among themselves and with the rest of the world on multiple levels.[33] Foreign students' long stay in the Soviet Union provided a suitable framework for creating new international networks. Concentrating on youth as the prime target of Soviet public diplomacy was a result of both ideological and practical factors. As most activists in the movements for national liberation were approximately 20-25 years of age, youth leaders also held significant positions both in political movements and in state administration.[34] In this context international education programs became a major part of the strategy to influence foreign students and to reproduce or transform foreign dominant groups.[35] This dissertation provides a new view to globalization of socialism through Soviet public diplomacy, more specifically educational aid, by analyzing activities of the most visible institution of Soviet international education during the Cold War era.

Analyzing Peoples' Friendship University as a case of Soviet public diplomacy

Peoples' Friendship University [Universitet Druzhby Narodov, UDN] was founded as a flagship institution of Soviet educational cooperation in 1960. Establishment of the university brought wide publicity to the Soviet project of providing an "anti-imperial"

---

[32] Maxim Matusevich, "Expanding the Boundaries of the Black Atlantic: African Students as Soviet Moderns," *Ab Imperio* no. 2 (2012): 328-329, 342-343. See also: Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

[33] James Mark et. al, *Alternative globalizations*, 1-4.

[34] RGASPI f.M-3, o.2, d.90, 15-16.

[35] Natalia Tsvetkova, "International Education During the Cold War: Soviet Social Transformation and American Social Reproduction," *Comparative Education Review* 52, no. 2 (2008): 199.

option to Western higher education that had until then dominated the field of global higher education. Despite the fact that certain Soviet universities had accepted foreign students from the developing world since the mid-1950s, UDN was the first institution entirely dedicated to students from Asia, Africa and Latin America and thus a visible example of the new Soviet internationalist foreign policy that stressed aid and solidarity with the peoples engaged in anti-imperial battles. According to the Soviet authorities, UDN was a new and innovative institution, "the first internationalist university in the world", serving the needs of new global world. At the same time, it was essentially an instrument of Soviet foreign policy and public diplomacy aimed at the newly independent countries of the developing world.

This dissertation analyzes UDN as a case of Soviet cooperation with the developing world, concentrating on the ways in which ideological and political goals set for the cooperation were present in the education process of foreign students in the USSR in 1960-1980. In other words, the analysis concentrates on how the university planned to undertake the public diplomacy challenge of turning foreign students into "good friends" of the Soviet Union during their 5-7 year stay in Moscow. Forms of activities aimed towards these goals are analyzed starting from the practices of choosing students, followed by study programs filled with both lectures and different leisure time activities, until graduation and returning home. Changes in UDN education program during the period 1960-1980 reflect wider political tendencies in the Soviet society as Thaw-era societal and political activism changed into more stable bilateral cooperation of the 1970s, which also influences the forms of work with the students. Analysis of Soviet goals and practices is complemented with discussion on realities of everyday life at the university and beyond that often questioned or contradicted the contents of ideologically oriented activities. Using both published memoirs and oral history narratives from UDN

alumni, the dissertation complements the narrative of Soviet planning and implementation of activities by discussing the attitudes of students towards the education they received while in the Soviet Union.

The dissertation argues that activities of UDN served both educational and ideological goals, and while these two spheres were interconnected, they were still treated as separate entities. While lectures and reporting on students' performance were mostly working towards educational goals of the education project and demonstrating the high academic level of Soviet education, activities during the leisure time of students were dedicated to fulfillment of ideological goals by creating a positive image of socialist development and "Soviet reality" both in Moscow and elsewhere in the Soviet Union, which would influence the students so that they would return home as "good friends" of the Soviet Union. Both goals were supporting the public diplomacy efforts and the internationalist foreign policy of the Soviet state. Educational goals of the institution connected to the image of Soviet scientific and technological superiority, while the ideological goals stressed the role of socialism and importance of friendly relations with the Soviet Union for creating development. While it was important to fulfill the educational goals set for university activities, to train highly-educated specialists for the developing world, it was equally important that these specialists would return home as "good friends" of the Soviet Union to create new pro-Soviet elites and thus spread the Soviet sphere of influence.

The dissertation complements previous research on the topic that has either treated Soviet international education as part of wider field of international connections and

cooperation, [36] its public representations both domestically and internationally, [37] political interests of the international partners, [38] or the position of foreign students and attempts to influence them concerning questions such as racism in the Soviet society. [39] By focusing on activities of a single institution covering the entire span of the students' stay in the Soviet Union, the dissertation aims to highlight the methods of planning and implementation connected to the students' education process and the role of different Soviet actors involved. This approach connects the dissertation to new scholarship on the Cold War that stresses the importance of interaction, grass-root level activities and spheres such as education as opposed to traditional approaches largely concentrating on international relations and diplomacy between superpowers.

The dissertation operates at several levels but concentrates on one institution as a space and agent of Soviet public diplomacy. The macro level of this study is formed by the context of Soviet foreign policy, which aimed to spread the Soviet sphere of influence into new territories in the developing world. This macro level is represented by actors such as the Soviet Ministry of Higher and Special Education or the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Central Committee of the Komsomol, who guided and controlled the activities taking place at UDN. The intermediate level is the university itself: an institution that aimed to both educate and disseminate Soviet values to the students and, on a smaller scale, also in the public sphere due to its visible position in both Soviet and international media. Micro level, or grass-root level, is the level of individual activity. This means the university faculty, Soviet and foreign students operating within the university.

---

[36] Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin*.
[37] Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge".
[38] Katsakioris, several articles.
[39] Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow".

While this study focuses on the intermediate level, it also incorporates the macro and micro levels into the analysis, since the analysis of the intermediate level is meaningful only when placed into a wider context represented by macro level actors. On the other hand, experiences of the grass-root level help to understand the difficulties and successes experienced at the intermediate level. In addition, they provide a glimpse to the everyday realities at the university.[40] As Pia Koivunen has noted, the importance of examining grass-root level experiences and views is "not only that the analysis brings forth the 'view from below' but it also elaborates different standpoints within the international communist world, which was not as coherent or as uniform as contemporary accounts from both sides often imply".[41] Although UDN was largely a socialist microcosm, it was also a community of different nationalities and cultures. When researching Cold War public diplomacy and the encounters or confrontations it created through subjects like UDN, analysis should cover various actors from designers of transnational projects to the participants themselves.

Historiography

Higher education is part of a wider framework on Soviet public diplomacy in the Cold War era, while the foundation of UDN was a Thaw-era project that connected new internationalism of Soviet foreign policy to decolonization processes taking place around the developing world. The dissertation employs approach of social and cultural history to these events. Soviet educational aid was part of the globalizing Soviet foreign policy, at the same time connecting on the ideological level to an idea of alternative,

---

[40] Michael David-Fox has applied a roughly similar approach in *The Revolution of the Mind*, which explores the realities of early Bolshevik higher education through analysis of "communist theories and visions" and "the contested and messy attempts to implement them within new institutions". David-Fox, *Revolution of the Mind*, 2.

[41] Pia Koivunen, *Performing Peace and Friendship: The World Youth Festival as a Tool of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy, 1947-1957.* (University of Tampere, dissertation, 2013), 16.

socialist, modernity. The goal of Soviet public diplomacy was to make this form of modernity attractive for new foreign audiences around the developing world. At the same time, arrival of foreign students to the USSR was an example of transnational connections between the "second" and the "third" worlds. These different themes connect to a wide field of existing literature.

Since the collapse of the socialist system and the end of East-West rivalry, research on the Cold War period has gone through a significant transformation with the focus shifting towards the role of ideology and culture as explanatory tools in the conflict.[42] An especially relevant field of new Cold War studies is cultural and social history of the period. Works concentrating on the "cultural Cold War" show how scientific and educational exchanges as well as high and popular culture were deployed for goals of promoting socialism and spreading the Soviet sphere of influence.[43] In other words, the earlier emphasis on nation-states and diplomatic relations moved to transnational[44]

---

[42] During the Cold War, research in Western and especially US institutions tended to approach the topic of Soviet public diplomacy and educational cooperation from exclusively propagandist point of view. For examples on such texts, see: Alvin Rubinstein, "Lumumba University: An Assessment," *Problems of Communism* 64, no. 20 (1971): 64-69; Seymour M. Rosen, *The Development of People's Friendship University* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973).

[43] On definition of Cold War cultural and social history, see: Patrick Major & Rana Mitter, "East is East and West is West? Towards a Comparative Socio-Cultural History of the Cold War," in *Across the Blocs: Cold War Cultural and Social History*, Rana Mitter and Patrick Major (eds.) (London: Frank Cass, 2004). For an overview of the historiography on the cultural Cold War, see: Gordon Johnston "Revisiting the Cultural Cold War," *Social History* 35, No. 3 (2010): 290–307. For works concentrating on East-West relations in the field of culture, see: Peter Kuznick and James Gilbert (eds.), *Rethinking Cold War Culture* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001); Yale Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain* (Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003); Annette Vowinckel, Marcus M. Payk, and Thomas Lindenberg (eds.), *Cold War Cultures. Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies* (New York: Berghahn, 2012). For transnational approaches, see: Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker (eds.), *Socialist Sixties: Crossing Borders in the Second* World (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013); Simo Mikkonen, Giles Scott-Smith, Jari Parkkinen (eds.), *Entangled East and West: Cultural Diplomacy and Artistic Interaction During the Cold War* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2018); Simo Mikkonen and Pia Koivunen (eds.), *Beyond the Divide: Entangled Histories of Cold War Europe* (New York: Berghahn, 2015).

[44] On transnationalism, see: Patryk Babiracki, "Interfacing the Soviet Bloc: Recent Literature and New Paradigms," *Ab Imperio* No. 4 (2011): 376–407; Michael David-Fox, "The Implications of Transnationalism," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12, No. 4 (2011): 885-904. Berthold Unfried has criticized employing the concept of "transnationalism" in the context of educational cooperation as despite the entanglements, flows of people, and imaginations of socialist

processes and "small actors" with geographical focus expanding to the developing world. Relations between "the second world" and "the third world" are a constantly growing field of study covering different forms of aid, cooperation and interaction.[45]

world community, "(socialist) nation state remained the uncontested point of reference" and thus prefers to employ the term internationalism that is present also in the rhetoric of the era. Berthold Unfried, "Education as a Paradigm and as a Part of Institutionalized 'International Solidarity' of the German Democratic Republic," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, ed. Ingrid Miethe and Jane Weiss (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020), 85-86.

[45] For an overview, see: Engerman, "Second World's Third World," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12, no.1 (2011): 183-211 and Tobias Rupprecht, "Die Sowjetunion und die Welt im Kalten Krieg: Neue Forschungsperspektiven auf eine vermeintlich hermetisch abgeschlossene Gesellschaft," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 3 (2010): 381–399. Examples of literature on different regions of the developing world during the Cold War include: Robert J. McMahon (ed.), *The Cold War in the Third World* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2012); Artemy M. Kalinovsky and Sergey Radchenko (eds.), *The End of the Cold War and the Third World: New Perspectives on Regional Conflict* (London: Routledge, 2011); Sue Onslow (ed.), *Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation* (London: Routledge, 2009); Tsuyoshi Hasegawa (ed.), *The Cold War in East Asia, 1945–1991* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011); Tuong Vu and Wasana Wongsurawat (eds.), *Dynamics of the Cold War in Asia: Ideology, Identity, and Culture* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); G.M. Joseph and Daniela Spenser, *In from the Cold: Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold* War (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008); Hal Brands, *Latin America's Cold War* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2010). Examples of research on relations between the "second" and the "third" world include: David C. Engerman, "Learning from the East: Soviet Experts and India in the Era of Competitive Coexistence," *Comparative Studies in South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 227-238; David C. Engerman, *The Price of Aid: The Economic Cold War in India* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2018); Philip Muehlenbeck, *Czechoslovakia in Africa, 1945–1968* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2016); Jeremy Friedman, *Shadow Cold War: The Sino-Soviet Competition for the Third World* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015); Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin*; Artemy Kalinovsky and Sergey Radchenko (eds.), *The End of the Cold War and the Third World: New Perspectives on Regional Conflict* (New York: Routledge, 2011); Quinn Slobodan (ed.), *Comrades of Colour: East Germany in the Cold War World* (New York: Berghahn, 2015); Sergey Mazov, *A Distant Front in the Cold War: The USSR in West Africa and the Congo, 1956–1964* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010); Christine Phillou, "Introduction: USSR South: Postcolonial Worlds in the Soviet Imaginary," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 197–200; Steven G. Marks, *How Russia Shaped the Modern World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003); Massimiliano Trentin, "Modernization as State-Building: The Two Germanies in Syria, 1962–1972," *Diplomatic History* 33, no. 3 (2009): 487–505; Ragna Boden, "Cold War Economics: Soviet Aid to Indonesia," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 10, no. 3 (2008): 110–128; Alessandro Iandolo, "The rise and fall of the 'Soviet Model of Development' in West Africa, 1957–64," *Cold War History* 12, no. 4 (2012): 683–704; Zoltán Ginelli, "Hungarian Experts in Nkrumah's Ghana: Decolonisation and Semipheriperial Postcoloniality in Socialist Hungary," *Mezosfera* 5 (2018) http://mezosfera.org/hungarian-experts-in-nkrumahs-ghana/, accessed 6.7.2021; Philip Muehlenbeck and Natalia Telepneva (eds.), *Warsaw Pact Intervention in the Third World: Aid and Influence in the Cold War* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2018); Jan Dvořáček, Linda Piknerová and Jan Zahořík, *A History of Czechoslovak Involvement in Africa: Studies from the Colonial Era through the Soviet Eras* (Lewiston: Mellen Press, 2014); Peter Q. Wright, "Between Market and Solidarity: Development Aid and the Political Economy of International Higher Education in Socialist Yugoslavia," *Nationalities Papers* (2020): 1-21.

As Odd Arne Westad has noted, the ''third world'' is a late twentieth-century neologism, employed for various purposes and in various cultural settings to create some of the most fundamental hegemonic discourses of the era.[46] In this study, the concept of "developing world" is employed instead of "the third world", as this is closer to the Soviet point of view expressed in primary sources. The term mostly found in the primary sources is "less-developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America" [slavorazvitye strany Azii, Afriki i Latinskoi Ameriki]. The second reason for choosing this terminology is hierarchy constructed within the term "third world". In contemporary usage the term positions the West[47] as "the first world" and the socialist bloc as "the second world". Such hierarchical terminologies reduce the variety of exchange processes and neglect global entanglements in history, establishing the East or the "second world" as the defining other of freedom and progress in the West or "the first world".[48]

The applicability of "Cold War" into different types of studies has also been criticized.[49] However, instead of concentrating on conflict, Federico Romero has pointed out that the concept has "broad but distinct focus on ideas, identities, and the contest for cultural

---

[46] Westad, *The Global Cold War*, 2.

[47] The concept of the West itself in the Soviet context referred to both the United States and countries of Western Europe. Alexei Yurchak has analyzed the cultural meanings of the West and especially the Imaginary West that he describes as a space that was both internal and external to the Soviet reality. Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 161. See also: György Péteri ed., *Imagining the West in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 2010.

[48] Ingrid Miethe and Jane Weiss (eds.), "Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South* ed. by Ingrid Miethe and Jane Weiss (Berlin. Peter Lang, 2020), 9-10.

[49] This de-centralizing view on the Cold War and even demands to abandon the concept have been expressed by several researchers, including: Matthew Connelly, "Taking off the Cold War Lens: Visions of North–South Conflict during the Algerian War of Independence," *American Historical Review* 105, no. 3 (2000): 739–69; Daniel Speich, "The Kenyan Style of 'African Socialism': Developmental Knowledge Claims and the Explanatory Limits of the Cold War," *Diplomatic History* 33, no. 3 (2009): 449–65; Jadwiga E. Pieper Mooney and Fabio Lanza (eds.), *De-centering Cold War History: Local and Global Change* (London: Routledge, 2013).

hegemony".[50] The constantly renewed Cold War dynamism enhanced the expansion of global imperial formations, which were diverse, and yet to a certain extent similar in their strive for domination and hegemony. David Engerman provides a similar argument by stating that the Cold War was "at its root a battle of ideas", of parallel and mutually exclusive universalist claims to progress.[51] At the core of cultural Cold War two systems, socialism and capitalism, created encounters and interacted on different fields. Successfulness in this competition was partly dependent on public diplomacy, such as promotion of state systems, values, and worldviews for domestic and foreign audiences, and equally importantly, how these were received at home and abroad.[52] Thus, studies on global Cold War have started to pay more attention to the transformative encounter of the developing world with the competing Cold War ideologies of modernization

---

[50] Federico Romero, "Cold War Historiography at the Crossroads," *Cold War History* 14 No.4 (2014): 688.

[51] David C. Engerman, "Ideology and the origins of the Cold War, 1917–1962," in *The Cambridge History of the Cold War, vol. 1,* ed. Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 20, 24.

[52] Pia Koivunen, *Performing Peace and Friendship*, 8. Much of the research on this topic has concentrated on binary and competition between the United States and the Soviet Union and their attempts to influence one another. For a discussion on the cultural diplomacy and propaganda in the Soviet context, see Anne E. Gorsuch, *All This Is Your World. Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad after Stalin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Rósa Magnúsdóttir, "Mission Impossible? Selling Soviet Socialism to Americans, 1955–58," in *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, ed. by Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and M. C. Donfried (New York & Oxford: Berghahn, 2010); Kristin Roth-Ey, *Moscow Prime Time: How the Soviet Union Built the Media Empire that Lost the Cultural Cold War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011); Susan E. Reid, "Who Will Beat Whom?: Soviet Popular Reception of the American National Exhibition in Moscow, 1959," *Kritika*: *Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 9, No. 4 (2008): 855–904; György Péteri (ed.), *Imagining the West in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union* (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 2010).

projected upon it by the East[53] and the West[54] with financial, military, technical, and cultural resources.

Education provided to students from the developing world was both an ideological and a political project. Ideology in the Soviet case can be understood more as discourse or culture than belief system or dogma.[55] Ideology is also connected to the Soviet concept of modernity through the idea of non-capitalist development path. Soviet history provided a model for the developing world to follow, in which ideology and modernity were inseparable from one another. Michael David-Fox has written extensively about the concept of modernity in the Soviet context, arguing that the note on multiple

---

[53] The socialist bloc was not unified, and especially the Sino-Soviet split created a competition for influence in the developing world between the Soviet Union and China. On the case of China, see: Chen Jian "China, the Third World, and the Cold War," in *The Cold War in the Third World*, ed. Robert McMahon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012): 85–100; Jeremy Friedman, "Soviet policy in the developing world and the Chinese challenge in the 1960s," *Cold War History* 10, no. 2 (2010): 247–272; Austin Jersild, *The Sino-Soviet Alliance: An International History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014); Lorenz M. Luthi, *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Sergey Radchenko, *Two Suns in the Heavens: The Sino-Soviet Struggle for Supremacy, 1962–1967* (Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2009); Zhihua Shen and Danhui Li, *After Leaning to One Side: China and Its Allies in the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011).

[54] This field has so far been dominated by research on American influence and modernization of the developing world. For examples, see: Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); David C. Engerman, Nils Hilman, Mark Haefele, and Michael E. Latham (eds.), *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003); Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2010); David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010); Amanda Kay McVety, *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Aid Policy in Ethiopia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Robert B. Rakove, *Kennedy, Johnson, and the Nonaligned World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Bradley R. Simpson, *Economists with Guns: Authoritarian Development and U.S.–Indonesian Relations, 1960–1968* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008).

[55] On the other hand, Alexei Yurchak has rightly pointed out that the system of values and everyday life under late socialism did not necessarily connect to "ideology", but to a phenomenon separate from the state rhetoric. Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever until It Was No More,* 8. David-Fox, *Crossing Borders,* 80-82, 94. See also: Steve Smith, "Two Cheers for the 'Return of Ideology,'" *Revolutionary Russia* 17, no. 2 (2004): 119–35 and Ronald Grigor Suny, "On Ideology, Subjectivity, and Modernity: Thoughts on Doing Soviet History," *Russian History/Histoire russe* 34, no. 1–4 (2007): 1-5. For discussion on the performative nature of ideology during the period of late socialism, see also Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever until It Was No More,* 14-17.

modernities is valuable, as it highlights that there is no single road to the modern. In other words, the Soviet state did not simply copy models from the West, but aimed to create its own understanding of modernity.[56] As György Péteri has argued, during the Cold War period, Khrushchev was eager to "provide a workable way toward an alternative modernity" with "distinctly socialist characteristics."[57]

Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd have stressed that the Thaw differed from the preceding and following epochs of Soviet history in terms of integration with the rest of the world. The changes in both Soviet domestic and international politics, as well as in other fields, such as education, made this period distinctive.[58] The period of the Thaw can also be placed in the wider framework of global 1960s, which connects to the emergence of global patterns related to youth culture and cultural and political contest.[59] Young people were celebrated in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the socialist bloc as the builders a new society.[60] While the foundation of UDN reflected the enthusiasm

[56] Michael David-Fox, *Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015), 8, 67-68. David-Fox's understanding of modernity has been formed as a response to ideas concerning the Stalinist period expressed by Sheila Fitzpatrick and Stephen Kotkin. See: Sheila Fitzpatrick, "Introduction," in *Stalinism: New Directions* (London: Routledge,2000), 1-14; Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Oakland: University of California Press, 1995).

[57] György Péteri, "The Occident Within—or the Drive for Exceptionalism and Modernity," *Kritika*: *Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 9, no. 4 (2008): 937, 934.

[58] Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd, "Thaw as an Event in Russian History," in *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960,* ed. Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 27-28, 46-48.

[59] Arthur Marwick, *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy and the United States, c. 1958–c. 1974* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998); Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991* (London: Abacus, 1995).

[60] Existing scholarship on Soviet youth focuses largely on domestic developments and while these works have analyzed what it was like to be young in the post-war Soviet Union, Soviet efforts to influence young people beyond the socialist world have received little attention. Koivunen *Performing Peace and Friendship*, 25-26. Much of the research on youth and internationalism has concentrated on international youth festivals: Quinn Slobodian, "What Does Democracy Look like (and Why Would Anyone Want to Buy It?): Third World Demands and West German Responses at the 1960s World Youth Festivals," in *Cold War Cultures. Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies*, ed. Anette Vowinkel, Marcus M. Payk and Thomas Lindenberger (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), 254–275; Nick Rutter, "Look Left, Drive Right: Internationalism at the 1968 World Youth Festival," in *Socialist Sixties. Crossing Borders in the Second World*, ed. Anne Gorsuch and Diane Koenker (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2013), 193-212. For other research on Soviet youth culture, see: Anne Gorsuch, *Youth in*

of Thaw, its functions in the 1970s echoed the stabilization of late socialism. Alexei Yurchak has argued that the performative shift of authoritarian discourse during late socialism allowed Soviet people to develop a new kind of relationship to ideological meanings, norms, and values.[61] This new relationship to ideology and standardization of public life showed within the university community, as well as in ritualized practices of political performance, such as May Day demonstrations.

One of the key terms applied when discussing the Soviet efforts of sharing the accomplishments of Soviet modernity with international partners was friendship. After WWII period "friendship" meant accepting and supporting the Soviet state and its foreign policy, and those that who did not support Soviet foreign policy were considered enemies.[62] "Friendship" became a rhetorical tool of diplomacy for the Soviet Union that was actively used in forging bilateral relations.[63] As Rachel Applebaum has noted, "throughout the Cold War, Soviet and Eastern bloc officials used the term 'friendship'

Revolutionary Russia: Enthusiasts, Bohemians, Delinquents (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000); Hilary Pilkington, *Russia's Youth and Its Culture: A Nation's Constructors and Constructed* (London: Routledge, 1994); William J. Risch, "Soviet 'Flower Children': Hippies and the Youth-Counter-culture in 1970s L'viv'," *Journal of Contemporary History* 40, No. 3 (2005): 565–584; Sergei Zhuk, *Rock and Roll in the Rocket City: The West, Identity, and Ideology in Soviet Dniepropetrovsk, 1960–1985* (Washington DC.: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2010). For a discussion on Soviet youth culture and policy during the Thaw, see: Juliane Fürst, *Stalin's Last Generation: Soviet Post-War Youth and the Emergence of Mature Socialism* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010); Juliane Fürst, *Flowers through Concrete: Explorations in Soviet Hippieland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020); Juliane Fürst, "The Arrival of Spring? Changes and Continuities in Soviet Youth Culture and Policy between Stalin and Khrushchev," in *The Dilemmas of De-Stalinization: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era*, ed. Polly Jones (London: Routledge, 2006); Robert Hornsby, *Protest, Reform and Repression in Khrushchev's Soviet Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Brian LaPierre, *Hooligans in Khrushchev's Russia: Defining, Policing, and Producing Deviance during the Thaw* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2012).

[61] Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever until It Was No More,* 4-5, 9, 28-29, 31, 217-237, 283. Late socialism itself is a concept that has been contested. Juliane Fürst has suggested applying the term "mature socialism" instead, stressing the age, tranquility and complexity of this period compared to the period of Stalinism. Juliane Fürst, *Stalin's Last Generation*, 26-29.

[62] Patryk Babiracki, "Enemy to Friend: Soviet Union, Poland, and Refashioning of the Imperial Identity in *Pravda*, 1943-47," in *Bridging Disciplines, Spanning the World: Inequality, Identity, and Institutions*, ed. Rachel Beatty Riedl, Sada Aksatova and Kristine Mitchell (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 142.

[63] Evgeny Roschin, "Friendship of the Enemies: Twentieth Century Treaties of the United Kingdom and the USSR," *International Politics* 48, no. 1 (2011): 71-91.

to describe the relationships among their countries. Friendship was supposed to emphasize the singularity of international relations in the socialist world: to connote alliances based on shared ideology and goodwill, rather than on hard power or realpolitik."[64] The Soviet Union promoted "friendship" between its citizens and those of other states to maintain power and create new connections. On an everyday level, Soviet cultural exports, the study of the Russian language, and a variety of institutions and programs promoting cultural exchange were to foster mutual understanding.[65] The successfulness of the "friendship project" in the Eastern bloc encouraged Soviet officials to use it as a model to expand the empire of friends beyond socialist countries to the newly independent countries in Africa and Asia from 1949 until the 1970s.[66] While Western scholarship tended to see these interactions as Sovietization, this point of view underestimates the complexity of these interrelationships.

Public diplomacy had a significant role in relations between the Soviet Union and the developing world and in Soviet attempts to gain influence in new territories. The case of UDN demonstrates how the Soviet concept of friendship was applied to cooperation with new territories of the developing world, thus spreading the sphere of "friends" and political influence. In this sphere, ideological friendship was inseparable from ideas of alternative and socialist models of development and modernity. While previous research on relations between the Soviet Union and the developing world has largely concentrated on conflict, the approach of cultural Cold War stresses the importance of Soviet public diplomacy efforts that effected the target countries. The case of UDN

---

[64] Rachel Applebaum, *Empire of Friends: Soviet Power and Socialist Internationalism in Cold War Czechoslovakia.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), 8.

[65] Rachel Applebaum, "A Test of Friendship: Soviet-Czechoslovak Tourism and the Prague Spring," in *Socialist Sixties. Crossing Borders in the Second World*, ed. Anne Gorsuch and Diane Koenker (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2013), 214.

[66] Applebaum, *Empire of Friends*, 12-14.

provides a new perspective to this field by analyzing grass-root level attempts to promote socialist values within an institutional setting. This form of educational aid is analyzed as a part of Soviet internationalist foreign policy of the Cold War era that enabled transnational encounters between the foreign students and Soviet citizens.

Sources and methodology

This dissertation is based on qualitative research methodology. It makes use of various types of sources, from archival materials to interviews. Employing different types of sources aim to highlight different approaches to the topic, connecting experiences on the grass-root level to general developments in Soviet domestic and foreign policy. The varied source material also requires contextualization and source criticism, as the sources are produced by different actors both in the Soviet Union and elsewhere for different purposes and during different time periods. Altogether they provide a multi-layered view to realities present at UDN during the period of late socialism.

Archival sources

The main body of sources for this research is collected from four Russian archives, Russian State Archive [Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii, GARF], Russian State Archive of Social and Political History [Rossiiskoi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Sotsial'no-Politicheskoi Istorii, RGASPI], Moscow Municipal Central Archive [Tsentral'nyi Munitsipal'nyi Arkhiv Moskvy, TsMAM] and Central Archive of Moscow Social Movements [Tsentral'nyi Arkhiv Obshchestvennykh Dvizhenii g. Moskvy, TsAODM]. In addition, published materials from collections of Russian State Archive of Contemporary History [Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Noveishei Istorii, RGANI] are included in the archival sources. Most archival sources concern the period of 1960s, as there are more documents available from this decade describing everyday

realities of the cooperation in a rather open manner. Moving on to the 1970s, the sources become scarcer, and they tend to contain more party speech, thus reflecting the changing policies and societal atmosphere. This position has also affected the research framework that concentrates on the 1960s and uses the more formal documentation of events during the 1970s as a point of comparison.

From the Russian State Archive's collections, the files of Ministry of Higher and Special Education [Ministerstvo vyshego i srednego spetsial'nogo obrazovaniia SSSR, MINVUZ SSSR] and Union of Soviet Friendship Organizations and Cultural Relations [Soiuz Sovetskikh obshchestv druzhby i kul'turnoi sviazi s zarubezhnymi stranami, SSOD] were the most relevant for the needs of this research. In addition, individual files on international activities were also consulted in collections of All-Union Central Union of Trade Unions [Vsesoiuznyi tsentral'nyi sovet professional'nykh soiuzov, VTsSPS] and other relevant actors. These documents form the basis for the macro level of analysis, providing information about planning and implementation of Soviet educational cooperation on the highest levels of political and administrative hierarchy. They include numerical information about foreign students accepted to different Soviet institutions of higher education, plans of work for the Friendship House [Dom Druzhby] and other institutions working with foreign students. Ministry of Education was also actively involved in planning and executing study plans, holiday programs and internships for the foreign students. Finally, these files also include stenographs of meetings that describe conditions for learning in different Soviet institutions. Many meetings were dedicated to topics such as Russian language teaching and ideological-educational work [ideologo-vospitatelnaia rabota] or political-ideological education [ideino-politicheskoe vospitanie].

The files consulted at the Russian State Archive of Social and Political History belong to the collection of Komsomol files. The most important document collections consulted were those of Central Committee of VLKSM [Komsomol] and Committee of USSR Youth Organizations, 1956-1991. These documents, like the ones found in the Russian State Archive, include reports from different Soviet universities on work conducted with foreign students. However, in addition they provide information about the application processes of students and problems they encountered in Moscow. Very interesting documents on problems and crime in dormitories and streets of Moscow can be found, in addition to detailed descriptions of events such as the demonstration on the Red Square in 1963. Many files of the Komsomol collections are in a fairly unorganized state, which means that it is possible to encounter interesting pieces of information that are difficult to track in other archives.

Even though in the collections of the Russian State Archive and the Russian State Archive of Social and Political History it is possible to track numerous files on UDN, most of the materials concentrating specifically on this institution are found in the two Moscow city archives. Moscow Municipal Central Archive houses a collection of UDN files that concentrate on practical and technical aspects of the university activities. These include topics such as development of study plans and construction of university buildings. This kind of information provides a view to the everyday realities of life at UDN, describing contents of study programs and providing information on dormitories, classrooms, laboratories, libraries, as well as other spaces and equipment needed for successful functioning of the university. In addition, this archive houses an extensive collection of the university newspaper *Druzhba* [Friendship].

Druzhba served important ideological functions in the education process of foreign students and served as the public forum of the university community.[67] Certain themes were repeated annually, marking Soviet public holidays or events at the university. *Druzhba* is a major source of published narratives about everyday life at the university, but its ideological character requires placing it in a suitable analytical and methodological framework. As Jeffrey Brooks has pointed out in his analysis of Stalinist era newspapers, the Soviet press "served to spark discussion, collect information, stimulate public criticism of selected malfeasance, and, to a limited extent, satisfy readers' demands for information". [68] Brooks further describes the contents in Soviet newspapers as interpretive, carrying ideological messages, interactive, allowing for a limited expression of opinions of the readers, and informational, including domestic and foreign news. [69] In other words, Soviet newspapers are examples of official public culture and as such provide edited public narratives about phenomena present in the university space. In the case of *Druzhba* most of its contents is produced by the foreign students themselves, describing their experiences following the stylistic norms of Soviet public culture.

Finally, the Central Archive of Moscow Social Movements includes document collections of UDN CPSU and Komsomol organizations. Documentation of annual meetings in 1960-1979 were an important source for this dissertation. These meetings brought together members of the organizations to discuss the features of political and ideological work at the university. In addition, minutes and records of other Komsomol

---

[67] As its first editor-in-chief Vsevolod Kerov noted, the newspaper "was a part of a Soviet university and its task was to help the university to solve global and private problems, educate cadres friendly to us from the rows of students from the developing world. --- To say it openly, the newspaper was founded to fulfill certain ideological tasks. " Frolov et al. *Ocherki po istorii Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov* (Moscow: RUDN, 2009), 118.

[68] Jeffrey Brooks, *Thank You, Comrade Stalin!: Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold* War (Princeton: Princeton University Press), xviii.

[69] Brooks, *Thank You, Comrade Stalin!*, 6.

and CPSU committee meetings were useful for building an overall image of the different activities the university Komsomol and CPSU organizations conducted. While these documents provide a detailed and rich image of the different activities and everyday realities at UDN, they are also rich in party speech and self-criticism. Although this type of rhetoric is visible in many other public speeches and comments, it is most widespread in these university-level meetings.

Materials from these four archives constitute a fairly comprehensive collection of archival documents concerning UDN. The strengths of this collection of materials are that it is fairly versatile, consisting of different types of documentation on everyday life and activities of the university and bringing together all three levels of actors analyzed in this dissertation. Especially material concerning political organizations and ideological work within the university is rich. The weaknesses connect to the fairly unorganized and scattered nature of materials concerning foreign students in general and UDN in particular especially within GARF and RGASPI collections. The collection has also methodological challenges typical for Soviet archival sources. As these materials were mostly produced for administrative needs, they discuss realities of everyday life with very standardized and normative language commonly practiced as part of the Soviet public sphere. From a methodological point of view, political and ideological expressions found in the Soviet public space, whether in speeches or in journalistic work, were results of a thorough editing process. This is also visible in self-criticism presented in public: while the political organs expressed a lack of certain desired characteristic, they rarely provided any new methods to overcome the situation, but instead referred to methods that were already employed.[70] This rhetorical circularity

---

[70] Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever until It Was No More,* 47-54, 71-73.

is plentiful in the archival materials used for this study, especially concerning topics such as improving study performance or making ideological education more efficient, which makes it challenging to analyze the realities of the situation at the university.

Voices of students

The students' point of view is presented in this dissertation through published memoirs and interviews, as well as interviews the author has conducted. As for the published material, in addition to several interviews published in various newspapers in Russia and elsewhere, critical voices towards the Soviet educational cooperation can be found in the memoirs of foreign students published in the West during the Cold War period. These types of works include *Moscow Diary* by Ghanaian writer William Anti-Taylor[71], *A Student in Moscow* by Ugandan medical doctor Andrew Richard Amar[72], *An African Abroad* by Nigerian journalist Olabisi Ajala[73] and *Moscow is not my Mecca* by Guyanese writer Jan Carew[74]. In other words, these memoirs concentrate on experiences of African and Afro-Caribbean students in Moscow in the early 1960s, providing highly critical narratives of student life, concentrating on racism, material conditions and surveillance, though they also provide positive remarks about the general friendliness of Russians.[75] These published narratives need to be analyzed in a critical manner, as

---

[71] William Anti-Taylor, *Moscow Diary* (London: Robert Hale, 1967).

[72] Andrew Richard Amar, *A Student in Moscow* (London: Ampersand, 1961).

[73] Olabisi Ajala, *An African Abroad* (London: Jarrolds, 1963).

[74] Jan Carew, *Moscow is not my Mecca* (London: Secker&Warburg, 1964). This "memoir" is based on stories of several Guyanese students who had returned from the USSR, as Carew himself never studied in the Soviet Union.

[75] In addition to these works concentrating on Cold War era experiences, the author has familiarized herself with memoirs of people of color from interwar and Stalinist periods. These include Harry Haywood, *Black Bolshevik: Autobiography of an Afro-American Communist* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978); Langston Hughes*, I Wonder as I Wander: An Autobiographical Journey* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993); Claude McKay, *A Long Way from Home* (Boston: Mariner Books, 1970); Robert Robinson, *Black on Red: My 44 Years Inside the Soviet Union* (Washington DC: Acropolis Books, 1988); Homer Smith*, Black Man in Red Russia: A Memoir* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 1964).

their production for audiences especially in the West and the developing world was heavily supported by foreign intelligence services.[76]

A different kind of narrative about students' experiences at UDN is created through interviews and written narratives of UDN alumni.[77] For the purposes of this research, the author has conducted interviews and collected written narratives about student life using a questionnaire. Same questions were included in the interviews and the questionnaire, and they were translated into English, Russian and Spanish to make it as convenient as possible for the informants to narrate their experiences. The informants included an Argentinian female, who studied agricultural sciences in the late 1960s and beginning of 1970s, a Portuguese female living in Brazil with her parents during the time of applying to UDN, who studied Russian language and literature in the early 1960s, a Pakistani male who studied engineering in the 1970s, and a Nigerian male who studied medicine in the late 1970s. In other words, despite the small number of informants, they come from different regions and studied in different faculties at different periods of time, which makes the material rich in terms of covering experiences of both genders during different periods of time, with different backgrounds and interests. In addition, the author interviewed a Russian informant who did not study at UDN but lived in Moscow in the 1970s, spending significant amounts of time with

---

[76] At least Anti-Taylor is mentioned in British Intelligence Service (Information Research Department) archival materials as an individual whose memoirs were actively spread in propaganda purposes both within the UK and in foreign markets, mainly in Africa. Archival materials suggest that these types of memoirs were co-authored by African students and British authorities. British National Archives, FO 371/94963, quoted in a presentation "Dupes and Defectors: African Students as Cold War Propagandists" by Thom Loyd at University of Texas at Austin symposium "African-Soviet Encounters: New Histories of Russian Racism and Anti-Racism" 3.2.2021.

[77] Svetlana Boltovskaja and Tobias Rupprecht have also conducted interviews with foreign students in the USSR to highlight the students' perspective on education and everyday life in the USSR. Svetlana Boltovskaja, *Bildungsmigranten aus dem subsaharischen Afrika in Moskau und St. Petersburg: Selbst- und Fremdbilder* (Herbolzheim: Centaurus, 2014); Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin*.

foreign students. She eventually married an Argentinian student and belonged to the group of friends the foreign students made outside the university.

Memory narratives, whether written or oral, do not recount experiences or perceptions as they were at the time of studies, but what the informant wants to represent as their narrative of the events. Reminiscence of the past is a process of giving meaning to one's personal history and reconstructing experiences. Rather than authentic stories of things that were experienced, elements of interview narratives depend on the informant's memory, the contemporary world, and temporal distance between the moment of recollection and the time that is being recalled.[78] Narratives collected for the needs of this research, whether written or oral, are very different from the ones the same people would have produced in the 1960s and 1970s. Temporal distance between study years and the time of recollection shapes the memory and creates new forms of narrative. While these narratives tell about experiences of university studies, they also reconstruct the informant's relation to them. At the same time, without access to authentic diaries or other material produced during the students' stay in Moscow, these narratives are the best way to reach the students' personal experiences.

---

[78] See, for example: Donna DeBlasio (ed.), *Catching Stories: A Practical Guide to Oral History* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2009) and Donald A. Ritchie, *Doing Oral History: A Practical Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). For studies and collections on Soviet history that use interviews, see Donald J. Raleigh*, Russia's Sputnik Generation: Soviet Baby Boomers Talk about Their Lives* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006); Donald J. Raleigh, *Soviet Baby Boomers. An Oral History of Russia's Cold War Generation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Melanie Ilic, *Life Stories of Soviet Women. The Interwar Generation* (New York: Routledge, 2013).

1. Peoples' Friendship University – A flagship institution of Soviet internationalist education

Peoples' Friendship University held a special position among the institutions of higher education in Moscow and the Soviet Union as a whole, as it was specifically founded to receive students from countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In 1963 there were approximately 10 000 international students in Moscow, 3500 of them from capitalist countries and the developing world, 2200 of them studying at UDN.[1] As these numbers suggest, during its early years of operation the university was the most significant institution hosting students from the developing world in Moscow. The university grew on a rapid pace especially in the early 1960s and continued to gain wide visibility in the Soviet media as the majority of foreign students in Moscow and the Soviet Union in general still arrived from other socialist countries and blended into the local population, while UDN stood out as the colorful international institution dedicated to friendship and cooperation. The situation changed in the 1970s with growing numbers of foreign students spreading to different institutions, but UDN still maintained its public status as the flagship institution of Soviet internationalism and educational cooperation with the developing world.

University for the developing world: changing images and positions

As part of the new internationalist foreign policy of the Soviet Union, the secretary general of CPSU Nikita Khrushchev traveled extensively around the developing world since the mid-1950s, forming new contacts, stressing Soviet willingness for cooperation and building bilateral relations.[2] Establishment of UDN was part of this process and

---

[1] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.336, 39.

[2] Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and The Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 67.

was announced during Khrushchev's visit to Indonesia in February 1960.[3] Two days later the news was published in Pravda.[4] The announcement came as a complete surprise both to the Central Committee of CPSU and the Soviet of Ministers that were forced to immediately start preparations for opening this new institution.[5] Next autumn, the university had enrolled its first cohort of students consisting of 539 foreigners from 59 countries accompanied by 57 Soviet students. In 10 years, the university grew into an institution of approximately 4000 students, 75% of them from 84 developing countries, with approximately 500 foreign and Soviet specialists graduating every year.[6]

Image of UDN

UDN was the most important example of Soviet international education during the Cold War and an institution designed to recruit students on political and social criteria, following an internationalist policy of expanding cultural and political ties with the developing world. The university was renamed "Patrice Lumumba Peoples' Friendship University" [Universitet Druzhby Narodov imeni Patrisa Lumumby] in 1961 to honor the Congolese national hero and symbol of internationalism. The mission of UDN was to train professionals for the countries of the developing world and had, according to the instructions of Khrushchev, to give priority to "young and talented people from poor families who have not had the possibility to realize their wishes and to study in the Soviet Union".[7] The university served as a symbol of internationalism and as a space in which the Soviet Union presented an image of itself through altruistic friendship, anti-

---

[3] Constantin Katsakioris, "The Lumumba University in Moscow: Higher education for a Soviet-Third World alliance, 1960-91," *Journal of Global History* 14, no.2 (2019): 282.
[4] *Pravda* 24.2.1960, 1.
[5] Frolov et al. *Ocherki po istorii Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov* (Moscow: RUDN, 2009), 26.
[6] TsAODM, f. P-4376, o. 1, d.79, 49.
[7] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.869, 23-25.

imperialism, and power of technology and science, thus emphasizing a picture of the Soviet society as international, egalitarian, and modern.[8]

Educational cooperation between the USSR and the developing world was rapidly increasing in the late 1950s and early 1960s, and founding a separate institution for foreign students raised wide discussion not only abroad but also within the Soviet Union. Already in 1959, a year before UDN was founded, there were 744 students from capitalist countries studying in the USSR, 680 of them from the developing world.[9] While many experts saw that educating foreign students in Soviet universities together with the Soviet students was a more successful tactic than founding a new institution of higher education especially for them, the need for a specialized university was explained through requests coming from the target countries themselves. At the same time, it was claimed especially among foreign experts that a separate university gave the Soviet authorities wider control over study processes and everyday interactions of foreign students with Soviet citizens.[10] This model of international education was also copied to other socialist states, such as University of 17th of November in Prague, Karl Marx University in Leipzig, Institute of Gamal Abdel Nasser in Sofia, and Institute for Foreign Students in Budapest.[11]

UDN was an institution with a reputation as diverse as its student body. Both in the Soviet Union and in some target countries around the developing world, the institution suffered from its reputation of supposedly poor academic quality compared to other

---

[8] Abigail Judge Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge: The Peoples' Friendship University and Soviet Education for the Third World," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013):254-255.

[9] GARF f.9606 o.1 d.166, 4-5.

[10] Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge", 249.

[11] Barbora Buzássyová, "Repositioning of Czechoslovak Educational Strategies to the 'Least Developed Countries': The Rise and Decline of University of 17th November," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, ed. Ingrid Miethe & Jane Weiss (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020), 183-185.

Soviet universities, while in the West it was often perceived as a propaganda tool that cooperated with the KGB in educating terrorists, such as Carlos the Jackal[12] who studied chemistry at UDN for 1,5 years in the late 1960s. On the other hand, the majority of UDN graduates were not involved in radical political activism after graduation and numerous well-known individuals, from presidents of countries such as Guyana and Honduras to influential scientists and other professionals working in different countries around the world, graduated from UDN.[13] In other words, while the university was not the political and ideological KGB school as portrayed in the Western media, it had to make a significant contribution to creating a positive public image, as its negative reputation was reflected in the attitudes of state governments in certain target countries.

Interests of the developing world changing the position of UDN

While for the Soviet Union higher education was a channel to transfer Soviet knowledge and implement ideas for socialist modernization, for the developing world Soviet education provided opportunities for state-building and reforming social structures. Overcoming the colonial past and its hierarchies was a prime concern of postcolonial states. Educating local professionals for high- and middle-level ranks of civil service, the military, and the private sector was important to replace colonial hierarchies. Newly independent states were keen to invest in post-elementary education that provided human capital essential for national socio-economic development.[14]

---

[12] More about Carlos the Jackal and his studies at UDN: Konstantin Smirnov, "Delo Shakala: Poltora goda himii," *Kommersant Vlast* 23.12.1997, https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/14005, accessed 4.11.2020.

[13] Russian service of the BBC provides an interesting overview to the university and its most well-known students: Artiom Krechetnikov, "Simbol druzhby ili 'ruka Moskvy'?," *BBC Moskva* 27.1.2010, https://www.bbc.com/russian/russia/2010/02/100127_russia_rudn_history, accessed 4.11.2020.

[14] Eric Burton provides a good overview on the topic through the case of Tanzania from the 1960s onwards. Eric Burton, "African Manpower Development during the Global Cold War: The Case of Tanzanian Students in the two German States," in *Africa Research in Austria: Approaches and*

Despite this general ethos of creating new postcolonial societies, countries sending students to the USSR often had very practical interests on what kinds of specialists were needed. In the case of the Arab countries, the postcolonial era created a need to nationalize natural resources previously controlled by the colonizing states. Thus, approximately half of the Arab students in the USSR were studying engineering and 20% medicine. Soviet authorities noted the students' lack of interest in specializations such as economics, philosophy, or journalism, as there was an urgent need for vocational specialists.[15] The situation was similar for Latin American students, who mostly chose to study engineering, agriculture, medicine, and pharmacy, despite their often more left-leaning positions than their Asian and African peers. Economics and law were neglected domains due to the different socio-economical and jurisdictional systems in the students' countries of origin.[16] Thus, in most cases, state administrations in the developing world had a strong interest in promoting education in practical and non-ideological fields of study to cope with their societies' urgent needs.

In the Soviet Union, many political leaders rose to their positions from technical and scientific specializations and the Soviet leadership believed that engineering diplomas could result in high status in local labor markets and, consequently, dominant political positions.[17] For the foreign students themselves, ideological reasons were rarely the main inspiration for pursuing studies in the Soviet Union. Despite the anti-racist and anti-imperialist slogans, the affordability of education offered in the USSR was the most common reason that attracted thousands of foreign students to the Soviet institutions of

---

Perspectives, ed. Andreas Exenberger and Ulrich Pallua (Innsbruck: Innsbruck University Press, 2016): 106-107.

[15] Costantin Katsakioris, "Les étudiants de pays arabes formés en Union soviétique pendant la Guerre froide (1956-1991)," *Revue européenne des migrations internationals* 32, no. 2 (2016): 8-10, 22.

[16] Tobias Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin: Interaction and Exchange Between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015): 197-198.

[17] Natalia Tsvetkova, "International Education During the Cold War: Soviet Social Transformation and American Social Reproduction," *Comparative Education Review* 52, no. 2 (2008): 205-206.

higher education.[18] While the idea of technocracy functioned in the Soviet authoritarian state system where ideology and politics pervaded most social spheres, importing this model to other countries that had inherited most of societal infrastructure from their previous colonizers was a difficult task, though in certain socialist-minded countries, Soviet education became a vehicle for large-scale mobilization, class organization, and the creation of new elites.

Cooperation between the Soviet Union and the developing world was a process of constant negotiation, with the target countries having much of a say in what type of cooperation they wanted to establish. Soviet Union was also experiencing competition from the side of its socialist partners in Eastern Europe in terms of building contacts with the developing world.[19] Unreliability of foreign political organizations and trade unions that provided students recommendations for studies in the USSR in the 1960s was one of the reasons the Soviet administration started to stress state-to-state cooperation in the field of international education in the 1970s. As Khrushchev was replaced by Brezhnev as the head of state and the overall societal atmosphere in the Soviet Union changed, mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and state authorities in the target countries of educational cooperation led to a generally stable cooperation. Foreign governments appreciated the large number of scholarships offered and the fact that students and their activities were controlled in the Soviet Union with

---

[18] Maxim Matusevich, "An Exotic Subversive: Africa, Africans and the Soviet Everyday", *Race&Class* 49, no.4 (2008): 69. The situation was similar to that of African students in the GDR. See: Sara Pugach, "Eleven Nigerian Students in Cold War East Germany: Visions of Science, Modernity, and Decolonization," *Journal of Contemporary History* 54 no. 3 (2019): 551–572.

[19] David C. Engerman, "Second World's Third World," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12, no.1 (2011): 194-198. For the case of foreign students in socialist Romania, see: Mihai Dinu Gheorghiu, Irina Macovei, Adrian Netedu, Carmen Olaru, "Les étudiants africains en Roumanie (1970-1990). De l'internationalisme militant à la commercialisation des études." *Revista de psihologie sociala* II, no. 34 (2014): 117-128.

the absence of phenomena such as student revolts.[20] In practice this meant that the Soviet administration was no longer supporting activists of local political organizations but turned the cooperation into a more controlled process that was conducted in tight collaboration with the target countries.

UDN as an institution

The curricula of UDN were subject to the supervision of the Ministry of Higher and Special Education, while the university was formally administered by a council, which included four social organizations: the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and the Committee of Youth Organizations. This made the university administratively distinct from state universities that were directly under the control of the Ministry of Higher and Special Education. The flagship position of UDN was demonstrated especially in the 1960s in its study programs that provided non-ideological education and were tailored to fit the needs of the target countries, the public images stressing friendship and cooperation, and in a wide network of international contacts established especially with institutions located around the developing world.

Fields of research and study program

When UDN opened its doors in 1960, it would only receive students for the preparatory faculty, which taught Russian language for foreign students and foreign languages for Soviet students, history and social sciences, and sports. The subject-specific faculties started their work in autumn 1961. Due to Khrushchev's unexpected announcement of

---

[20] Constantin Katsakioris, "Creating a Socialist Intelligentsia: Soviet Educational Aid and its Impact on Africa," *Cahiers d'études africaines* 226 no. 2 (2017): 267-268, 273.

opening the university, curricula of different specializations were planned rapidly and at first only to cover the first year of studies. The number of subjects taught at UDN grew as the different faculties created their curricula during the early 1960s.[21] UDN had six faculties: engineering sciences, medical sciences, natural sciences, agronomical sciences, law and economics, and humanities. In the beginning the specializations offered in engineering sciences were machine and mechanisms construction and operation, construction, and exploration, mining, and usage of minerals. In agrological sciences the students could specialize in agrology or livestock farming. In medical sciences the specializations available were medicine and pharmacy. The natural sciences specializations were mathematics, physics, and chemistry. In the faculty of law and economics the students could specialize in economy and planning of national economy, or international law. In humanities the specializations available were history, Russian language and literature.[22]

Many specializations offered courses that answered needs of the students' countries of origin, such as specialized courses on tropical diseases in the faculty of medicine, tropical agriculture in the faculty of agricultural sciences, usage of tropical construction materials in the faculty of engineering, and history of Asia, Africa and Latin America in the faculty of humanities. Needs of the target countries also influenced research focus: for instance, in the department of agriculture research concentrated on productivity of livestock and typing and optimization of crop seeds for the needs of various tropical environments.[23] In later years new specializations were added and old ones removed in

---

[21] TsMAM f. P-3061, o.1, d.1, 7.

[22] TsMAM f. P-3061, o.1, d.1, 7.

[23] *Professora, doktora nauk i vidnye uchenie Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov*, 26-27.

a flexible manner. The faculties themselves, however, remained the same until the early 1990s.

The study programs of UDN experienced adjustments in the early 1970s reflecting the changing position of the institution. In the 1960s the study programs were planned to last four years for all specializations except medicine, which required five years of studies. This meant that programs offered by UDN were one year shorter than those offered by other Soviet universities. The situation was compensated by UDN students having more lectures per day. In the beginning of their study period at UDN students spent 1-3 years, depending on their skills and educational background, in the preparatory faculty. The students earned a Soviet "specialist" degree, which in most countries was recognized as equivalent of a master's degree. In 1972, the university prolonged duration of study programs to the same level as other Soviet universities. After this change, programs lasted 4,5-6 years depending on the specialization: a degree in medicine took 6 years, degrees in engineering, natural sciences and Russian language 5 years, degrees in all other specializations 4,5 years.[24] The students who had started their studies during the old study programs also graduated following their structure, which meant that the first cohorts of students following the new program structure graduated only in 1977.[25] Together with the changing program durations, Russian language classes were included in the first and second year studies in the specialized faculties. Obligatory social science courses were included in all degrees, while studies at the preparatory faculty were limited to one year. Until then the majority of students from 20-25 countries had spent a minimum of two years in the preparatory faculty.[26]

---

[24] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.96, 60.

[25] V. N. Nikitin, *Universitet Druzhby: kratkii ocherk poluvekovoi istorii* (Moscow: RUDN, 2010), 31.

[26] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.79, 146, 149. After the reform, students that were not ready for university-level studies after one year of studies at the preparatory faculty were sent to technical vocational schools for more practical training,

The extension of study programs signified that by the 1970s the differences between other Soviet universities and UDN had diminished and study programs were unified in different institutions due to changing political atmosphere and interests, as widest Thaw-era enthusiasm towards the developing world was largely replaced by more stable bilateral cooperation in the 1970s.[27] This normalization, or change from the initial concept of providing education specifically for the needs of students from the developing world, unified education provided at UDN with that of other Soviet institutions and served as a reaction to claims of lower academic quality and high level of ideology.[28] On a practical level the new policy aimed to diminish the dropout rates by bringing less radical and more well-prepared students to the Soviet Union.

University buildings

Due to the rapid announcement of UDN's foundation, dormitories and locations where teaching took place were spread around Moscow in the 1960s. First rector of UDN, Sergei Rumiantsev, together with the minister of higher and special education Viacheslav Eliutin had to contact Khrushchev directly, explaining the difficult conditions in which the university started its work.[29] For the first year of teaching, the

---

[27] James Mark and Péter Apor have argued that the Pinochet coup of 1973 was a key event, after which the interest towards global socialism and "Third-Worldism" significantly diminished within the socialist bloc compared to the 1960s and that these ideologies were partly replaced with environmentalism and peace movement. Even though activism concerning certain regions, such as Nicaragua and Southern Africa continued until the 1980s, this activism had largely lost its meaning to the intellectual and political elites. James Mark and Péter Apor, "Socialism Goes Global: Decolonization and the Making of a New Culture of Internationalism in Socialist Hungary, 1956–1989," *The Journal of Modern History* 87, no. 4 (2015): 886-887.

[28] Constantin Katsakioris has even argued that this development "left the university with fewer arguments to account for its identity as the flagship project of Soviet educational aid" Katsakioris, "The Lumumba University in Moscow", 299. However, similar development of stabilizing relations took place in Czechoslovakia, where since the late 1960s the developing countries themselves had more of a say on what kind of education they needed through a more cooperative model of partnership than in the 1960s. Barbora Buzássyová, "Repositioning of Czechoslovak Educational Strategies to the 'Least Developed Countries': The Rise and Decline of University of 17th November," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, ed. Ingrid Miethe and Jane Weiss (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020): 188.

[29] RGANI f.4, o.16, d.806, 18-20.

students of the preparatory faculty were placed in the buildings previously occupied by the KGB school and the school of military staff on Donskoi pro"ezd and ulitsa Paveletskaia. Later the specialized faculties and more dormitories were scattered around the city on 3rd Kabel'naia, Pavlovskaia and Ordzhonikidze streets. One of the most urgent needs of the new university campus was to build a dormitory, as the temporary dormitories were not spacious enough, varied in quality and were located in different parts of the city.[30]

A decision was made to start the planning and construction process of the university's campus in south-west Moscow, Miklukho-Maklaia street, in 1961. The building project itself started only in summer 1962 and was severely delayed at different stages, with students participating in the construction process during their holidays since 1964. The activities of this university construction brigade continued annually until the campus construction was finalized in 1983.[31] The first students from preparatory faculty were able to move in and start their studies in the first new buildings of UDN campus in autumn 1963, but in general the building work was constantly late from schedule.[32] All construction works were supposed to be completed by 1968, but in fact only 17% of all buildings were completely finished by the deadline.[33] Only in late 1970s the university could move entirely to its new campus and the construction process was officially completed in 1983.[34]

---

[30] RGASPI f. M-1, o.46, d.294, 21-26; TsMAM f.P-3061, o.1, d.2, 3-4.

[31] RGASPI f. M-1, o.46, d.294, 82-86.

[32] *Druzhba* 23.10.1963, 1.

[33] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.143, 1-2.

[34] V.N. Nikitin, *Universitet Druzhby,* 45-46.

University staff

Faculty nominated for work at UDN had high ideological standards to fulfill, as only reliable communists and internationalists with recommendations from the Party were appointed for teaching positions at the university. However, in general the faculty was younger than in other Soviet universities: in many cases members of faculty on the lower levels of academic hierarchy were only 3-4 years older than their students. Some of the first lecturers hired included Ivan Potechin, head of the African department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and Anatolii Sofronov, editor in chief of the *Ogoniok* magazine. Both the university's first rector Sergey Rumiantsev and Vladimir Stanis, who replaced him in 1970, had previously served as deputy ministers of higher education. The first vice-president of the university, Pavel Erzin, was a general-major of the KGB.[35] Motivations for the faculty to work at UDN were varied, and at the highest level of university administration not all appointments were met with enthusiasm. Diary notes of rector Rumiantsev demonstrate his reluctance to move from the Ministry of Higher and Special Education to the post of UDN's first rector.[36]

The faculty working at UDN experienced a heavy workload that consisted mostly of teaching. During the interwar period, institutions of Soviet science system developed in a hierarchical and specialized manner. Since the Stalinist era the Soviet Academy of Sciences developed into a center of research in control of dozens of scientific research institutes, while the universities tended to concentrate on teaching, providing narrow specializations for the practical needs of Soviet and, especially in the case of UDN,

---

[35] Tobias Rupprecht, "Gestrandetes Flaggschiff. Die Moskauer Universität der Völkerfreundschaft," *Osteuropa* no. 1 (2010): 99, 102; *Professora, doktora nauk i vidnye uchenie Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov*, 507, 561.

[36] Frolov et al. *Ocherki po istorii Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov,* 26.

foreign societies.[37] Even though much of the practical training and some of the lecturing was conducted by assistants that had not defended their kandidatskaia rabota [equivalent of Western PhD dissertation], even high-ranking professors concentrated more on teaching than research. The workload of the faculty was intense, as they were expected to support the students by providing them consultation both at the university and at the dormitories. UDN faculty were not only responsible for teaching academic subjects, but also faced significant pressure to include as much ideological contents into their classes as possible. Especially instructors of Russian language working with foreign students faced a significant amount of pressure from upper levels of the Soviet administration to include ideological topics concerning life in the Soviet society into materials used during classes and participate in ideological work conducted mainly by the UDN Komsomol and CPSU organizations.

Structures of control

Each Soviet university was working with the students and monitoring their activities and moods through a complex network of actors. From the highest levels of Soviet state administration, such as Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Higher and Special Education, to individual faculty members and Komsomol activists within the university community, reports about the students and their organizations traveled up the hierarchical structure of administration and control. At UDN, ideological work among foreign students was planned and implemented by university board[38], scientific board,

---

[37] Michael David-Fox and György Péteri, "On the Origins and Demise of the Communist Academic Regime," in *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe,* ed. Michael David-Fox and György Péteri (Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000), 4. See also: Michael David-Fox, "Russian Universities Across the 1917 Divide," in *Universities under Dictatorship*, ed. John Connelly (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005), 1.

[38] The university board consisted of representatives of the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Countries of Asia and Africa, Union of Soviet Friendship Organizations and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, the Central Committee of Trade Unions, the Committee of Soviet Youth Organizations, the

rectorate, university CPSU committee, university Komsomol committee, university trade union committee, board of international friendship[39], faculty student boards, presidents of compatriot associations, leaders of national societal organizations, Soviet students, and activists of CPSU and Komsomol units.[40] However, the most important coordinating actor within the UDN university community was the Komsomol that was actively working with foreign students as well as monitoring them.

Since the late 1950s questions related to international students were mostly coordinated by the Council of Work with Foreign Students in the USSR, which was replaced by All-Union Council on Affairs of International Students[41] in 1964. The council was a coordinating organ of different actors on questions concerning studies and political work among foreign students. It took care of coordinating the application processes, ideological work conducted both at the universities and during holidays, distribution of scholarships through different organizations, and promotion of Soviet education system abroad.[42]Regional Ministries of Education were responsible for practical organizational questions. Each of these had a sector dedicated for work with foreign students. These units were responsible for organizing the studies, including work at the preparatory faculties. They also participated in student selections of state universities in cooperation

---

Soviet Ministry of Higher and Special Education, rector, vice rectors from each faculty, decans, and representatives of faculty members and students.

[39] This was the only organization that brought together both Soviet and foreign students and organized different kinds of cultural events at the university.

[40] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.139, 61.

[41] The All-Union Council member organizations were the Central Committee of Komsomol, the All-Union Committee of Trade Unions, the State Committee of the USSR Ministers' Council, Ministry of Education of the RSFSR, Moscow City Committee of the Communist Party of Soviet Union, Council of Soviet Organizations of Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, Soviet Committee of Solidarity with the Countries of Asia and Africa, Soviet Consumers' Union (Tsentrsoiuz), USSR Ministry of Health, USSR Ministry of Agriculture, USSR Ministry of Culture, Peoples' Friendship University and Moscow State University.

[42] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.221, 32-33; RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.29, 203-205; RGANI f.5, o.55, d.94, 129-133.

with Soviet embassies and organizations offering scholarships, and organized transportation of students to the USSR.[43]

The Central Committee of Komsomol had a sector dedicated to work with foreign students that was responsible for coordinating Komsomol activities of different universities and training the staff and students working with international students. In addition, it maintained contact with the compatriot associations, cooperated with the Ministry of Higher and Special Education, received reports about the activities in different universities, and created a general plan of ideological work for the foreign students.[44] The Central Committee's plan for work with foreign students was sent to all Soviet universities where foreign students studied. Different sections of work were familiarization of students with Soviet reality, work with compatriot associations, cultural activities, and publication of printed materials.[45]

At university level actors involved in work with international students were numerous. Among these actors, the most important ones representing foreign students were compatriot associations [zemliachestvo] and regional organizations. These organizations were led by the foreign students themselves and the level of their connections with the Soviet authorities varied. Within the university administration a group consisting of faculty and Soviet students monitored these organizations and material produced through this monitoring was then passed on to the All-Union Council on Affairs of International Students, which received extensive reporting on activities of different compatriot associations. [46] Komsomol was actively monitoring also the Student Union of UDN, which brought together all students of the university and

---

[43] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.335, 1-9.
[44] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.335, 32-36.
[45] RGASPI f.M-3, o.2, d.264, 50-53.
[46] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.222, 57.

cooperated with compatriot associations as well as faculty and dormitory councils, in which the foreign students formed the majority.[47] The CPSU units on university and faculty levels had people responsible for work with international students, as did the Komsomol units functioning on different levels of the university administration from all-university level to individual study groups. In addition, decans of each faculty were informed about activities of the international students and reported to the university council. Especially professors of Russian language and social sciences were deeply involved in ideological work and reported the political mindsets of the students to upper administrative levels. Soviet students living and studying with foreign students would also report both to Komsomol and the university and dormitory administration.[48]

---

[47] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.356, 98-102.
[48] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.368, 9-49.

2. Student selection as the basis of cooperation

This chapter starts by analyzing the public image of UDN that was actively promoted both within the Soviet Union and for foreign audiences. It then moves on to look at the process of choosing new students, which had significant variation over time between different geographical regions depending on changing state of bilateral relations between the USSR and the target coutnries. Finally, the chapter looks at the processes of students traveling to Moscow and analyzes the difficulties related to this complex process. The chapter argues that the process of student selection formed the basis for work towards both educational and ideological goals of UDN as it was crucial to select students who were capable of completing a university degree and possessed a suitable political mindset. When problems occurred during the students' stay in the Soviet Union or when they did not fulfill expectations placed upon them after returning home, improving the student selection process was the usual suggestion to correct these issues. While the majority of students could start their studies without major problems, especially in the 1960s cooperation with different local organizations made the student selection process at times chaotic and resulted in bringing a significant number of students who were not prepared for university studies to Moscow. While this was waste of resources, it also complicated both the educational and ideological work that was later conducted with the students and led to changes in the student selection process in the 1970s.

Promoting the university for domestic and foreign audiences

Establishment of UDN was widely noticed in publications both within the Soviet Union and abroad as Khrushchev's announcement gained headlines especially in leftist newspapers around the world and later exotic masses of students provided colorful

material for Soviet photographers and journalists, who were keen to report on activities taking place at the university. While Soviet materials aimed both at domestic and international audiences tended to present images of peaceful cooperation and friendship at the core of the education project, the narratives connected to these images were different depending on the audience. While for foreign audiences the technological advancement and non-ideological nature of Soviet education were highlighted alongside solidarity towards the developing world in their fight for independence, for the Soviet audience the process of foreign students turning into "friends" of the Soviet Union was emphasized, thus suggesting a new wider sphere of Soviet global influence as a result of foreign policy aimed at countries of the developing world.

An anti-imperial and technologically advanced institution

In the public sphere, UDN was described as "the first international institution of higher education in the world."[1] In promotion materials, the university stressed its non-political character and spirit of internationalism. These statements were an important part of the self-representation of the Soviet state in establishing its image as an altruistic friend of the peoples of the world.[2] Works produced in the Soviet Union for foreign audiences were carefully constructed yet illuminating examples the Soviet Union's self-representation abroad. The university's emphasis on science, anti-imperialism, and internationalism suggests a state that aspired to be modern, egalitarian, and international.[3] The core of this new type of internationalism was expressed through the concept of friendship that brought together hundreds of foreign students from different

---

[1] Brochure *Universitet Druzhby Narodov imeni Patrisa Lumumby* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov, 1962), 1.

[2] Tobias Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism After Stalin. Interaction and Exchange between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 58-59.

[3] Abigail Judge Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge: The Peoples' Friendship University and Soviet Education for the Third World," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 240.

countries, turning them into one friendly and cooperative unit: "The spirit of internationalism and comradeship which prevails at the Patrice Lumumba University has fused the multinational collective into a big, friendly family"[4], as one of the promotion leaflets described.

In the public sphere, Soviet education was portrayed as a project based on true cooperation and equality, and thus differed from the education provided by colonial states. UDN Komsomol stated in 1964 that Soviet cooperation with the developing world does not include any military or political obligations: "The Soviet Union does not force the countries of Asia and Africa to anything, nor does it look for anything but friendship, wide cooperation and strengthening of peace."[5] Instead of forcing these countries to follow a certain pattern of development, "the Soviet Union shares its rich experience, knowledge, and materials with the developing countries."[6] While these public narratives of the nature of educational aid tended to highlight the peaceful and friendly character of Soviet foreign policy as supporting peoples of the developing world in their own aspirations for development, they also highlight the bonds of friendship created through education that widens the sphere of Soviet cooperation into new territories. Stress on education without compulsion or militarism was rhetorically positioning the Soviet Union vis-à-vis the West in the Cold War atmosphere. This rhetoric was widely present in Soviet media, as this excerpt from an article in *Sovetskie profsoyuzi* [Soviet Trade Unions] magazine in 1960 highlights:

> *The decision of Soviet state administration to establish Peoples' Friendship University in Moscow is a new, bright example about Soviet politics of peace and friendship among peoples. The foundation of the university supports aspirations of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin*

---

[4] *Peoples' Friendship University* [in four languages] (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970).
[5] RGASPI f.M-3, o.2, d.112, 36.
[6] RGASPI f.M-3, o.2, d.112, 37.

America to create their own engineers, agricultural specialists, doctors, teachers, economists, and experts of other fields.[7]

Western media was keen to contest these narratives of technological advancement and ideas of altruistic friendship by claiming that studies in the USSR were of low academic level and full of propaganda compared to studies in the West.[8] UDN fit this stereotype perfectly, as it offered accelerated programs that were one year shorter compared to those of other Soviet universities. This peculiarity, among other things, aroused distrust in foreign countries regarding the quality of studies. Accusations of low academic level were caused by the majority of UDN students coming from abroad, which amplified claims that UDN was not good enough for Soviet students, but specialized in educating foreign students with disadvantaged backgrounds. This reputation also connected to accusations of UDN being an ideological institution that trained future collaborators of the Soviet state. To fight these negative stereotypes present in foreign media, the university repeatedly highlighted its technical and pedagogical superiority. In the public sphere Soviet education offered at UDN was presented as similar or superior in comparison with Western education in terms of the material, technological and pedagogical conditions provided for foreign students, but different in its values that promoted solidarity, friendship and altruistic help in sharing its knowledge.

Sharing knowledge and materials of the Soviet Union meant providing modern educational technology and convenient study spaces for the students of UDN. Technical equipment was connected to modern pedagogical methods used at the university, thus

---

[7] "Universitet Druzhby Narodov," *Sovetskie profsoiuzi* 8/1960, 12.
[8] In his memoirs from UDN published in London, William Anti-Taylor describes in detail the allegedly low academic level of the university. William Anti-Taylor, *Moscow Diary* (London: Robert Hale, 1967), 39-41. However, this image alleviated after the 1960s, and for instance The New York Times suggested in 1980 that the most blatant comments about the university did not correspond to reality, even though ideology was present in the education process of UDN students. Craig R. Whitney, "Lumumba U: Is it a Soviet Tool?," *The New York Times* 6.1.1980.

stressing the effectiveness of the learning processes in an environment bringing together latest technological and pedagogical expertise: "Modern technological means of education – tape recorders, films and slides, electronic examiners and tutors – are widely used at the university".[9] Through this focus on modernity both in the study processes and in the classrooms and laboratories, the university created a new vision of socialism that highlighted advancements in Soviet science and technology. UDN students would experience Soviet innovation, which had produced rising living standards under socialism. This self-presentation emphasized that socialism was capable to generate such transformations and created a symbolic space for displaying aspects Soviet modernity.[10] This public image of UDN was a representation of the Soviet state, a technologically superior modern nation.[11]

This narrative of modernity was highlighted by UDN's location in Moscow, the capital city that had been promoted since the Stalinist times as the capital of all working people of the world and embodiment of the cultural superiority of the USSR.[12] The new university was located in the center of a new kind of modern and socialist society, allowing the students to absorb this atmosphere. The city of Moscow had an important role in the education process of the students with its theaters, libraries, research institutions and other locations that demonstrated the most advanced form of "Soviet reality". The cultural establishments highlighted another important factor of Soviet

---

[9] Brochure *Moscow Friendship University* [in English] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov, ca. 1975), 20.

[10] Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge", 255. On Soviet modernity, see: Michael David-Fox, *Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015).

[11] Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin*, 60. On public diplomacy and Soviet promotional publications, see also: Rósa Magnúsdóttir, "Mission Impossible? Selling Soviet Socialism to Americans, 1955–58," in *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, ed. by Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht & M. C. Donfried (New York & Oxford: Berghahn, 2010), 59-60.

[12] For more on Moscow and its special position within the Soviet Union, see: Anne E. Gorsuch, *All This is Your World: Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad after Stalin.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 36.

public image towards foreign audiences: its superiority in several fields of culture, such as literature, theatre, fine arts, classical music and ballet.

This image of both technological and cultural superiority was both attractive and familiar to potential future students of UDN living around the globe. A Sri Lankan student remembered that Soviet technological advancement and especially the launch of Sputnik made him "incredibly interested" in Soviet science and motivated him to study electrical engineering and later build a career in aviation engineering.[13] For others, Soviet cultural products were more important in gaining a positive image about the country. An Argentinian alumna remembered how she started dreaming about studies in the Soviet Union at the age of 15 after reading five times Iuri Trifonov's novel *Students* about everyday life of students at Moscow State University.[14]

Promoting UDN through media and networking

Khrushchev's announcement about establishment of UDN raised great interest both domestically and internationally, especially among leftist circles. Thus, it was important for the university not to lose this interest, but to maintain it through active communication with different partners both through media and personal contacts. During the first two months of activities, the university received 455 foreign correspondents from 72 countries.[15] In addition, the rector and other high-level university administrative staff gave interviews on both foreign and national radio, TV, and the press.[16] Soviet administration relied on different media channels to spread information. The advertisements of the first application round were published in Soviet

---

[13] "Voices from Russia's Cold War 'friendship' university", BBC, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/8498904.stm, accessed 28.10.2020.

[14] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

[15] Numeric information from the permanent exhibition of RUDN museum, visited in March 2018.

[16] GARF f.5451, o.45, d.1543, 93.

press and the "progressive" international press. Information was also spread through Soviet embassies, TASS, Soviet international radio programs, local press, and local organizations working in developing countries.[17] International contacts of UDN were an important part of the efforts to promote knowledge about the institution abroad. During the first year of the university's activities, representatives of UDN visited countries such as Ecuador, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Ceylon, and Nepal.[18] Soviet organizations of friendship and solidarity assisted in spreading the word about UDN and 12 000 leaflets describing the application process were printed in English, French, Spanish, Arabic, Japanese and Indonesian to promote the first application round.[19]

However, the most important method of promoting the university was receiving international delegations to UDN. Most of them consisted of foreign state officials, such as ministers, staff of foreign embassies located in Moscow, leadership of foreign friendship organizations and leftist parties, as well as faculty of foreign universities. Discussions with these delegations often concerned state of higher education in different countries around the world, details of admissions and education processes at UDN, as well as recommendations of students to be admitted to the university. Many members of the official delegations also conducted private talks with the rector and other high-level staff members to get their younger relatives or family members a place at the university. For instance, 140 delegations from 55 countries visited the university during academic year 1961-1962 and most of them had discussions on student admissions on their agenda.[20] In other words, besides public promotion of the university, private and

---

[17] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.294, 102-104.
[18] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.294, 102-104.
[19] GARF f.5451, o.45, d.1543, 93.
[20] TsMAM, f.P-3061, o.1 d.81, 6-7, 11-12.

personal contacts were an important part of the process of choosing new students since very beginning of UDN activities.

In 1964, UDN rector Rumiantsev noted in a speech the importance of these visiting delegations for student recruitment and maintaining contacts with communist parties in different regions, in this case Africa:

> *Numerous delegations have visited the university, all of them noting the enormous importance of our university, as well as the enormous difficulties that stand in front of the university: to demonstrate friendship towards more than 80 nations. Situation at the university is inextricably connected to the situation in Africa itself and the communist parties of these countries.[21]*

The excerpt highlights the highly political nature of UDN student recruitment and international networks that was contradictory to the public image of non-ideological education presented both for Soviet and foreign audiences. "Demonstrating friendship" to more than 80 nations in practice meant not only altruistic sharing of knowledge and technology, but attempts to influence or at least gain knowledge about the political situation in Africa, which is demonstrated through direct connections between local communist parties and the university. The university would also directly reach out to foreign organizations not only asking them to spread information about UDN and study opportunities in the USSR in general, but also to gain information about the political moods at the grass-root level of different countries.

For the potential students themselves contacts with current and previous students were a major source of information about life in the Soviet Union and the university. The students of UDN had an active role in promoting the university for new potential students during their holidays in the homeland. This kind of approach to encourage

---

[21] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.25, 1.

common people to share their impressions about the Soviet Union was used in several fields of Soviet public diplomacy.[22] The story of a student from Mauritius published in *Druzhba* in 1962 shows the enthusiasm related to students visiting home and the possibilities for spreading the word about UDN, though the narrative also highlights the general attitudes visible in the local media concerning the USSR:

> *When everyone found out about my arrival, during the first few days there was not even time for eating. I had to tell everyone about the life in the USSR, the university, studies, Soviet people, and everything. Because there were so many interested people, I had to give speeches in press conferences, demonstrations, and meetings. The local newspapers reacted by writing that "Moscow is at our gates!" and that I had been "brainwashed"![23]*

Despite the scripted and edited nature of this comment, it repeats themes present in other archival material. Students who spent their holidays in their home countries were expected and encouraged to actively promote their university both in personal discussions and in the local "progressive" media to recruit new students. Same strategy of student recruitment was used in the 1920s, when active students of Soviet international universities and other political activists based in the USSR were of major importance in recruiting new students.[24] While the article in *Druzhba* mentioned the general negative attitudes towards studies in the Soviet Union, the main message to UDN students was that of enthusiasm and interest towards the university globally,

---

[22] Rósa Magnúsdóttir has noted that in the mid-1950s even American tourists were considered a valuable source of "true information" about the Soviet Union among their compatriots. Magnúsdóttir, "Mission Impossible?", 50.

[23] *Druzhba* 29.9.1962, 2.

[24] For example, recruitment of American blacks to the Communist University for the Toilers of the East [KUTV] in 1925 was done by a single activist who returned to the United States to choose students among the communist party members. McClellan, "Black Hajj to Red Mecca", 63-64. On international contacts and cooperation between CPSU and other communist parties around the globe, see also: Steve Smith, "The Russian Revolution, National Self-Determination, and Anti-Imperialism, 1919-1927," in *Left Transnationalism: The Communist International and the National, Colonial, and Racial Questions*, ed. Oleksa Drachewych and Ian McKay (Montreal: McGill University Press, 2019), 73-98.

which was meant to encourage all students visiting their home countries during holiday times to actively participate in student recruitment.

Personal contacts both at the level of official delegations visiting the university and at the level of students themselves spreading information about the university to their compatriots were important forms of recruiting new students and spreading the word about the university. At the same time, these activities served as methods to gather information about political moods in different countries. While establishment of UDN was a very visible event in leftist media, mainstream media did not play a significant role in spreading the word about study opportunities at UDN. Instead, it seems that the students who wanted to study in the Soviet Union received information mostly through leftist media, personal contacts, or local political organizations. For the offspring and relatives of political elites, negotiations that took place during visits of high-level delegations often opened doors of the university.

Student selection

The application and selection processes of new students for UDN were complicated, taking place at several stages, and significantly different for potential foreign and Soviet students. Especially in the beginning of the university's activities, the flow of applications was a challenge for the university administration. During the 1960s the university developed more efficient processes for going through the applications. In some cases this happened in cooperation with local state administrations in the target countries, while in others the university chose its students independently, accepting even candidates that were persona non grata in their own countries. Student selection was a process that was actively discussed, as it was seen as the main source of problems during the students' stay in the Soviet Union. Selecting unsuccessful candidates affected

both the educational and ideological goals of the university, as annually the class of new students included both candidates with low educational level and with anti-Soviet political mindsets. Despite the attempts to improve the situation, these problems persisted. The situation stabilized in the 1970s as new students were increasingly selected in cooperation with local state administrations in the target countries.

General Soviet policies of receiving students from the developing world

The Soviet government sought to select prospective foreign students to Soviet universities primarily according to their family background or social origin. Students from the developing world were selected according to specified quotas, where a clear majority of placements was given to students from lower social classes. Thus, social background was clearly more emphasized than academic achievement. The Soviet government's purpose was to strengthen alliance with workers and leaders of local leftist political movements to promote their status and political power within their countries.[25] The number of students from the developing world in the USSR grew throughout the 1960s and approximately half of these students arrived from socialist countries, most importantly Vietnam, Mongolia and Cuba.[26]

Most Soviet universities got their foreign students through scholarship programs based on bilateral agreements and programs of leftist international organizations, such as the International Union of Students or the World Federation of Democratic Youth.[27] In addition, central committees of Soviet youth and women's organizations and trade unions, as well as UN-organizations such as UNESCO and IAEA gave out scholarships

---

[25] Natalia Tsvetkova, "International Education during the Cold War: Soviet Social Transformation and American Social Reproduction," *Comparative Education Review* 52, no. 2 (2008): 203-204.

[26] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.395, 1.

[27] Both were considered leftist organizations. For example, Ugandan student Andrew Richard Amar notes in his memoirs that the IUS was "controlled by the Russians". Andrew Richard Amar, *A Student in Moscow* (London: Ampersand, 1961), 7.

for students to pursue their studies in the Soviet Union. These organizations were officially independent from the state and allocated their stipends based on their own interests, so even students who were not allowed to leave their countries could receive a scholarship from one of the organizations, while they were not eligible for state-to-state scholarships. From 1964 onwards state-sponsored scholarships for foreign students provided by the Ministry of Higher and Special Education were the most typical method of entering Soviet universities, as their number was doubled compared to the scholarships offered by societal organizations.[28]

This system gave the Soviet Union significant flexibility to choose the students for its universities, but also highlights the scattered nature of cooperation: several international and Soviet organizations gave out scholarships, each with their own local contacts in the developing world and different guidelines for choosing potential students. In practice this meant that the system was complex and relied heavily on Soviet contacts with different international and local organizations. The functionality and reliability of these contacts was an issue constantly harming the cooperation. These features were also present in the student selection process of UDN.

UDN international student selection

In the 1960s UDN was the only institution in the country that chose its students independently through university committee, compared to the other institutions having little to say about the students that were sent to them by different Soviet organizations or bilateral agreements.[29] This practice highlighted the specific position UDN had

---

[28] 1963 the Ministry of Education gave out 568 scholarships, while the organizations provided 368 scholarships. In 1964 the numbers were 1151 for the Ministry and 402 for the organizations. Constantin Katsakioris, "Transferts Est-Sud. Échanges éducatifs et formation de cadres africains en Union soviétique pendant les années soixante," *Outre-mers* 94, no.354-355 (2007): 95.

[29] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.395, 3-4; Julie Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow: Race, Politics, and the Cold War," *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 47, no. 1-2 (2006): 41; Constantin Katsakioris, "Creating a

among other Soviet institutions of higher education, as it demonstrated the seemingly non-ideological nature of education offered. Even though different organizations had a major role in recommending students for UDN, it was also possible for individuals to apply without recommendations from local organizations, and approximately 20% of new students were chosen every year out of this group of applications. The practice of student selection changed in the 1970s with the majority of students arriving through bilateral agreements, which demonstrated wider changes in the position of UDN in the Soviet field of higher education.

Interest towards the university was great since the very beginning, which created a huge flow of applications to Moscow for the quota of 600 new students. For the first application round in 1960, UDN received altogether 44 000 letters and other documents expressing interest to study from 62 countries in 20 languages.[30] Altogether over 1000 applications arrived from the capitalist countries of Europe and America, and over 2000 from the socialist countries, especially from Romania, China, and Korea.[31] As the desired profile of future students was not clearly defined in the first public statements, applications arrived also from countries that were not included in the student body of the institution. Later the university defined its target group more clearly: it welcomed students from non-socialist[32] countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who were under 35 years of age and had attended high school. Other factors, such as religious or political affiliations, did not officially matter in the selection process.

The process of choosing the first group of students was chaotic, with thousands of applications arriving to Moscow even in autumn, when studies of the first cohort of

---

Socialist Intelligentsia: Soviet Educational Aid and its Impact on Africa, 1960-1991," *Cahiers d'études africaines* 226 (2017): 264-265.
[30] TsMAM f.P-3061, o.1, d.2, 28.
[31] GARF f. 5451, o.45, d.1543, 93.
[32] The only exception to this rule was Cuba, as in the early 1960s UDN welcomed also Cuban students.

students had already started. 14 000 applications arrived by the end of July, which made the process of selecting students complicated and rapid, as the academic year was supposed to start in September.[33] The admissions office tried to check all the contact details and recommendations of each applicant, which required numerous attempts to contact local communist parties and other organizations in different countries.[34] As a result of this work, the first group of 539 students from 59 foreign countries accompanied by 57 Soviet students were able to start their studies in the beginning of October 1960.[35] There had been approximately 70-80 applications for each study placement with Indian students forming the largest group of students among the first cohort of UDN students.[36]

As numbers from following years demonstrate, the university continued to raise great interest around the world, but the first intake's over 40 000 applications were clearly an exception compared to the situation only a few years later. For example, for the academic year 1962-1963 UDN had an intake quota of 600 international and 100 Soviet students. That year the university received over 6000 foreign applications[37], out of which 4000 applications from 63 countries fulfilled the set requirements and were presented to the university committee. 782 applicants were chosen for studies, and 657 of them were able to send their documents on time and receive an invitation to

---

[33] GARF f. 5451, o. 45, d.1543, 198.

[34] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.1, 4-7.

[35] V.N. Nikitin, *Universitet Druzhby: Kratkii ocherk poluvekovoi istorii* (Moscow: Rossiiskii Universitet Druzhby Narodov, 2010), 11.

[36] Archival documents concerning the number of applicants in 1960 vary apparently due to the continuous flow of applications arriving. GARF f.5451, o.45, d.1543, 86-90. The requirements for choosing students were very similar to the ones that were used for choosing students from the Eastern bloc countries already during late Stalinism, as Rachel Applebaum has noted on her research concerning the Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship project. Rachel Applebaum, *Empire of Friends: Soviet Power and Socialist Internationalism in Cold War Czechoslovakia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), 54.

[37] The number of applications varied from one year to another, for example in 1963-1964 the university received 9000 applications.

Moscow.[38] Still, the image of tens of thousands of applications flowing to Moscow was widely used by the university to promote the image of its popularity and importance.

Preliminary student selection for UDN was done differently in different geographical areas. In Latin America, most students were selected based on recommendations from the local communist parties. In the Arab countries and Africa, the practice was more mixed, as the students were selected based on recommendations of a variety of different actors, such as local socialist and national-liberational parties and workers' unions.[39] In certain cases the university cooperated with local state administrations in student admissions. In Asia and certain African countries, the local state administration was an active member in committees selecting new students in cooperation with Soviet embassies.[40]

This system that was put in place in 1960 experienced changes throughout the years that significantly lessened the independence of UDN in student selections. By 1965, the international section of the Central Committee of CPSU had set student quotas for each country and UDN made student selections based on these quotas in cooperation with local organizations and Soviet embassies.[41] In the early 1970s the system was changed again, as stress was put on choosing students from workers' and farmers' families through bilateral negotiations, simultaneously reducing the amount students selected based on personal requests.[42] The changing position of UDN reflected the expansion of state-to-state connections, through which majority of scholarships to Soviet universities were distributed in the 1970s. [43] Foreign states placed relations with Soviet

[38] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.294, 104-105.
[39] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 24-27.
[40] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 24-27.
[41] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.177, 1-6.
[42] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.63, 146.
[43] Katsakioris, "Creating a Socialist Intelligentsia", 266.

organizations under their strict control and insisted to allocate scholarships for state universities, sending only a small number of students to UDN, thus reflecting their will to control and monitor students during their stay in the USSR as well as the negative reputation UDN possessed in many countries.[44] At the same time, UDN's position as the leading Soviet institution for educating foreign students from the developing world diminished. By the end of 1960s only 10% of new students from non-socialist countries of the developing world started their studies at UDN as the number of institutions receiving foreign students grew with relatively small numbers of foreign students studying in each institution.[45]

UDN's international student body did not experience significant changes despite the efforts to improve the selection process. In general, over half of the students came from worker or peasant families. However, a significant proportion of students especially from India and Africa came from "bourgeois" families, which caused criticism within the university administration. Approximately half of the student population were members of communist or national-democratic parties in their countries of origin and all students arriving to the Soviet Union were screened by the KGB to detect extremist tendencies. Members of the most extreme movements, such as the Muslim Brotherhood, were not let into the country.[46] Despite the promotion of gender equality in the Soviet public sphere, UDN was a very male-dominated community. In the early 1960s only approximately 10% of the foreign students were female and by the late 1970s their proportion had risen to approximately 15%. Most of these foreign female students came

---

[44] Constantin Katsakioris, "Afrikanskie studenty v SSSR. Utcheba i politika vo vremia dekolonizatsii*," Ezhegodnik sotsial'noi istorii* (2008), 218, 226.

[45] Already in the late 1960s, international students were studying in 204 different universities across the Soviet Union. RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.127, 40-44.

[46] TsAODM f.P-4, o. 165 d.31, 13-14; Konstantin Smirnov, "Delo Shakala: Poltora goda himii," *Kommersant Vlast* 23.12.1997, https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/14005, accessed 4.11.2020.

from Latin America, despite the Soviet efforts to encourage especially the African states to send female students to the USSR. Thus, it seems that this imbalanced gender dynamic was mostly a result of political organizations in the developing world recommending mostly male students for studies abroad, reflecting the gender roles present in the target countries.

Different ways of selecting foreign students both for UDN and other Soviet universities demonstrate how the Soviet administration was ready to adjust to requirements of its partners and be flexible in choosing the partners of cooperation. In some cases, the Soviet authorities cooperated with foreign non-socialist state administrations, which was especially case in the 1970s with the rising importance of state-to-state contacts, while in others their partners were underground and even illegal political organizations, which was typical for the early 1960s. These varying contacts with different partners demonstrate the changes in Soviet foreign policy. However, the overall goal of student selection remained the same throughout the years: to find both ideologically and intellectually suitable candidates to study in the USSR to reach the long-term goal of creating new elites, global networks and political change on the grass-root level of the post-colonial states.

Choosing Soviet UDN students

The proportion of Soviet students at UDN varied drastically from the approximately 10% in the first years to more a third in the 1970s, which was explained through the need to enhance ideological work among foreign students and support them in learning Russian.[47] Until mid-1960s most of the candidates for the quota of 100 Soviet students

---

[47] In 1978 there were 3590 international and 2270 Soviet students at the Peoples' Friendship University. TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.55, 86. The quota of new Soviet students for academic year 1970-1971 stated that only 20 out of the 600 new Soviet students at UDN were expected to be female. This equals 3,3% of the overall quota. The female students were placed to study mathematics, physics, chemistry, and

were invited to UDN from other Soviet universities. Successful candidates had to possess at least two years of work experience and good knowledge of foreign languages.[48] They were expected to be members of Komsomol or CPSU, and present recommendations from the republic or city level committees of these organizations together with their applications. Most importantly, the Soviet students were required to have good abilities to combine university studies to active societal work with the international students. In practice this meant helping the foreigners learn Russian, learning about foreign countries and cultures for the benefit of their future professions as Soviet specialists of the developing world, and reporting about the international students' activities to Komsomol.[49]

The guidelines of UDN admission required Soviet students to be chosen from different parts of the Soviet Union. For the academic year 1961-1962 the quota of 100 new Soviet students was shared between Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Caucasus, Central Asia, the Baltic states, and Moldova.[50] In reality, 83 of the 100 new Soviet students that started their studies at UDN in autumn 1961 were from Russia, most of them either from the city of Moscow or the region [oblast] surrounding it. Many regions listed in the

---

Russian language, while all other fields received only male Soviet students. In reality, approximately 20% of Soviet students were female. RGASPI f.M-1, o.38, d.286, 214-215; RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 29. The situation reflects avoiding the possibility of Soviet female students marrying foreign males and emigrating, which was considered highly undesirable behavior. Marriages and other human relations within the university community are discussed more in detail in chapter 5.

[48] The requirement concerning work experience was based on Khrushchev's 1958 education reform that gave priority in admission to higher education to students with practical work experience. The law required 80% of the newly admitted students to have at least two years of work experience or to be demobilized servicemen of the armed forces. These quotas were problematic, as most universities experienced great difficulties in recruiting students that would fill the requirements of work experience and at the same time have the capabilities required for studies in the higher education. Laurent Coumel, "The Scientist, the Pedagogue and the Party Official. Interest Groups, Public Opinion and Decision-Making in the 1958 Education Reform," in *Soviet State and Society Under Nikita Khrushchev*, ed. by Melanie Ilic and Jeremy Smith (London: Routledge, 2009), 67-69, 71; Benjamin Tromly, *Making the Soviet Intelligentsia: Universities and Intellectual Life under Stalin and Khrushchev* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 164-171.

[49] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 1.

[50] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 60.

guidelines, including all Baltic and Caucasus states, did not send any students to the university.[51] Positioning of Russians as "the first among equals" within the Soviet multi-national state is thus present in the Soviet student population of UDN. Creating a student body in which an overwhelming majority of Soviet students were Russian demonstrated the position of UDN as a university located in Moscow, where the students were expected to learn from the most developed form of socialism together with their Russian peers.[52] Other regions of the USSR and their inhabitants mostly served a role of portraying socialist development in progress.

Fast growth of the university and the need for more efficient ideological work was visible in the growing quotas for Soviet students. While in the beginning of 1960s only 100 Soviet students were admitted annually to UDN, for the academic year 1966-1967 the plan was already made for 630 Soviet students, 200 of them from Moscow, with smaller quotas for other regions of Russia and other Soviet states. At this point the Soviet army was also given a quota to send students to UDN.[53] Since the early 1970s, Soviet students entered UDN either through entrance examinations or preparatory courses, which had been introduced in 1969 to prepare students from working class backgrounds for university studies to fulfill the quotas set for Soviet students. Students from preparatory courses were more often CPSU members and politically better prepared than the ones coming through entrance examination system, so introducing

---

[51] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 31.

[52] Terry Martin, *The Affirmative Action Empire. Nations and Nationality in the Soviet Union, 1923–1939* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001), 442-443, 452-453, 457, 461. The situation was contradictory to previous experiences of intercultural communication, as in 1950s and 1960s Soviet Central Asian citizens were in many cases used as mediators of Soviet foreign policy in the Middle East. See: Masha Kirasirova, "'Sons of Muslims' in Moscow: Soviet Central Asian Mediators to the Foreign East, 1955-1962," *Ab Imperio* 4 (2011): 106-132. On experiences of Central Asian and Caucasian Soviet citizens in Moscow in 1960s and 1970s, see: Jeff Sahadeo, "Soviet 'Blacks' and Place Making in Leningrad and Moscow," *Slavic Review* 71 no. 2 (2012): 331-358.

[53] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.368, 90.

preparatory courses as a method of entering the university carried political meaning.[54]
Achieving a study placement through an entrance exam was a more competitive method
than the preparatory courses. In general, there were approximately three candidates per
one study place in the entrance examinations, but for some fields there was very little
competition.[55] Thus, during the 1970s, the Soviet army and Moscow city quotas were
often not filled.[56] These problems with Soviet student recruitment did not mean that
UDN was not an attractive institution. However, as strict requirements for
recommendations from CPSU or Komsomol were not compromised in the application
process, they often efficiently prevented young Soviet citizens who were motivated to
study at UDN from doing so.[57]

The changing norms of selecting Soviet UDN students reflect the changes happening in
selection processes of foreign UDN students and the realities of everyday life at the
university. As more and more foreign students arrived through bilateral agreements and
not through recommendations of political organizations, the proportion of Soviet
students at the university was increased and their ideological competency was stressed,
as the quota for Soviet army and introduction of preparatory courses for politically
active Soviet candidates demonstrate. These were attempts to improve results of
ideological work carried out within the university community by Soviet students. A
larger proportion of ideologically and politically competent Soviet students in the

---

[54] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.20, 134.
[55] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.63, 40.
[56] In spring 1972 the army was expected to send 400 candidates to the preliminary exams, but only 234 candidates arrived, out of which 111 passed the exams, and finally only 88 started their studies. Altogether the university was able to choose 342 new Soviet students, even though the quota was much larger. RGASPI f.M-1, o.38, d.286, 214-215. In 1970-1971 more than half of the Soviet students came from families of officials, while approximately 25-30% came from workers' families and less than 10% from kolkhoz workers' families. In 1975, the number of students from workers' families had raised to 47%, which was on an equal level with the number of students from officials' families. GARF f.9606, o. 1, d.4561, 1-4; GARF f.9606 o.1, d.6592, 2-5.
[57] Correspondence with Russian informant, 2017.

student community also meant that it was more difficult for the foreign students to isolate themselves from Soviet students and spend time exclusively with their compatriots or other foreigners, which would not only improve the foreign students' skills in Russian, but also familiarize them more effectively with the Soviet society, both of which were of major importance for reaching the ideological goals set for university activities.

Traveling and arriving in Moscow

Once an international student was chosen to study at UDN, there were still many practical and bureaucratic obstacles to overcome. Especially in the 1960s many countries refused to give passports to individuals who wanted to travel to Soviet Union for studies. In addition to problems related to travel documents, travel connections were complicated and relied heavily on cooperation between the university, Soviet embassies abroad and commercial actors, such as airlines. Communication between these different actors caused delays in the transportation process and affected educational work of UDN since the very beginning of the students' education path, as a significant proportion of students could reach Moscow only late in the autumn, which made it difficult to organize studies at the preparatory faculty.

Bureaucratic and practical difficulties

Difficult conditions in the countries of origin of students were visible in the applications as well as cancellations of them. In certain cases, people who had already been rewarded a study place in the Soviet Union were killed before they were able to leave their countries. In these cases, new scholarship recipients were named through accelerated proceedings. Some students also experienced accidents that prevented them from leaving. Losing documents in fires or thefts were typical reasons for potential students

to be forced to cancel their applications.[58] Practical issues of minor scale also appeared, as many potential students experienced problems in getting legalized copies of their documents and delivering them on time due to the unreliability of postal services.[59]

Several countries tried to restrict the students from leaving to study in the USSR. In many cases the students that openly stated their desire to study in the Soviet Union were experiencing difficulties in getting passports that would allow them to travel abroad.[60] In 1963, a prospective student from Zanzibar wrote a letter stating that studying in the Soviet Union was seen very negatively from the side of the colonial administration that took passports away from anyone who planned to study in a socialist country. Even in the case that the person cancelled his plans to study abroad, he was under a threat, facing a risk of losing his job.[61] In another case an Ethiopian student was expelled from an American college based in Ethiopia after he had openly talked about his plans to continue his studies in the Soviet Union.[62]

UDN was considered as an especially difficult case, as it was seen as an institution of ideological indoctrination with low academic level. The Western media depicted UDN a ghetto for colored students, pointing out that separating non-European students into their own institution was a sign of Soviet racism and segregation, while the isolation of a separate campus provided an ideal environment for indoctrination.[63] Certain countries, such as Morocco, refused to allow their students to enter UDN due to the reputation the institution had. The state administration of Tunisia also noted that while the educational

---

[58] RGASPI f. M-3, o.3, d.28, 290.
[59] RGASPI f. M-3, o.3, d.28, 403.
[60] RGASPI f. M-3, o.3, d.28, 406.
[61] RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.28, 707-710.
[62] RGASPI f. M-3, o.3, d.28, 672.
[63] Constantin Katsakioris, "The Lumumba University in Moscow: Higher education for a Soviet-Third World alliance, 1960-91," *Journal of Global History* 14, no. 2 (2019): 290; Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge", 244.

level of Tunisian students was on a European level, UDN was catering to ill-prepared African students.[64] These comments demonstrate the ways in which the Soviet stress on friendship among peoples was seen in a negative context as aid for poorly educated students from the developing world, a category where certain target countries of UDN did not want to place themselves.

Soviet embassies also received official complaints from local state administrations concerning students that were granted scholarships to study in the Soviet Union against the will of their countries. In 1963, the Nigerian Ministry of Foreign Affairs blamed the Soviet Union for giving scholarships to Nigerian students that had reached the Soviet Union through a third country, without passports granted by the Nigerian administration. The Soviet officials responded that they support the Nigerian government in all issues concerning Nigerian citizens studying in the Soviet Union, but no concrete action was taken to return the students in question to Nigeria.[65] The same complaint was repeated in 1964, when 25 Nigerian students arrived to the USSR without permission from the Nigerian administration.[66] A similar case took place concerning a Cambodian student who had arrived to the Soviet Union on a tourist visa and applied to UDN independently while already in the country. He started his studies at the university despite the comment of the Soviet embassy in Phnom Penh stating that such actions could be harmful to Soviet development projects in Cambodia. The Soviet Ministry of Higher and Special Education also received a comment from the Cambodian Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the student in question was declined the permission to study abroad and it was thus

---

[64] Katsakioris, "Transferts Est-Sud", 94-95; Constantin Katsakioris, "Soviet Lessons for Arab Modernization: Soviet Educational Aid to Arab Countries after 1956," *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no.1 (2010), 97-98.

[65] RGASPI f. M-2, o.3, d.28, 531. Kwame Nkrumah's and Madibo Keita's administrations provided Ghanaian and Malian passports to Nigerian students that had been invited to study in the Soviet Union. Katsakioris, "Creating a Socialist Intelligentsia", 266.

[66] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.129, 33-34.

indefensible that the Soviet Union had granted a state-funded scholarship for such a student.[67]

Problems related to students' possibilities to accept an offer to study at UDN reveal a variety of practical and political issues related to the process. While the harsh conditions present in certain countries of the developing world prevented students from traveling to the USSR, UDN possessed a special position compared to other Soviet universities as its activities were commented and criticized especially actively in foreign media. While negative media presence influenced local attitudes, general political atmosphere in the target countries, and state of bilateral relations with the Soviet Union were also visible in reactions concerning foreign students aiming for university studies in the USSR. Heated negotiations taking place on the highest levels of Soviet foreign policy administration concerning opportunities of individual students to be admitted to UDN demonstrate the political role of the institution.

Traveling to Moscow

Soviet administration covered travel expenses of new students and tickets were distributed through Soviet embassies abroad. However, the embassies' work was in many cases inefficient, which prevented students from arriving to Moscow on time to start their studies. The situation was the most difficult in the early 1960s. In the academic year 1961-1962 approximately 15 000 international students from 106 countries were studying in the Soviet Union, over 10 000 of them from the socialist countries. The Ministry of Higher and Special Education noted that all students from socialist countries had arrived in the Soviet Union in time to start their studies, while the Soviet embassies in the developing world and embassies of target countries in the

---

[67] GARF f. 9606, o. 2, d.98, 85-88.

Soviet Union were not able to even provide the number of new students beforehand, not to mention their names or desired specializations. For instance, from Mali the Soviet Union was expecting five new students through cultural exchange programs and 20 new students for UDN, but by the end of the year already 85 new students had arrived in the Soviet Union.[68] The students' arrival throughout the year made work of preparatory faculties difficult and thus complicated educational work of Soviet universities since the beginning of the students' stay in the USSR.

The situation with student transportation was especially complicated in the first years of UDN's activities. In 1960, only 39 out of the 556 new students had arrived in Moscow by the end of September. In addition, 127 were expected to arrive soon and only 6 students had informed that they were not able to come.[69] The situation had improved only little in autumn 1961: out of the 720 new students of UDN that were invited to Moscow, only 446 had been able to arrive there by mid-September, when the academic year and courses had started in the beginning of the month. Some of the students were only able to arrive in November, which naturally had a negative impact on their studies. The best travel connections were established for students from Western Africa and Latin America due to a reliable contract with Air France. From Cuba and Japan, the new students were transported to the USSR by ship to save foreign currency.[70] However, in 1964, UDN administration noted again that by the beginning of September 16,5% of the new students from different parts of the world were missing and by the beginning of October more than 10% of the new students were still on their way to Moscow.[71]

[68] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.869, 3-6.
[69] GARF f.5451, o.45, d.1543, 97, 126.
[70] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 30.
[71] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.355, 74.

There were numerous cases of students having to wait for tickets to the USSR for months, while the Soviet embassies in their countries were unwilling to help them. To illustrate the situation, a Nigerian student had traveled to Cairo in 1962 to get his visa and tickets to the USSR, but the Soviet embassy in Cairo was not aware of his scholarship and turned him away. While seeking help from the Nigerian embassy in Cairo, the student's passport was taken away from him and he was returned to Nigeria.[72] In autumn 1963 a group of Nigerian students was transported from Lagos to Moscow in cooperation of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Aeroflot, and the Soviet embassy in Nigeria. The goal was that all 45 Nigerian students would have arrived in Moscow by September 1. The first attempts to contact the Soviet embassy in Nigeria received no answers, so the ministry negotiated with Aeroflot for the transportation to take place on September 15. As this note received no answer either, Aeroflot sent a telegram to the Soviet embassy in Nigeria on September 23 and received an answer stating that the students would be ready in two weeks. On October 10, the embassy informed that the desired date of travel would be October 18. When the plane had already arrived in Nigeria, Aeroflot received another telegram from the embassy asking to postpone the arrival of the plane to October 22 because the students were not ready. Finally, on October 23, 11 out of the 45 scholarship holders arrived in Moscow and the embassy requested to send a new plane for the remaining 34 students. Altogether the whole episode cost 26 597 rubles, when tickets for 11 students on a regular flight would have cost 4136 rubles.[73]

By the late 1960s, the cooperation with Soviet embassies had somewhat improved. An UDN report from 1968 noted that since 1966 most students arrived already in August,

---

[72] RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.28, 674-678.
[73] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.98, 79-80.

which allowed the academic year to start on time.[74] Still, it was only in 1973 when all new students of UDN arrived in Moscow on time and could start their studies at the beginning of September.[75] The lengthy discussions found in the archives concerning practical issues such as transportation highlight the dependence of Soviet state administration on the network of Soviet embassies abroad as well as difficulties in communication between these different actors. Overall, the processes of transporting students serve as an example of different levels of Soviet cooperation, from ideological goals to practical issues and negotiation with different partners, from university level to the highest levels of Soviet foreign policy administration. At the same time, the problems related to travel were harming the work of preparatory faculties and thus the entire Soviet education project.

First days at UDN

Upon arrival to Moscow, the foreign students were met at the airport by UDN volunteers and escorted to their dormitories, but also encountered the first attempts of ideological characterization. In summer 1965, UDN had 18 volunteers to receive 18 groups of students, altogether approximately 1500 people. Out of these volunteers, only six spoke any foreign languages. Once at the dormitory, they conducted group discussions in French and English with the students on topics such as Komsomol, student life, religion in the USSR, education in the USSR, and UDN.[76] The instructions for volunteers stated that they should aim to find out the language skills of the new students, their attitude towards the USSR, their political sympathies, their religious background, and their societal position, such as tribe or caste.[77] This information was important in preventing

---

[74] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.143, 8-9.
[75] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.114, 68.
[76] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.394, 19-20.
[77] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.394, 6.

potential problems and identifying the students' political position and character since the very beginning of their stay in the Soviet Union. The student volunteers also reported this information to the Komsomol. In other words, it was important to start ideological work with the students as soon as they arrived in the Soviet Union.

Due to the problems with transportation and the unclear number of students arriving, especially in the early 1960s there were not enough places in the dormitories, which caused both practical and ideological problems to the Soviet administration. New improvised dormitories were taken into use as more and more students arrived. The Ministry of Higher and Special Education noted in 1961 that these dormitories did not fulfill the standards set for them. A group of students that had arrived in Moscow was placed in an old sports hall, which had broken windows, was extremely dirty and full of old building materials and sports equipment.[78] The inadequate conditions caused harm to the overall education project and ideological work, when the deficiencies of the receiving socialist society were present to the students from the very first days after their arrival.

The varied backgrounds of students combined to their different expectations and difficulties faced during their journey to Moscow was a challenging starting point for the Soviet educational project. Most students had very vague understanding of the Soviet reality that was expecting them in Moscow.[79] They had in most cases read Soviet materials that promoted an idea of a smoothly-functioning, modern and technologically

---

[78] GARF f. 9606, o.1, d.869, 6-8.

[79] A similar problem had been present already with the students of socialist countries arriving to the Soviet Union during the 1950s. Already then Soviet authorities were expressing constant demands to prepare the students for the reality they were about to face in the USSR while they were still in their countries of origin. Patryk Babiracki, "Imperial Heresies: Polish Students in the Soviet Union, 1948-1957," *Ab Imperio* no.4 (2007): 224-225. Rósa Mágnusdóttir has found similar problems concerning American visitors to the USSR in the 1950s, as they were not impressed by what they saw in the socialist society and returned home disillusioned rather than eager to promote the Soviet cause at home. Magnúsdóttir, "Mission Impossible?", 66-67.

advanced socialist society. Thus, the problems related to transportation and accommodation did not provide a good first impression of the Soviet Union and could potentially lead to disillusionment with socialism. Due to varied level of connections with organizations recommending students for studies in the Soviet Union, their political views were sometimes contradictory to the Soviet Union. Moscow city Komsomol committee noted rather bluntly in 1962 that a certain percentage of the students chosen were always "useless, thieves, agents of foreign powers, or provocateurs".[80] However, for the majority of students, studies in the Soviet Union were a unique opportunity for social advancement and depending on their background, some students also experienced a positive cultural shock upon arrival. Almost 50 years after he first arrived in Moscow, a Pakistani UDN alumnus from a poor working-class family still held a very positive memory of his first experiences in the Soviet Union, as in his country of origin his family had lived in poverty:

> *I knew very little about the Soviet Union before arrival. The only things I knew came from books, documents, and a calendar I had received from the* [Soviet Union-Pakistan] *friendship society. I knew that it was a socialist country that was being built for the working class and so on. But how it really looked like, I had no idea. Before going to the Soviet Union, I had never left Pakistan. For me personally, compared to Pakistan the Soviet Union was paradise.[81]*

Varying educational background was one of the reasons the arriving students did not always have a clear understanding about the country in which they had decided to study. Even though the university administration aimed to choose only students that had finished high school, around 15-25% of new students each year had only unfinished high school studies in their educational background. [82] In the field of humanities most students knew only about the literature, culture, and history of their own country. Most

[80] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.310, 10.
[81] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.
[82] RGASPI f. M-1, o.46, d.294, 107.

of them had never heard of Shakespeare, Goethe, Balzac, Cervantes, or Pushkin. They did not know the capital cities of Great Britain, France or Spain and were not able to point the Atlantic or Pacific oceans on the map.[83] In 1961, the Ministry of Higher and Special Education noted that even in best cases the knowledge level of many African and Asian students in natural sciences and mathematics was equal to the level of classes 6-7 in the Soviet education system.[84] On the other hand, a rather small minority of arriving students had already finished the first year of university studies either in their country of origin or in the West. An example of the situation was the case of a Cameroonian student, who had previously studied in the universities of Bordeaux and Nantes but had been expelled due to his political activism. He was welcomed to continue his studies in the Soviet Union.[85] The students that had studied also in the West were actively used to promote the superiority of Soviet higher education in comparison to the Western one in the public sphere.

In addition to problems caused by uneven educational levels of the students, many students arriving in the Soviet Union were suffering from various health issues. Many of them were diagnosed with malaria, tuberculosis, and skin and venereal diseases. Some female students were 5-8 months pregnant when they arrived in the Soviet Union.[86] Especially many students arriving from Africa were so ill that they had to be taken to hospital straight from the airport. Some of the students were also deaf or handicapped. [87] To improve the situation, the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs constantly informed Soviet embassies located in the developing world about

---

[83] GARF f.5451, o. 45, d.1543, 62-63.
[84] GARF f.9606, o. 1, d.869, 13-14.
[85] RGASPI f. M-3, o. 3, d. 28, 292.
[86] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.869, 4.
[87] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.171, 30-32.

requirements concerning health certificates and diplomas from previous education, but these requests provided little results. [88]

Thus, upon the foreign students' arrival to the Soviet Union, the Soviet administration was faced by problems caused by their educational background, health, and in some cases political orientations. All these details demonstrate the difficulties in communications between different actors during the students' selection process. At times chaotic processes of students applying, traveling, and settling in UDN resulted in a very varied student population in which many students were politically unreliable, did not possess a sufficient background education for university studies, or were too ill to study effectively, which made both ideological and educational work with the students challenging. Problems encountered also put under question the idealized images of Soviet technological and social advancement present in the public sphere. Thus, one of the key factors suggested repeatedly by different administrative organs to improve the results of education process was to modify the student selection process. As the partners of Soviet cooperation changed from local political organizations to foreign state administrations, the problems present in the student selections of the 1960s were mostly solved due to the more stabilized nature of cooperation. However, this also changed the nature of cooperation as whole, moving from support to political organizations through education to providing opportunities for professional development to students that were selected by their own state administrations for studies abroad.

---

[88] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.171, 175-77.

3. Studying at UDN: Providing knowledge, promoting ideology

This chapter looks at the studies offered at UDN, concentrating on the role of ideology in the education process. Discussion on studies is separated into two parts: firstly, the first year(s) of studies in the preparatory faculty, which provided the foreign students basic knowledge of Russian language and necessary skills in other subjects to help them manage their future studies, and secondly, the following years spent in specialized faculties. The chapter argues that despite the public rhetoric of non-ideological education provided at UDN, ideological goals set for the education process were of major importance, which finally led to standardization of UDN study programs with those of other Soviet universities and more open promotion of ideology as part of Soviet higher education in the 1970s. While the educational goal of UDN was to train new specialists for the developing world, thus promoting the image of Soviet technological advancement and modernity globally, work towards the more vaguely defined ideological goals of the project of turning the students into "good friends" of the Soviet Union was enhanced through several reforms, most importantly by making courses of social sciences obligatory in 1968. Overall, the analysis concentrates on features of Soviet socialism as they were conveyed to students in different stages of their study paths and the practical problems connected to this process.

Preparatory faculty and learning Russian

Education taking place in the preparatory faculty consisted of diverse pedagogical processes and various challenges were connected to this work. As the preparatory faculty was the students' first experience of studying in the Soviet Union, its tasks ranged from preparing the students for life in Moscow, teaching them enough Russian

to be able to live and study in the Soviet Union, improving their knowledge on subjects needed for their studies, and providing information about the Soviet society and state ideology.[1] The first year of studies concentrated on teaching the students enough Russian so that they could start managing their everyday life independently as soon as possible. Later classes of Russian language were also added to the curriculum of the first and second year of studies in the specialized faculties to improve the language skills of students. During the spring semester of preparatory faculty the students had also lectures in Russian on subjects such as mathematics, physics, geography, literature, and history, depending on their future specialization, to compensate their educational background and to learn the specialized vocabulary of their field. The stated goal of studies in the preparatory faculty was that after one year of studies the students' knowledge and skills in these subjects would be on the same level with Soviet high school graduates. In addition, they were expected to gain good command of both written and spoken Russian and possess "a right kind of understanding of global political events".[2] At the same time, the Soviet students would study foreign languages, regional geography of the Soviet Union, physical education, and history of the CPSU during their year at the preparatory faculty.[3]

---

[1] A similar introductory program was in place also in other socialist states receiving students from abroad. As Barbora Buzássyová's analysis of the language preparation center of University of 17th November in Prague shows, the contents of the first-year studies in this department was most probably copied from similar Soviet programs created at Moscow State University and other Soviet universities since the 1950s. Barbora Buzássyová, "Repositioning of Czechoslovak Educational Strategies to the 'Least Developed Countries': The Rise and Decline of University of 17th November," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, ed. Ingrid Miethe & Jane Weiss (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020), 186.

[2] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.1022, 34.

[3] TsMAM f. P-3061, o.1, d.36, 36.

Learning Russian: practical and ideological aspects

The most important task of the preparatory faculty was to teach the foreign students Russian, and this process carried both practical and ideological meanings within itself. According to Soviet experts, as the Soviet Union would spread its global sphere of influence, world-wide interest towards Russian culture would develop and more people would study Russian. Accordingly, Russian would become a world language of international communication.[4] Thus, the students did not learn Russian only for practical purposes, but instead language education was planned to contain a wide spectrum of cultural topics, from classic Russian literature to everyday life in a socialist society, all of which served the goal of creating a personal relationship with the language and society, in other words, becoming a "good friend" of the Soviet Union. According to the Ministry of Higher and Special Education, classes of Russian language were the most important situations for ideological education to take place during the preparatory faculty. To support these ideological goals set for language education, the Ministry stressed the need to include materials of ideological contents to the language classes to not only teach the students structures of the language, but also the Soviet politics, ideology, and culture. In practice the Ministry repeatedly suggested to include articles from progressive newspapers to the materials used during Russian classes, as they would be useful study material for the students to practice their reading and learn new vocabulary. At the same time, these materials would provide information about political discussions taking place in the Soviet society and provide a Soviet point of view to developments taking place domestically and internationally.[5]

---

[4] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.1022, 5-6.
[5] RGASPI f. M-1, o.46, d.310, 48-49.

To be able to study subjects such as mathematics or geography after only half a year of studying Russian, the pace of language learning was swift and UDN put great effort to it. Foreign students of UDN had some of the best instructors of Russian as a foreign language working with them[6], preparing them not only to learn enough Russian for their everyday life and studies in Moscow, but also introducing them to ideological meanings connected to language. In the preparatory faculty students formed small groups of 5-7 people and in many cases students from the same country studied together, but also their future specialization influenced the formation of groups. UDN had different types of language laboratories for work in groups and individually, with tape recorders and slide projectors representing the latest technologies in language learning.[7] The students had different instructors for grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. In the preparatory faculty students had 16-18 hours of grammar and vocabulary and 8-10 hours of pronunciation weekly during the autumn semesters, followed by 14 hours and 6 hours respectively in the spring semester.[8]

Despite the significant amount of time spent on language learning, weak skills in Russian were the single most important factor that hindered some students in their studies. There were more language-related problems in lectures of humanities and social sciences, while more technical fields of study were easier to understand even with weaker Russian skills. Even though UDN had in many ways one of the best environments for learning Russian as a foreign language in the 1960s Soviet Union, some students faced problems especially in their spoken language even after years of living and studying in the Soviet Union. Poor knowledge of Russian affected the

---

[6] UDN was actively involved in training new teachers of Russian as a foreign language since its foundation.

[7] *Druzhba* 28.3.1966, 2.

[8] GARF, f.9606, o.1, d.1023, 99-105.

students' performance in their studies during the first few years, but in certain cases even when they were defending their theses after 5-6 years of studying in the Soviet Union.[9]

The faculty members themselves acknowledged that the number of lessons on Russian language provided by the university was alone not enough for building strong language skills needed for everyday life and studies, not to mention for creation of a personal and emotional bond to the language. Thus, activities to practice and use Russian also outside the classrooms were strongly encouraged. The university was active in organizing practical language and culture training: students were taken on Russian-language excursions to destinations such as the State Library, Moscow State University and Tretiakov gallery, and different kinds of cultural program in Russian was organized at the dormitories.[10] Cultural program organized for the students concentrated strongly on Russian literature, art and music. Foreign students were encouraged to learn from the ideals presented in Russian literature and political thought. Russian language and culture was synonymous to Soviet language and culture, at the same time forming the core of "Soviet reality" that the students experienced and learned from in Moscow, not only in their everyday life, but through literary works and other idealized representations.

These activities supported the idea of Russian as a language of intercultural communication both within UDN and as the common language unifying multinational Soviet Union.[11] To enhance Soviet political influence and create new socialist political

---

[9] RGASPI, f. M-1, o.46, d. 338, 82-85.
[10] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.1023, 121.
[11] For discussion on the role of Russian language for intercultural communication within the Soviet Union, see: Peter A. Blitstein, "Cultural Diversity and the Interwar Conjuncture: Soviet Nationality Policy in its Comparative Context," *Slavic Review* 65 no. 2 (2006): 273-293; Peter A. Blitstein, "Nation and Empire in Soviet History, 1917-1953," *Ab Imperio* no. 1 (2006), 197-219; Peter A. Blitstein, "Nation-

elites in the developing world, students were encouraged to form networks among themselves using Russian as a the lingua franca. Similar idea of Russian-speaking global networks was present during the interwar period, as since the 1930s Russian was increasingly promoted as the language of socialism with knowledge of Russian becoming a sign of political loyalty.[12] The role of Russian language in networking and building global contacts was highlighted also in the public sphere. Comment of an Indian student published in *Druzhba* in 1965 promotes an emotional and ideological view on Russian language as a unifying factor between different peoples, a lingua franca that allows students from different countries to learn about each other:

> *The Indian students study together with thousands of young men and women from dozens of countries around the world. Many of them do not know the mother tongues of each other. The Russian language unites them. With the help of Russian language, we not only study our fields of specialization, but also learn a lot about each other's countries, their problems, culture etc. These young people are the future of the world. So, as Peoples' Friendship University gives them knowledge on different subjects, the Russian language has a major role in creating tighter bonds of mutual understanding among the students.*[13]

This idealized public representation of Russian language reflects the ideological goals of language education in creating Russian-speaking global networks. This goal was highlighted by selection of study materials, such as newspaper articles that provided

---

Building or Russification? Obligatory Russian Instruction in the Soviet non-Russian School, 1938-1953," in *A State of Nations: The Soviet State and Its Peoples in the Age of Lenin and Stalin*, ed. Ronald G. Suny and Terry D. Martin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 253-274.

[12] Brigitte Studer, *The Transnational World of the Cominternians*. (London: Palgrave McMillan, 2015), 71-72, 133. On the everyday life of Africans in Moscow during this period, see: Maxim Matusevich," Journeys of Hope: African Diaspora and the Soviet Society," *African Diaspora* 1 (2008), and Woodford McClellan, "Black Hajj to 'Red Mecca': Africans and Afro-Americans at KUTV, 1925-1938," in *Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounters*, ed. Maxim Matusevich (Trenton: Africa World Press, 2007). Stephen Kotkin's concept "speaking Bolshevik" has been a much-used term for the tactics Soviet citizens used in their everyday lives in the Soviet system. Kotkin argues that "Soviet people not only 'spoke Bolshevik' to survive in the system but performed the Bolshevik ideology and rhetoric, for example by participating in official rituals." These principles were applied also to foreigners residing in the Soviet Union during the interwar period. Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain. Stalinism as a Civilization* (Oakland: University of California Press, 1995), 198–237. On Soviet language forms and usage, see also Francoise Thom, *La Langue de Bois* (Paris: Juilliard, 1987).

[13] *Druzhba* 24.10.1965, 3.

knowledge about Soviet society, foreign policy and other topics, as well as the Russian-language cultural program that aimed to familiarize the students with Soviet achievements to create an emotional bond to the language. However, these idealistic goals were contested by realities of people from different backgrounds arriving to the Soviet Union. A Portuguese alumna noted that during her stay in Moscow she became fluent not only in Russian, but also in Spanish, which was the most commonly spoken language within the Latin American student community.[14] In other words, despite the public promotion of Russian language as a lingua franca, the student community at UDN remained multi-lingual and regional languages, such as Arabic and Spanish, were used for communication especially among students from the same region. Learning Russian needed for basic educational needs required time and thus diminished the role of ideology during the language classes. Balancing the two goals of teaching the students Russian they needed for their studies as well as ideology through Soviet newspapers and other similar materials while encouraging them to use Russian as a lingua franca in their leisure time within the multinational student community was a challenge.

Social sciences and other subjects

Program of the preparatory faculty was planned to provide knowledge and skills that would put foreign students on the same level with Soviet high school graduates. Besides learning Russian, the program consisted of classes in other subjects, such as mathematics and literature, that were required for successful studies in the specialized faculties. In addition, the students were given basic introduction to the Soviet Union and its political system through optional introductory courses of social sciences, some

---

[14] Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020.

of which were lectured in foreign languages. These studies were also tightly connected to the foreign students' ability to learn enough Russian to understand the courses and lectures offered for them. In other words, the language question affected all fields of study at preparatory faculty.

Optional courses in social sciences served an important purpose of introducing the students to the Soviet state and socialist system of governance. To enable understanding, some courses were lectured in foreign languages most commonly spoken among the foreign student population. In the 1960s the core of this social science program was a course titled "Economic and Historical Review", which was lectured in English, French, and Spanish. This course concentrated on the development of different economic systems towards socialism through examples taken from the history of developing countries.[15] There were requests to lecture the course also in Japanese, Indonesian and Arabic, but the faculty of UDN did not possess sufficient skills in foreign languages to complete this request.[16] On their potential second year of studies at the preparatory faculty, the students participated in a course titled "Soviet Union", which provided basic information about geography and history of the country and was lectured in Russian.[17] Since 1971 a course on history of the Soviet society was included in the program of the preparatory faculty. This was separated into two parts: the course titled "Soviet Union" had existed in the program already before the reform, but "Economic and Historical Review" was now replaced with the course on history of the Soviet society, which continued also during the first year of studies in specialized faculties. The course

---

[15] In his memoirs published in the West William Anti-Taylor describes this course as pure propaganda, where the course readings consisted of resolutions of the latest Congress of CPSU. He also notes that foreign students would arrive to UDN for short courses of "indoctrination", though no evidence to support such claims can be found in the archives or from the interviews. William Anti-Taylor, *Moscow Diary* (London: Robert Hale, 1967), 87-89.

[16] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.1022, 62.

[17] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.1532, 80.

included excursions and film presentations and was lectured in English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Greek.[18]

Besides these two courses on social sciences, other subjects, such as literature, geography, and mathematics, were lectured in Russian. As the foreign students' language skills remained in many cases on an insufficient level to fully understand the contents of the lectures, the university staff was creative in inventing methods to improve the situation. The professors tried to use as many loan words from Latin as possible to improve the students' understanding and translated central concepts of each subject into French, Spanish, and English to enhance the learning process. In addition, Soviet students with knowledge of foreign languages took part in the lectures by helping to translate words and concepts into foreign languages. More textbooks in foreign languages were requested for the collections of the university library to enable the students to learn the essential concepts of their specializations faster.[19]

In some cases, students and their instructors had hardly any language in common. Not all students were fluent in the colonial languages, which were also the most commonly spoken foreign languages among the faculty at UDN: for instance, Somali, Sudanese and Indonesian students were not as fluent in English as Indian students.[20] A concrete example was the situation of Ceylonese students at UDN in the early 1960s. Most of the students spoke only Singhalese without any knowledge of English, and no Russian-Singhalese dictionaries existed at the time. The students were struggling especially during the spring term of the preparatory faculty when they started to study different subjects in Russian. The students tried to ease the situation by compiling a Russian-

---

[18] Lectures in Greek were necessary for the Cypriot students studying at UDN. TsAODM f.P-4, o.165, d.122, 74-76.
[19] RGASPI f. M-1, o. 46, d. 338, 87-89.
[20] GARF f.9606, o. 1, d.1026, 1-24.

Singhalese dictionary to help future Ceylonese students.[21] While the majority of students were sufficiently fluent in some colonial language, the language question placed certain groups of students in a disadvantaged position since the beginning of their studies. The situation increased pressure on teaching the students Russian, but providing study materials and exercises that would cater the needs of different student groups was a great challenge.

The different courses offered for international students in Russian and foreign languages demonstrate the different goals set for activities at the preparatory faculty. Learning subjects needed for studies in specialized faculties supported the educational goals of UDN: in order to complete a university degree in a Soviet university, it was necessary to learn the specialized vocabulary of one's respective field in Russian. Problems arose from the varied backgrounds of the students, as at early stage of their education path they were not fluent in Russian and reliance on colonial languages left certain groups of students in a deprived position. The same happened with social science courses that served an important purpose towards the ideological goals of the education project. Lecturing social sciences in foreign languages highlights the different role these courses served within the education process: learning Soviet history and other similar topics in the very beginning of the foreign students' stay in the Soviet Union was not necessarily needed for completing a university degree in engineering, natural sciences or medicine, but it served an important ideological purpose in introducing the students to the Soviet society, thus providing them opportunities to understand the surrounding society and models of development they could apply to their countries of origin. In other words,

---

[21] RGASPI f. M-1, o. 46, d. 407, 41-45.

this part of studies in the preparatory faculty was already laying foundation not only for the students' stay in the Soviet Union, but also for their return home.

Studies after the first year

After completing studies in the preparatory faculty, the students started their studies in faculties of medicine, engineering, natural sciences, agriculture, law and economics, and humanities. Their successfulness in studies was closely monitored by the university. Especially good grades of both foreign and Soviet students in social sciences were considered an important sign of ideological maturity that supplemented professional development demonstrated through grades in other subjects. Changes in ideological education that took place in 1968 with ordinance of the state leadership brought a significant turn to the life at the university, changing its position of a special institution with little ideological education included in the degrees. Since 1968, contents of UDN degree programs was unified with those of other Soviet universities. This was a sign of changing Soviet foreign policy, but also suggests a certain disillusionment with the UDN model of turning students from the developing world into "good friends" of the Soviet state without obligatory courses of social sciences.

Education in specialized faculties

After the preparatory year, students would choose their specializations. Admission after the preparatory faculty was more competitive to faculties providing education leading to professions needed in the students' countries of origin. The most popular choices were medicine and engineering, while the less motivated and talented students were often sent to faculties of humanities and natural sciences. After the preparatory faculty, studies in the specialized faculties were intense and posed a challenge to many students, especially due to the language of instruction, which was Russian. A Portuguese alumna

of Russian language and literature stated that studying at UDN was "a lot of work", with classes running from 8am until 3pm, also on Saturdays. She also noted that the students had a lot of homework and thus they did not get much rest during the week.[22]

Education processes taking place in the faculties were versatile, including many different forms of practical and theoretical training, as well as internships and independent projects. This combination of theory and practice carried not only educational, but also ideological meaning of bringing together and highlighting the connection of academic knowledge and realities of working life in industry, agriculture and other fields. By Soviet standards, UDN was considered a modern institution that offered its students good access to the newest technologies in learning. This was highlighted by the institution's position and visibility in the public sphere. For instance, for the training of mining engineers, the faculty had six laboratories for teaching different processes, such as mining technology, transportation, and ventilation. During their studies, the students completed four research projects, two on technology and two on mechanization of mining processes, and two final projects. The studies were completed with a diploma project, which was based on independent research. These projects were then defended in front of the National Examination Committee, and after successful defense the students received a diploma of a mining engineer.[23]

Practical training and internships provided the students opportunities to work side by side with the Soviet citizens, while experiencing working life in different parts of the Soviet Union. They were an integral part of the education process in the 1960s and 1970s and in most Soviet universities and degree programs, the fifth and final year of studies was separated into two parts, consisting of an internship and writing one's thesis.

---

[22] Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020.

[23] *Druzhba* 1.3.1965, 1.

Some students would complete several shorter internships during their study program due to different program requirements. In 1961-1968 only 10% of the students did not complete an internship, and 75% of the students participated in practical training during summer holidays. [24] Internships took place in locations such as factories, sovkhozes, hospitals, and museums. While most students in fields such as engineering, natural sciences, medicine, and agriculture could easily find internships in any part of the Soviet Union, for some groups of students, it was practical to complete the practical training in Moscow or even at UDN. This was the case for the linguists hoping to become teachers of Russian as a foreign language, who in most cases completed their practical training at the preparatory faculty of UDN.[25] Some specializations, such as medicine or agriculture, also required more practical training than more theoretical fields, as teaching the work processes of these types of specializations was not possible at the university premises.

While learning practical work methods, such as tractor-driving, the students could also learn from more experienced workers. The process of learning from the workers highlighted the importance of practical training and friendship between Soviet citizens and foreign students in the learning process. Through friendship and working side by side with the workers, the students not only learned practical work methods, but also gained valuable experience about "Soviet reality". In 1964, *Druzhba* published an extensive article on internships and practical training, noticing that UDN students completed internships in 73 enterprises and institutions around the Soviet Union. In many cases, the students completed an internship together with their classmates as a group. For example, second-year chemistry students completed their internship in

---

[24] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.143, 25-32.

[25] *Druzhba* 28.3.1964, 1-2.

Kaluga synthetic fragrance plant and 32 students of the agrology faculty took an exam of tractor driver [traktorist-mashinist] during their internship at the Pakhta-Aral sovkhoz in Uzbekistan. The students of engineering "mastered workers' professions and provided a number of rational suggestions" at the Nevski machine building plant in Leningrad. A large group of students completed an internship at the Red Proletariat machine tools [stanki] building plant in Moscow.[26]

Grades were an important sign of fulfilling the educational goals set for UDN and challenged popular perceptions of poor academic quality through quantitative data with high passing rates with good average scores. The grades and percentage of students that passed all their exams was carefully followed and analyzed by Komsomol, which was a general practice in different educational institutions.[27] Soviet students were constantly doing better in their studies that foreign students. During the winter exam session of 1970, approximately 80% of students passed all their exams, while this percentage was 93,7% for the Soviet students.[28] For instance in 1966 over half of the students coming from a certain country failed their exams or had to take them several times to get a passing grade. These countries at the time were Yemen (with 80% of Yemeni students failing or retaking their exams), Egypt (75%), Paraguay (65%), Morocco (60%), and Congo (58%).[29] In general, the passing rates in humanities and social sciences tended to be higher than in other fields. For instance, the passing rates in fields of Russian language and history were significantly higher than those in faculties of natural sciences, engineering, and medicine.

---

[26] *Druzhba* 7.9.1964, 1.
[27] Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 98-99.
[28] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.11, 17-18.
[29] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.45, 33.

Educating new elites for the developing world was an expensive project, and it was made even more expensive with extra years foreign students needed to complete their degrees. Due to the educational background and language of instruction, foreign students often had issues in passing exams and had to repeat the whole year of studies in case they failed. If the requirement level for both Soviet and foreign students was the same, in many cases it took a foreign student approximately 8-10 years to graduate from Soviet university. This was both expensive and inefficient, because in Western Europe and the US students from the developing world could in most cases graduate in 3-4 years and return home. Studies in the West were mostly available for students from upper social classes, which meant that their educational level was often better than that of students in the Soviet Union, and the language of instruction was in most cases familiar for the students. An officially set goal was that foreign students in the Soviet Union should graduate in 4-5 years, including studies in the preparatory faculty, without lowering the level of requirements, which in most cases was unrealistic.[30]

UDN was battling common perceptions of low-academic quality by highlighting the modern technologies available for learning and the high passing rates of both Soviet and international students. Study schedule was intense and learning processes made use of modern technologies, including opportunities for practical learning in the form of internships. At the same time, passing rates in the exact sciences were constantly lower than in humanities and social sciences, which suggests that the level of competence of students and requirements for receiving a passing grade varied between different faculties. Educational background of most foreign students placed a challenge to the university as students repeatedly failing their exams was an ideological defeat that harmed the public image of Soviet education. At the same time, this was a very practical

---

[30] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.869, 13-14.

problem, as students repeating the same courses several times meant more expenses to the university and the Soviet state. Supporting students to pass exams and eventually graduate on time was important both for ideological and educational goals of UDN activities.

Ideological education in the 1960s

Education played a crucial role in the efforts to export the model of Soviet socialism to the postcolonial states. Students who studied Marxist philosophy, social sciences, and economics were expected to, if not adopt Marxist-Leninist ideology, at least become specialists who would later apply the theories and methods of Soviet science in their areas of specialization. [31] Aligning research and teaching to propagate ideology was an important part of government control over universities and ideological courses highlighted the restrictions on university self-governance.[32] To reach the ideological goals set for UDN activities, the university offered a range of courses in social sciences with openly ideological contents. Encouraging all students to voluntary take part in these courses was an important part of the activities of UDN Komsomol in the 1960s.

Some courses on ideological topics were obligatory for certain specializations, such as courses on planning the state economy for students majoring in economics, while others were based on the voluntary participation of students. The students could participate in a course on political economics in the first and second year of studies and a course on historical and dialectic materialism on the third and fourth year of studies. In addition, it was possible to study philosophy. Around 60-70% of all students, and in certain faculties 80-85% of the students, completed the full political economics course

[31] Constantin Katsakioris, "Transferts Est-Sud. Échanges éducatifs et formation de cadres africains en Union soviétique pendant les années soixante," *Outre-mers* 94, no. 354-355 (2007): 87.

[32] Michael Gruttner, "Concluding Reflections: Universities and Dictatorships," in *Universities under Dictatorship*, ed. by John Connelly (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005), 269-271.

voluntarily, which demonstrates the relative popularity of this course.[33] Other courses with ideological contents were included in the study programs of economics, law and history, while for students of medicine, engineering and natural sciences ideological contents of studies was minimal and based on voluntary participation.

The principle guiding UDN activities in the 1960s was that education in Marxist-Leninist philosophy should be available to all students and while in some cases this idea was supported by the state authorities of the target countries, in others the foreign embassies were actively restricting the students' participation in activities or courses with ideological contents. While the state authorities of Mali encouraged their students to participate in all courses of social sciences that were offered,[34] the Indian embassy controlled the students' participation in events and lectures of any political or ideological contents, which in practice meant that Indian students were not allowed to participate in voluntary courses of social sciences. The embassy of Egypt was controlling the Egyptian students in a similar manner, and after the Iraqi coup d'état in 1963 Iraqi authorities demanded all students residing in the Soviet Union to sign a paper declaring that they are not interested in politics or participating in any events of political nature, including lectures on ideological topics.[35] There were also other similar examples of strict state control concerning the students' participation in activities that were considered ideological.

Certain students also openly stated their dislike towards courses of ideological contents and UDN faculty was constantly experiencing difficulties in positioning themselves between requirements from higher levels of state administration and students deeming

---

[33] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.1532, 82.
[34] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.338, 79.
[35] RGASPI f. M-1. o.46, d.343, 1-2.

the courses of social sciences uninteresting and even harmful. Especially in the 1960s, many students were showing open interest towards ideologies competing with the Soviet form of socialism, while others were simply indifferent towards ideological topics and skipped classes. Many foreign students saw social sciences as waste of time that could be spent on more practical topics related to their future professions. Others found these courses very Soviet-centered, without many possibilities to discuss ideologies present among the foreign student community, such as Maoism, Pan-Africanism, and Arab socialism. The students were also demanding more concrete cases from Africa, Asia, and Latin America to be discussed in the classes of social sciences in a similar manner as in the faculties of medicine and agriculture, where special courses on tropical medicine and agriculture were included in the curriculum.[36]

A Nigerian student described the situation in Africa in a meeting discussing contents of ideological education in 1967:

> *Which African state will make use of the experiences of the USSR? The experiences of socialist and capitalist countries are two completely separate things. The African countries are at this point following the capitalist path of development and cannot make use of the experiences of the USSR. To make use of experiences, some analogues are needed, and they are missing at this point. A dictature of the proletariat was established in the USSR after the revolution, while in African countries the dictature of the bourgeoisie rules. Only a country that follows the non-capitalist path of development can make use of experiences of the USSR. For Africa there is interest towards the experiences in building democracy. From the experiences of the Soviet Union, we may learn that multinational state should be based on the principle of federalism.*[37]

As this excerpt shows, some students were feeling that the education they received was Soviet-centered and conducted from above without taking into consideration conditions in the foreign students' countries of origin, including acknowledgement that most of

---

[36] GARF f.9576, o.17, d.32, 65-68.
[37] GARF f.9576, o.17, d.32, 70-71.

these countries had adopted a capitalist economic system. For many students, the non-capitalist development path leading to socialism was only one, rather idealistic, option among many other forms of development. In the 1960s also other, non-Soviet, forms of socialism were present within the foreign student community and provided ideas that were excluded from ideological education provided by the university that concentrated on forwarding the Soviet experience of development through socialism. While Soviet education system stressed these ideological aspects of building socialism, the students themselves felt that they could learn other things from the Soviet experience, such as managing a multi-national state in a peaceful and successful manner. However, this was rarely in the focus of Soviet ideological education, which stressed that "friendship of peoples" present in the Soviet society was inseparable from the socialist system.

Changes in ideological education after 1968

Political atmosphere in the Soviet Union changed significantly after 1964, when Khrushchev fell from power and was replaced by Leonid Brezhnev. This meant the end of Thaw and the greatest period of enthusiasm towards the developing world. Soviet policy concerning the region became significantly less idealistic than before.[38] At the same time, political changes took place around the developing world, with Soviet-minded local leaders falling out of power from the mid-1960s onwards and several armed conflicts beginning. While Asian and African forms of nationalism were in the 1960s connected to ideas of modernization and development, by the 1970s anticolonial

---

[38] David Engerman has defined this change as turning from ideology and optimism of the Khrushchev years into "realism". David C. Engerman, "Second World's Third World," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12, no.1 (2011): 188-189. However, there were a few significant exceptions to this "realism", such as Soviet involvement in the decolonization process taking place in Lusophone Africa and the armed conflict in Nicaragua in the 1970s, as well as Soviet support to the anti-apartheid militants of ANC, SWAPO and ZAPU in Southern Africa. See: Jocelyn Alexander and JoAnn McGregor, "African Soldiers in the USSR: Oral Histories of ZAPU Intelligence Cadres' Soviet Training, 1965-1979," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 43, no.1 (2017): 49-66.

nationalism in several countries turned into an ethnic conflict.[39]. These developments are demonstrated in several changes that took place in Soviet education policy, such as the introduction of obligatory ideological courses for all foreign students in the Soviet Union in 1968.[40]

While in the public rhetoric of the era support to national liberation movements remained an important part of Soviet foreign policy, in the grass-roots level tensions were rising and causing problems for the functions of UDN. In 1966-1968, civil wars and armed conflicts around the world raised ethnic tensions at the university, for instance between students from Biafra and Nigeria. Other influential events were, among others, the fall of the Japanese Communist Party and the aggressive behavior of Cuban students in promoting Fidel Castro's ideas. Both Japanese and Cuban students soon left the university. In addition to conflicts taking place around the developing world, the world-wide student demonstrations of 1968 echoed in the university community. At the same time, rector Rumiantsev was put under question by higher levels of state administration, as in 1968 both the Central Committee of CPSU and Collegium of Ministry of Higher Education disapproved his plan for UDN's perspectives until 1975, which led to expelling Rumiantsev along with four other members of the rectorate in 1970.[41]

These changes radically influenced UDN, where enthusiasm of the early 1960s was replaced by a more pragmatic set of priorities in the 1970s. UDN lost its position as a unique institution offering non-ideological education as part of Soviet development aid,

---

[39] Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Post-Colonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 3-4.

[40] A similar policy change took place in Czechoslovakia in the same year. Buzássyová, "Repositioning of Czechoslovak Educational Strategies to the 'Least Developed Countries'", 187.

[41] Frolov et al. *Ocherki po istorii Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov* (Moscow: RUDN, 2009), 159-166.

created specifically to answer the needs of societies in the developing world. The university's new mission stated that it would concentrate on educating those students who could not afford education elsewhere, at the same time offering them a more ideological education process than before. The officially stated mission of the university changed from "training of highly-skilled cadres for countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, educated in the atmosphere of friendship of the peoples" to "training of highly-skilled specialists mastering Marxist-Leninist theory and educated in the spirit of proletarian internationalism".[42] These changes showed to the students in changing curricula and new obligatory courses of social sciences that were introduced in the period of 1968-1972.

Participation in courses of social sciences was made obligatory in 1968, but UDN was slow to adjust its curricula to these new orders from the Ministry of Higher and Special Education. Thus, the university was harshly criticized for its program of ideological education that had remained the same throughout the 1960s, turning from voluntary to obligatory in 1968. As a reaction, the university included new subjects to the curriculum. A course on scientific communism was lectured on the first year of studies, a course on philosophy in the 2nd year and a course on political economics in the 3rd year.[43] The 24th Congress of the CPSU in 1971 further instructed Soviet institutions of higher education to improve the ideological contents of their education. This resulted in adding ideological and theoretical contents to the lectures and including classics of Marxism-

---

[42] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.79, 144. Aa Barbora Buzássyová has noted, a similar ideologization and policy change took place in the education programs of foreign students in Czechoslovakia, as in 1966 "political and educational impact" on foreign students was made a main priority based on a government enactment. Buzássyová, "Repositioning of Czechoslovak Educational Strategies to the 'Least Developed Countries'," 187.

[43] Decree from the Central Committee of the CPSU titled "On improvement of academic and educational work at the Peoples' Friendship University named after Patrice Lumumba" ["Ob uluchenii akademicheskoi i uchebnoi raboty na Universitete Druzhby Narodov im. Patrisa Lumumby."], dated 25.8.1970. TsAODM f.P-4, o.165, d.22, 80-95.

Leninism to the class readings.[44] In 1972 a decree from the Central Committee of CPSU introduced new study plans for all institutions of higher education in the country. The goal was to strengthen the basic skills and knowledge of students and increase the amount of time spent in practical training in industry.[45] In addition to basic skills, stress was placed on social sciences: all institutions of higher education had to offer the same amount of instruction in topics such as history of the Soviet state, philosophy, political economics, and scientific communism. As mentioned in the instructions, from now on "study programs, depending on the character of the studied disciplines, should possess ideological contents that take into account the contemporary tendencies in training cadres, who will be able to fulfill not only professional, but also political tasks."[46]

These changes led to ideologization of the education process in all specializations. The content of the courses was carefully planned and determined by the highest levels of political administration. Lecturers were instructed to send the texts of their lectures for checking, after which no changes were allowed.[47] To provide an example, the program of studies in scientific communism at UDN followed the same program as in all other Soviet institutions of higher education consisting of 70 hours of lecturing with class readings including classics of Marxist-Leninist thought and materials of the latest Congress of CPSU.[48] Teaching staff of different faculties was keen to demonstrate that new ideological requirements could be fulfilled by adding ideological contents to all

---

[44] Decree "On improvement of educational work with foreign students" ["Ob uluchenii uchebno-vospitatelnoi raboty s inostrannymi uchashchiemsiia"].GARF, f.9606, o.1, d.4561, 24-27.
[45] Similar goals had been present already in Khrushchev's educational reform of 1958 that reflected the ideals of the 1920s connecting practical skills with academic knowledge. Laurent Coumel, "The Scientist, the Pedagogue and the Party Official. Interest Groups, Public Opinion and Decision-Making in the 1958 Education Reform," in *Soviet State and Society Under Nikita Khrushchev*, ed. by Melanie Ilic and Jeremy Smith (London: Routledge, 2009), 67-69.
[46] Decree "On measures of further improvement of higher education in the country" ["O merakh dalneishemu sovershenstvovaniiu vyshego obrazovaniia v strane"] GARF f. 9606 o. 1 d. 6592, 31-32.
[47] Frolov et al. *Ocherki po istorii Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov*, 186-187.
[48] TsAODM f.P-4, o.165, d.22, 60-71.

subjects taught. In a UDN CPSU unit meeting organized in 1970, a representative of the faculty of medicine noted that the course on normal physiology would in the future contain "basics of the dialectic method", "criticism of bourgeois scientific concepts", "aspects of the battle between materialism and idealism", "evidence about the superiority of socialist healthcare system over the capitalist one, and thus overall the socialist system over the capitalist one".[49]

These changes influenced everyday life at the university. Students were encouraged to participate in Komsomol events, such as competitions, conferences and study circles. Separating study requirements from leisure activities became more difficult, as the borderlines between these two became more blurred than before. The students had mixed opinions about the extra-curricular activities offered. While a Nigerian UDN alumnus of medicine noted that the idea of participating in any Komsomol activities was absurd as he did not feel that the Komsomol was in any way connected to his everyday life at the university,[50] a Pakistani alumnus remembers that he was very interested in political questions and took part in activities related to them also during his free time. In addition to activities at the Pakistani compatriot association, he participated in a study circle of Marxism-Leninism and gave presentations in public events.[51] These experiences demonstrate that the students were a very mixed group concerning their attitudes towards different kinds of ideological activities: while for some these activities were not relevant and they avoided participation in them, for others they were an essential part of the experience in studying in the Soviet Union and learning about the socialist state system.

---

[49] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.79, 195.
[50] Interview with Nigerian informant, 18.11.2020.
[51] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.

The whole education program of UDN experienced significant changes during the period of 1968-1972. Introducing obligatory ideological education to all specializations and classes radically changed the mission and position of the university. While previously UDN had claimed to provide high-quality non-ideological education as part of Soviet cooperation with the developing world, it had now lost this special position and become a "normal" Soviet university in terms of its curriculum. Previously ambitious programs of educating new professionals for the needs of the developing were now largely replaced by the goal to provide graduates with solid knowledge of both the basics of their respective fields and Marxist-Leninist theory, which would prepare them for both professional and political tasks in their countries of origin. Thus, while in the 1960s work towards ideological goals of the education project was mostly included in activities based on voluntary participation with studies in the specialized faculties concentrating on reaching educational goals of the project, in the 1970s these two fields become more interconnected. At the same time, the contents of ideological education became even more Soviet-centered than before due to the fact that there were no opportunities to diverge from the general education plan of all Soviet universities, despite the criticism that this Soviet-centrism had received from foreign UDN students already in the 1960s. However, certain educational features of the UDN study programs, such as stress on practical training provided during internships alongside theoretical knowledge incorporated into lectures, had been an important part of the education process since the early 1960s. In the 1970s, this now standardized form of study process created continuities between two periods of the university´s development that differed from each other in terms of ideological components incorporated into the education process.

4. Cultural and political activities: Structures of control and freedom of expression

This chapter looks at the varied field of cultural and political activities organized at the university and outside it, as well as different student-led organizations functioning within the university community. The chapter starts with the controlled sphere of activities organized by the university and other Soviet actors, then moving on to discuss student-led organizations and their political activism that provided the students a space for relative freedom of expression. The chapter argues that while all cultural and political activities where officially meant to support ideological goals of the education project, in reality foreign student-led organizations functioned as spaces for free expression by consensus of the Soviet authorities, thus creating two separate and often contradictory, yet at the same time interconnected spheres of activism within the university community. Most of the everyday cultural and political work with the students was organized by Soviet actors at the university outside classes, and in other locations around Moscow that brought together foreign students from different universities. However, the students were also encouraged to form their own organizations, the most common of which were compatriot associations that brought together students from the same country. While these organizations had a major role in controlling and monitoring their members, they were also the most important spaces available for foreign students to express oppositional political thoughts.

Cultural and ideological activities

Cultural and ideological program planned on the highest levels of Soviet administration was executed at the grass-root level of each university and in spaces that brought together students from different universities. The program highlighted achievements of

Russian culture and provided opportunities for additional political training and lectures. As Komsomol Central Committee defined the goals of ideological work in 1969, "foreigners graduating from Soviet institutions of higher education should not only possess deep professional knowledge, but also profound theoretical and practical skills to lead an active anti-imperialist fight for socialism and development". [1] The cultural and ideological program aimed to cover all sides of Soviet culture and society by cooperating with different actors for organization of events. The program received a mixed response from the student population, as while many found the cultural events attractive, attitudes towards political and ideological activities were more complex.

Contents of the cultural and political program

Planning and implementation of ideological work both at the university and in other locations was a carefully executed project, which was conducted in cooperation with universities, Komsomol and CPSU units of Moscow city, the Ministry of Higher and Special Education, and other Soviet organizations, such as the Union of Soviet Friendship Organizations and the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Countries of Asia and Africa. In other words, UDN did not plan the students' leisure time activities in a vacuum, as they were a result of cooperation with several different actors. The plans and forms of work were copied from one university to another and then applied according to needs of the student body. The example for most university-level plans of political and cultural activities was set by Moscow State University, which had made versatile plans already in the late 1950s, including detailed lists of literature, films, and other cultural products, as well as locations for excursions to be visited during the foreign students' planned 5-year stay in the Soviet Union. [2]

[1] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.223, 7-8.
[2] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d. 174, 45-56.

The goal for ideological activities taking place outside the classroom was defined as "formation of scientific world view, mental and physical growth of students, educating them according to the best traditions of humanism, democracy, battle for peace, strengthening of friendship between nations, and familiarization with Soviet reality".[3] A plan from 1963 lists topics to be covered as: the Soviet Union and its capital city, the development of Soviet society, Soviet democracy, the Communist Party of Soviet Union, the socialist economic system, socialist and communist concept of work, living conditions of the working class, social security and healthcare, education, science, questions of agriculture, nationality questions, human relations, international relations, and culture, which included literature, art, press, radio, television and sports.[4] In other words, the list of concrete topics included in ideological education show that the formation of scientific world view and other themes mentioned in the goals of ideological work were approached through concrete examples of the Soviet society and its development. The approach tended to be very Soviet-centered, leaving little room for topics that would be connected to the specific conditions and problems in the students' countries of origin. In other words, the ideological activities concentrated on Soviet-led internationalism instead of a more equal transnational exchange between the foreign student population and Soviet citizens.

Ideological work with the students consisted of different activities that aimed foreign students learning about "Soviet reality" and internationalism through media, festivities and meetings with both Soviet people and foreign visitors. Political activities outside

---

[3] RGASPI f. M-1, o.46, d.294, 4.

[4] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.336, 142-144. Similar plans that aimed to familiarize foreign students with different aspects of the Soviet society had been in use already during late Stalinism, when the first foreign students from the socialist countries of Eastern Europe arrived in the Soviet Union. Patryk Babiracki, "Imperial Heresies: Polish Students in the Soviet Union, 1948-1957," *Ab Imperio* no.4 (2007): 209.

classrooms consisted of lectures and discussions on contemporary issues often based on newspaper material and taking place both at the university and in the dormitories. The students also celebrated Soviet holidays, such as the Anniversary of October Revolution and the Day of Constitution. On certain occasions, thematic festivities could last throughout the year, such as during the 100th anniversary of Lenin in 1970.[5] Well-known visitors, such as Yasser Arafat, Angela Davis, and Pablo Neruda visited the university to promote internationalism. In addition, foreign students collected money for different causes to support the countries of the developing world.[6] They made excursions to local schools and factories and were in correspondence with school classes. Since 1969 UDN coordinated the work of a pioneer summer camp in Pushkino district with students taking full responsibility of work with children.[7] Foreign students were encouraged to participate in annual events, such as demonstrations on Soviet holidays or for solidarity with different countries. Especially demonstrations to support Vietnam were frequent in the late 1960s and 1970s.[8]

Participation in these activities was voluntary and often the students participating were motivated by curiosity, while for the Soviet authorities the foreign students' participation was a method to highlight Soviet internationalism in the public sphere. An Argentinian alumna participated in May Day demonstrations[9] in a parade that her faculty had organized, "parading through the Red Square with our flags, traditional

---

[5] GARF f.5451, o.45, d.1543, 6-12.

[6] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.222, 53-54.

[7] GARF f.5451, o.45, d.1543, 6-12.

[8] These kinds of state-controlled demonstrations were an important extra-parliamentary form of political expression, as Mark et al. have noted. At the same time, they were a method of regulating the attitudes connected to the outside world. The Vietnam War was the most important source of solidarity demonstrations around the socialist bloc, see: James Mark, Péter Apor, Radina Vučetić, and Piotr Osęka, "'We Are with You, Vietnam': Transnational Solidarities in Socialist Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia," *Journal of Contemporary History* 50, no. 3 (2015): 439-464.

[9] On ritual and celebratory meanings of these events, see: Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 121-122.

costumes and songs".[10] A Portuguese alumna remembered that she was curious about different aspects of life in the Soviet Union, which was the reason for her to participate in the May Day demonstration once or twice during her studies. She connects her participation to her overall curiosity towards the Soviet way of life and mentioned that in addition to these political performances, she was keen to visit orthodox churches in Moscow. Thus, all aspects of life in the Soviet Union were interested her, while neither political or religious activities carried particular ideological or spiritual meanings.[11]

A variety of cultural activities were available for the students both as producers and consumers of culture. There were hobby circles for singing, dancing, and playing musical instruments at UDN. Film screenings, exhibitions, meetings with artists, concerts and different kinds of get-togethers were organized in cooperation with cultural palaces. The students could also practice a wide range of sports. Cultural activities and sports aimed to create a sense of community within the student body. Common dance and song groups strengthened positive forms of patriotism by bringing together students from different and sometimes disputed tribes, clans, and castes, thus reinforcing national identities of the newly independent countries. For instance, UDN authorities noted that in 1971 two hostile African tribes were united into one compatriot association. At first, the atmosphere within the association was very tense, but introduction of different forms of arts and sports into the group's extra-curricular activities soon loosened the tensions. As a result, the members of two previously hostile tribes ended up performing in the same dance troupe.[12] In this sense, cultural work actively molded the foreign student population to follow similar patterns of peaceful coexistence and

---

[10] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.
[11] Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020.
[12] TsAODM f.P-4, o.220, d.231, 21-22.

folkloricized performance of varying ethnic identities that existed in the Soviet Union alongside its pronounced internationalism.

Especially cultural of activities were remembered fondly by the UDN alumni. An Argentinian alumna remembered how she frequented concerts, ballet, theatre, and cinema as there was a ticket booth next to the students' dormitory and tickets were easily available. [13] A Portuguese alumna had equally fond memories about the wonderful bookstores and high-quality theatre performances, opera and ballet that were available to the students at a very cheap price.[14] As these memories of alumni suggests, many activities that were included in the plans of cultural and political work did not carry ideological meanings to the students themselves. They experienced visits to museums and theatres as enjoyable artistic experiences, though for the Soviet administration these visits were an important part of familiarizing the students with Russian high culture and thus, a certain aspect of "Soviet reality".

Both political and cultural activities supported goals set for UDN ideological work by promoting Soviet-led internationalism and providing experiences about "Soviet reality", but the foreign students' interest towards these forms of work varied as the events organized, most commonly concerts and friendship evenings, remained similar year after year.[15] While it seems that many foreign students were indifferent or reluctant to participate in openly political activities, this general lack of enthusiasm was connected to the different phases of the students' stay in the Soviet Union. Upon arrival students were interested in life in the Soviet Union in general and participated in all kinds of activities, while closer to graduation they were more interested in themes connected to

---

[13] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 2019.
[14] Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020.
[15] TsAODM, f.P-4447, o.1, d.4, 129.

their own specializations and became more selective in which events to attend.[16] In general cultural events were better received and attracted wider participation than events of directly political or ideological nature.

Friendship House as a center of political and cultural activities

The Friendship House, founded in 1959 and located in central Moscow, was a space hosting numerous ideological, educational and cultural events related to international relations and welcoming foreign students from all Soviet institutions of higher education. The goal for its activities was familiarizing international students with life in the Soviet Union and the country's successes in building socialism, as well as achievements of the USSR in the fields of politics, economics and culture.[17] The Friendship House continued ideological work that had begun in the preparatory faculty, mostly during classes of Russian language.[18]

Propaganda value of the Friendship House and its activities was great both in Moscow, around the Soviet Union and abroad. The first international conference organized by the Friendship House's African seminar took place in March 1966 and gathered participants from the USSR, 35 African countries, Bahrain, Hungary, Honduras, India, Iran, Nepal, Peru, Syria, and Czechoslovakia, altogether 350 people. Many of them were well-known individuals, including professors.[19] Such events supported image of the Friendship House as an influential actor that reached various actors and audiences both

---

[16] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.58, 54-56. Benjamin Tromly has noted similar tendencies concerning the activities organized for Eastern European students during late Stalinism. Benjamin Tromly, "Brother or Other? East European Students in Soviet Higher Education Establishments, 1948-1956," *European History Quarterly* 44, no.1 (2014): 87.

[17] Eleonory Gilburd, "The Revival of Soviet Internationalism in the Mid to Late 1950s," in *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960* ed. by Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013): 363.

[18] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.336, 129-130.

[19] GARF f.9576, o.17, d.23, 222-223.

domestically and internationally, bringing together experts of relevant fields. Soviet expertise on the developing world was often demonstrated as part of the House's activities, and especially in the public sphere knowledge production on different developing regions of the world was highlighted, even though in reality most activities concentrated on educating foreign students on achievements of the Soviet society.

Regional seminars that brought together students from a certain geographic region as well as Soviet students interested in the region were the most important form of activities at the Friendship House. The first regional seminar, the Latin American seminar, was founded in May 1961, and was soon followed by the African seminar (founded in 1962) and the Arab seminar (founded in 1964). Out of these seminars the African seminar was the biggest and most active with over 400 regular participants compared to the approximately 100 regular participants of the Latin American seminar and even fewer for the Arab seminar, though this disproportion was partly caused by the large number of African students staying in Moscow.[20] The activities of all three seminars were very similar, so in the following paragraphs the African seminar is used as an example.

The African seminar, officially known as "The Soviet Union and New Africa Seminar" involved several actors in organization and coordination of its activities. The founding members were the Soviet Association of Friendship with the African Nations, the Committee of Soviet Youth Organizations, the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Countries of Asia and Africa, and the Federation of African Students in the Soviet Union. Its activities were supported by the Student Union of USSR, the Soviet Committee for the Protection of Peace, UDN and other Soviet institutions of higher

---

[20] GARF f. 9576, o.14, d.81, 159-160.

education. Scientific activities of the seminar were coordinated by Institute of Africa at Soviet Science Academy. In other words, the organizations behind the seminar were mostly Soviet, while the African students themselves were represented by the regional organization cooperating with all compatriot associations of African students, the Federation of African students in the Soviet Union. The activities organized included discussions, scientific events, conferences, meetings, trips, excursions, get-togethers, and concerts. During the first four years of the seminar over 80 events were organized and some of them gathered over 1000 participants.[21] The seminar brought together a variety of different actors from the highest levels of society and aimed to produce relevant program and publications of high quality, at the same time building contacts between Soviet and African actors.

In practice the seminar's activities tended to highlight not only cooperation between Africa and the Soviet Union, but also Soviet achievements in the fields of culture, science and politics. Organized events included plenary sessions featuring notable visitors either from Africa or the Soviet Union, roundtable discussions, scientific lectures on political and economic topics, mostly lectured by Soviet professors, and lectures on arts and culture, which concentrated on Soviet arts and culture, including excursions to locations such as Iasnaia Poliana, Tretiakov Gallery and Chaikovskii house museum in Klin. The seminar organized study circles for English, French, and several African languages, such as Swahili, Yoruba, and Hausa. A movie club was screening mostly Soviet films, supplemented by a few Egyptian ones. The seminar provided consultations and support for scientific projects and produced publications and exhibitions that toured other Soviet cities.[22]

---

[21] GARF f. 9576, o.13, d.143, 3-4.
[22] GARF f. 9576, o.13, d.143, 5-10; GARF f.9576, o.17, d.23, 356-362.

In other words, despite the officially stated stress on African issues, many events organized concentrated on Soviet culture and current state of international relations. Even topics related to development were often lectured from a Soviet point of view, providing Soviet expertise on questions concerning Africa. Despite the rhetoric of cooperation, only a small minority of visitors invited to the seminar were African, and most of these visitors were politicians that were keen to express their gratitude for the Soviet state for providing education for young Africans. The contents of the seminar concentrated strongly on educating African students, though without a doubt also Soviet students specializing in Africa could benefit from language practice and contacts created through the seminar. Still, the promoted image of equal cooperation between Africans and Soviet citizens is misleading, as the activities tended to be rather strongly managed by interests of the Soviet state.

Despite the wide range of activities organized, participation in the seminar events was usually connected to overall political activity, with certain compatriot associations significantly more active than others. Participation of some students was also restricted by their embassies, for example the Ghanaian embassy prohibited its students from participating in any events of the African seminar.[23] In the feedback the seminar received, African students requested for more lectures in foreign languages, especially in Swahili, and complained that same events were repeated year after year.[24] These complaints demonstrate that the seminar was suffering from similar problems as other forms of ideological work, caused by the repetitive Soviet-centered program mostly conducted in Russian. In other words, the activities concentrated on Soviet-led

---

[23] GARF f.9576, o.17, d.23, 10-12; GARF f.9576, o.17, d.42, 104-107.
[24] GARF f.9576, o.17, d.15, 11.

internationalism instead of a more genuine transnational exchange between Soviet and foreign actors as equal partners.

Participation in international events

In addition to activities in the Soviet Union, student delegations participated in international events, such as the Festivals of Youth and Students organized every five years and the international congresses of "progressive actors", such as the World Federation of Democratic Youth[25] and the International Union of Students[26]. This helped to build networks between groups of students studying in different countries and provided relatively autonomous and student-driven spaces for performing socialism and, even more importantly, friendship. As organizations from the developing world also participated in these events, ties between students staying in the Soviet Union and local organizations strengthened through participation in various events.[27]

UDN was the only university world-wide to send an independent delegation to the Festival of Youth and Students, which meant that instead of youth organizations or countries, students of UDN were representing their university at the festival.[28] During the period from 1960s to 1970s, UDN sent a delegation of 40-60 members to four festivals in Helsinki 1962, Sofia 1968[29], Berlin 1973 and Havana in 1978. Starting at

---

[25] The Federation was founded in 1945 and in the 1970s it brought together approximately 200 organizations from 98 countries. The Soviet Union was represented by Komsomol and the Committee of Soviet Youth Organizations.

[26] The International Union of Students was founded 1946 and besides the festivals it was active in organizing Universiades sports competitions that had taken place since 1905. In the 1970s, the Union brought together 88 student organizations from 86 countries. The Soviet Union was represented by the Soviet Student Union.

[27] RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.29, 591.

[28] V.M. Savin, *Universitet Druzhby Narodov i Vsemirnoe Festivalnoe Dvizhenie Molodezhi i Studentov* (Moscow: RUDN, 2013), 3-5, 9-10.

[29] For a detailed analysis of political tensions present at the Sofia festival, see: Nick Rutter, "Look Left, Drive Right: Internationalism at the 1968 World Youth Festival," in *Socialist Sixties. Crossing Borders in the Second World*, ed. Anne Gorsuch and Diane Koenker (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2013), 193-212.

the festival in Havana, UDN also sent a tourist group of approximately 200 students to the festivals in addition to its official delegation. [30] Especially during the festival in Havana the arrival of UDN delegation gained great publicity, as they crossed the Atlantic on a boat, spending altogether 32 days on the two-way journey. Travel to other festivals, such as Sofia and Berlin, was organized by train that also made stops for friendship gatherings and concerts on Soviet, Romanian and Polish territories.[31]

Delegates of UDN were chosen based on their successfulness in studies, participation in political work in Moscow, discipline, and "usefulness of the candidate in fulfilling the goals and tasks of the delegation",[32] which included promotion of the university and creation of new networks. The delegates also represented different geographical regions and disciplines in balanced proportions. The delegation aimed to promote the university by distributing promotional materials, participating in different public events of the festival program, organizing their own events, such as press conferences, concerts, and exhibitions, and by having private discussions with participants from different parts of the world. These discussions provided opportunities to connect both with the students' compatriots and, from the late 1960s onwards, with the alumni of UDN from around the world. For the needs of festival participation, *Druzhba* published special issues in foreign languages to be distributed at the festival alongside university brochures. During the festival in Havana, 6000 copies of *Druzhba* in Spanish, English, French, and Russian were distributed.[33]

Active participation in friendship meetings, demonstrations, mass gatherings and other events were duties of a festival delegate. Representing socialism with rituals, slogans,

---

[30] Savin, *Universitet Druzhby Narodov i Vsemirnoe Festivalnoe Dvizhenie*, 3-5, 9-10.
[31] Savin, *Universitet Druzhby Narodov i Vsemirnoe Festivalnoe Dvizhenie,* 106, 116.
[32] *Druzhba* 9.6.1962.
[33] Savin, *Universitet Druzhby Narodov i Vsemirnoe Festivalnoe Dvizhenie,* 14-16, 61.

and a special visual vocabulary were an important part of performing peace and friendship during the festival.[34] Foreign students going abroad and spreading a positive image of Soviet society were chosen from a group of activists that were keen to promote ideals of socialism and friendship of peoples. Thus, the festival was not only a superficial presentation of slogans, but for many participants, a meaningful act based on internalized values. The feeling of friendship and solidarity created during festivals was not necessarily based on close personal connections, but rather on shared ideals and performances of friendship. However, feelings created by these shared experiences and performances were in many cases genuine.[35] At the same time, the festivals were successful in creating new not only personal, but in some cases also political connections and networks among the participants.

The Festivals of Youth and Students were relatively short and as such fairly successful events of public diplomacy, while more long-term residence in the Soviet Union often created more varied emotions and lacked the enthusiasm connected to festival atmosphere. The students' long stay allowed them to form deep and versatile first-hand views on Soviet reality. Activities organized both by universities and other actors, such as the Friendship House, aimed to create feelings of friendship and solidarity combined

---

[34] Pia Koivunen, *Performing Peace and Friendship: The World Youth Festival as a Tool of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy, 1947-1957* (University of Tampere, PhD dissertation, 2013), 18-19. For comparison of youth festivals during the Stalinist period, see: Nick Rutter, "The Western Wall. The Iron Curtain Recast in Midsummer 1951," in *Cold War Crossings. International Travel and Exchange across the Soviet Bloc, 1940s-1960s*, ed. Patryk Babiracki and Kenyon Zimmer (Arlington: Texas A&M University Press, 2014), 78-106. As Anne Gorsuch has noted, Soviet tourists abroad were also expected to "perform socialism". Instead of being holidays for fun, tourist trips were politically motivated and were used for promoting the socialist homeland. Anne E. Gorsuch, *All This Is Your World. Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad after Stalin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 22-23. See also: Pia Koivunen, "The 1957 Moscow Youth Festival. Propagating a New, Peaceful Image of the Soviet Union," in *Soviet State and Society Under Nikita Khrushchev*, ed. Melanie Ilic and Jeremy Smith (London: Routledge, 2009).

[35] Memories of friendship experienced during the festivals are present in oral histories of the festival participants. These narratives tend to highlight the genuine and deep feeling of friendship created by shared values and ideological stance in the festival atmosphere despite language barriers and other practical problems. See Pia Koivunen, *Rauhanuskovaiset* (Helsinki: SKS, 2020).

to experiences and knowledge about Soviet-style socialism. However, regular participation in activities concentrating on performing friendship and highlighting Soviet achievements was interesting only for a minority of politically-minded activists, as the activities lacked the enthusiasm and feeling of autonomy that connected to events such as the Festivals of Youth and Students. Still, many students participated in political events occasionally, motivated by genuine interest and curiosity, and cultural events gained even wider popularity. In other words, the rather versatile cultural and political program suffered from inability to gain student attraction within a longer timeframe, which made higher education a challenging endeavor of public diplomacy.

Student organizations and political activism

Certain organizations and forms of political activism were supported among the foreign student population in Moscow. The university encouraged students to organize themselves into country-specific and regional organizations, the main tasks of which were officially to support the students in their studies and to encourage them to participate in events organized both at the university and elsewhere in Moscow. These organizations were initiated and led by the foreign students themselves, independent from Soviet organizations such as Komsomol, but at the same time expected to respect boundaries set for their activities by the university administration. However, also political activism that did not belong to this controlled sphere was common and Komsomol was actively monitoring activities and political moods of these organizations. At times, political activism of students was also influenced by actors such as foreign embassies located in Moscow and significant events, such as the death of a Ghanaian student in Moscow in 1963, could even erupt into student demonstrations. In 1969 there was an attempt to increase control over foreign student organizations, when the Soviet authorities founded the Association of Foreign Students in the USSR. This

umbrella organization brought together all foreign students and their organizations in the USSR and had local organizations on the level of cities and universities.[36]

Compatriot associations: connecting students at the grass-root level

Soviet administration encouraged foreign students to organize themselves into compatriot associations that existed on university, city, republic, and all-union levels. Membership in these organizations was part of the positive form of patriotism encouraged among the students in the spirit of internationalism.[37] Many aspects of the students' national past could coexist with internationalism of the socialist future, in a similar manner as in the Soviet Union itself, where a Soviet narrative of modernization was combined to a folkloricized celebration of the country's different ethnicities and their cultures.[38] While in the West student organizations served to protect the rights of students and promote their interests, in socialism the mission of the organizations was defined differently by the Soviet authorities. As the rights and interests of students did not, according to the Soviet administration, require protection or monitoring in the Soviet Union, the organizations were expected to concentrate on minor issues related to everyday life.[39] Compatriot associations were an important method of keeping foreign students away from party-controlled public life by giving them their own organizations while restricting participation in Soviet organizations, such as Komsomol. The co-

---

[36] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.222, 11-25.

[37] More on the concept of patriotism in this context, see: Abigail Judge Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge: The Peoples' Friendship University and Soviet Education for the Third World," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 253-254. In the case of colonial and developing world, the communist movement had applied elements of local patriotism to its agenda since the early decades of Comintern. For an interesting case on interactions between local patriotic elements and mostly Chinese-influenced communist movement in interwar South-East Asia, see: Kankan Xie, "Various Forms of Chineseness in the Origins of South East Asian Communism," in *Left Transnationalism: The Communist International and the National, Colonial, and Racial Questions*, ed. Oleksa Drachewych and Ian McKay (Montreal: McGill University Press, 2019), 286-314.

[38] Christine Varga-Harris, "Between National Tradition and Western Modernizations: Soviet Woman and Representations of Socialist Gender Equality as a 'Third Way' for Developing Countries, 1956-1964," *Slavic Review* 78, no.3 (2019): 772-773.

[39] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.339, 168-169.

existence of these two systems was one of the key factors in the relative freedom of the foreign students during their stay in the Soviet Union.[40] In other words, the students had certain freedoms within their organizations and the Soviet state was not actively controlling minor-scale political dissidence that would have not been tolerated within Soviet organizations.

At UDN, each country had their own compatriot association, so in the 1960s and 1970s there were 60-70 of them. The first compatriot organization was founded by Iraqi students in 1960, soon followed by Indonesian, Jordanian, Lebanese, Mexican, Sudanese, Yemeni, Cuban, Chilean and Japanese students in 1961.[41] Each of these organizations would connect students from one country, but several associations could also form a common regional umbrella organization.[42] In a brochure published in 1963 that answered questions about studies in the Soviet Union aimed for potential new foreign students, the compatriot associations were described as follows:

> *When it comes to social life of foreign students in the USSR, they are all united into compatriot associations that deal with questions related to studies, everyday life, and culture. Existence of any organizations or political groups that might have activities aimed against the governments of the students' countries of origin are not allowed. Heads of educational institutions warn foreign students against any statements that might harm the friendly relations between the Soviet Union and other countries.[43]*

In other words, members of these organizations were not expected to give critical comments about the Soviet Union or their country of origin, thus harming the bilateral relations between these states, but promote friendship, encourage students in their studies, and deal with small everyday problems related to accommodation and other similar themes. This was also the guideline for work with the compatriot associations

---

[40] Tromly, "Brother or Other?", 86-87.
[41] *RUDN: 2016 – the year that has changed the university* brochure (Moscow: RUDN, 2016), 23.
[42] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.368, 1-4.
[43] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.97, 83.

at UDN, where activities of the associations were defined as supporting students in their studies and organizing ideological activities, such as Marxist-Leninist reading circles.[44] Another important aspect of the activities was promotion of friendship with the Soviet Union. Members of the organizations participated in concerts and get-togethers with local Soviet workers, sometimes celebrating their national holidays with them. Some compatriot associations were also actively cooperating with friendship societies, and they had their own friendship schools and factories in Moscow.[45]

Most compatriot associations possessed wide contacts both with their country of origin and the Soviet authorities. For example, in the early 1960s the UDN association of Brazilian students had established contacts and active correspondence with the Brazilian bureau of commerce located in Amsterdam, the state oil refinement company of Brazil, the other compatriot associations at UDN, the Soviet National Student Union, Brazilian-Soviet Friendship Association, and several municipalities, cities and administrative regions in Brazil. The association was active in assisting Brazilians arriving to the USSR, including politicians, trade union activists and even members of the Brazilian Football Confederation.[46] As this example shows, ideally the compatriot associations were well-connected and active in bringing together their countrymen and Soviet people, at the same time promoting the interests of both sides.

The foreign students themselves often had a different understanding about the role of compatriot associations compared to the Soviet authorities. Many organizations were politically active and criticized certain features of life in the Soviet Union. Narratives of compatriot association activities state that they were often kept private from Soviet

---

[44] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.222, 46-49.
[45] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.222, 55-56.
[46] RGASPI f. M-1, o.46, d.294, 41-54.

observation and reporting. A Russian informant who was friends with Latin American students in the 1970s remembered that the Argentine compatriot association gathered informally in a private apartment of an Argentinian news correspondent stationed in Moscow.[47] In the 1960s, many organizations were de facto functioning as sections of political parties.[48] This was especially the case with African students. For instance, in 1964 an open conflict was formed between approximately 30 Congolese students studying in Moscow, and the Congolese Union of National Liberation Party that had given them recommendations to arrive to the Soviet Union. The party wanted to send these students to China to learn skills and methods of partisan warfare. The students refused, as they had already started their studies in Moscow and planned to engage in ideological work during their holidays. However, their photographs and names were given to the state security organs, the party cut their financial support, and two students that had arrived in Leopoldsville for holidays were immediately arrested.[49]

Political moods within the organizations and their relations to the Soviet authorities were on a constant flux depending on the political situation in the students' countries of origin as well as individual features of their current leadership. Soviet authorities supported progressive students for leadership positions and attempted to mold internal dynamics of the organizations. Latin American associations were in general led by communists, tightly following the political moods of Latin American communist parties and actively cooperating with the Soviet authorities.[50] For Asian associations, the

---

[47] Correspondence with Russian informant, 2017.

[48] As Sara Pugach has pointed out, the situation was in many ways similar in the GDR concerning political activities of the African student organizations, with the students keen to comment on the domestic politics of their countries of origin. Sara Pugach, "Agents of Dissent: African Student Organizations in the German Democratic Republic," *Africa* 89 no.S1 (2019): S90-S108. For a general overview on current research on African student activism in the era of decolonization, see: Dan Hodgkinson and Luke Melchiorre, "Introduction: Student Activism in an Era of Decolonization," *Africa* 89 no.S1 (2019): S1-S14.

[49] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.136, 16-17.

[50] GARF f. 9606, o.2, d.221, 184-190.

situation was more mixed as the students came from varying backgrounds. Most of their associations were small and in tight contact with the embassies of their countries, which often restricted the students' participation in events of political nature.[51] The political position of the Arab associations was fluctuating and often the most progressive organizations were at the same time the most fragmented ones. For instance, in the case of Syria there were two competing compatriot associations, one of them led by communists and other by members of the Muslim Brotherhood and Ba'ath Party, which were considered, alongside the Democratic Party of Kurdistan, the most significant concentration of Arab nationalism at UDN.[52] In the case of African associations, political moods tended to change on a relatively fast pace, and tribal relations and religion had a major role in interpersonal relations, which made the associations fragmented.[53] In other words, the internal dynamics of different compatriot associations reflect the features present in student selection with different countries sending students with different political orientations to the USSR and the varying level of global connections activists of the compatriot associations possessed.

As a response to this complex nature of compatriot associations, especially in the 1970s UDN stressed the importance of study groups as non-political entities bringing together students from different countries. As study programs were structured to include the same courses for all students within the same field of specialization, a study group formed in a natural way as a community of students participating in the same classes. Each group had assigned members to organize cultural and ideological program for the group. The group as a collective entity was expected to encourage its members to study

---

[51] GARF f. 9606, o.2, d.177, 57-58, 114-123.

[52] GARF f. 9606, o.2, d.221, 3-5,9, 19-22.

[53] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.222, 44-45.

better and aim for higher grades.[54] This way, the study group was expected to bring students together and bond over common interests. Study groups could take care of the same activities that were assigned to compatriot associations by the Soviet authorities: supporting the students in their studies and organizing leisure time activities. Stressing the importance of study groups was a way of increasing Soviet influence and monitoring the foreign student population.

Even though the activities of compatriot associations were defined by the Soviet administration as supporting the university administration in their task of turning the foreign students into good specialists and friends of the Soviet Union, political tendencies present within compatriot associations demonstrate that they were de facto spaces that brought different ideologies and local political tensions from around the world to Moscow. Despite the Soviet efforts to monitor the activities and political ethos of the associations, they contained a wide variety of different political mindsets and were in some cases actively criticizing the Soviet society or spreading competing political ideologies within the student community. The Soviet administration allowed these kinds of small-scale and grass-root level activities to take place, thus creating spaces for freedom of expression, and intervened only in the most serious cases of students actively promoting ideologies such as Maoism. On the other hand, the associations were also rapidly changing their political orientations, as they were mostly run by a small group of activists. While for most students the importance of compatriot associations laid in creating a community of compatriots with whom to spend leisure time in a non-political manner, the university was still keen to promote study groups as a more Soviet-controlled option for compatriot associations.

---

[54] *Druzhba* 28.3.1966, 2.

Regional organizations: supervision and activism

Most of the compatriot associations had a wider regional organization above them that was expected to present the students' wider interests and supervise compatriot associations. The Latin American umbrella organization was the Federation of National Associations of Latin American Students, founded in 1961 and bringing together students from 22 different compatriot associations.[55] Most Asian students were brought together by a loose organization of South and East Asian students. Arab students from 13 organizations had a rather passive umbrella organization called the Union of Organizations of Students from Arab Countries in the Soviet Union, founded in 1965.[56] African students were united under the Federation of African students in the Soviet Union, founded in 1962.[57]

In terms of political activity, by far the most active regional organization was the Federation of African students in the Soviet Union, which had committees in several cities. It used major political power among the students in the early 1960s and brought together all African students.[58] The organization described its main task as opposing colonialism and neocolonialism while supporting Pan-Africanism and national liberation movements. The organization was led by an executive committee that was in contact with different committees and sections below it.[59] In the early stages of its activities, the Federation was strongly committed to Soviet cooperation despite its openly stated support to Pan-Africanist ideas and stated there was no contradiction

---

[55] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.231, 53-59.
[56] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.221, 235-237.
[57] GARF f.9540, o.1, d.128, 5-7.
[58] While the African students' organizations in France and Great Britain brought together mostly students from the previous French colonial states and the British empire, respectively.
[59] GARF f. 9540, o.1, d.128, 5-7.

between the two, as this excerpt from a speech delivered by its chairman in the Federation's first congress in 1962 demonstrates:

> *We, African students, affirm our solidarity and our indefectible support to all the African peoples and all other peoples who fight against colonialism, neo-colonialism, and imperialism, for peace, complete general disarmament and the friendship between all peoples. We express our gratitude to all peoples, to all countries that support and give selfless help to our peoples in their struggle for national reconstruction. Our gratitude goes especially to the peoples and youth of the USSR who have spared no effort to fly to the aid of African peoples.*[60]

This interest in anti-colonialism and national liberation of all African nations, in other words Pan-Africanism, was wide-spread among the African intelligentsia and visible in all early Soviet cooperation with Africa, not only in the sphere of higher education. As the working class or proletariat was small in Africa, the intelligentsia had a major role in spreading new ideologies among the masses. This confrontation between Africans stressing the post-colonial experience and the Soviet stress on proletarian internationalism created a contradictions to the cooperation.[61] Soviet authorities often saw African intellectuals as "bourgeois nationalists" and very negative connotations were made to African socialism and Pan-Africanism, a these forms of socialism were considered an anticommunist ideology that did not recognize class struggle, but instead concentrated on questions of race, racism, and racial violence.[62] The Pan-Africanists themselves defined themselves as Marxists, thus questioning the universality of Soviet Marxism-Leninism. African intellectuals aimed to build "African socialism" that would

---

[60] Original in French, RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.29, 328.

[61] Constantin Katsakioris, "L'union soviétique et les intellectuels africains: Internationalisme, panafricanisme et négritude pendant les années de décolonisation, 1954-1964," *Cahiers du monde russe* 47, no. 1-2 (2006): 16. See also: Françoise Blum and Constantin Katsakioris, "Léopold Sédar Senghor et l'Union soviétique : la confrontation, 1957-1966," *Cahiers d'études africaines* 235, no. 3 (2019): 839-865.

[62] Racism was a central theme of political activism of UASA, Union of African Students and Workers in the GDR, as Sara Pugach has noted. Pugach "Agents of Dissent", S101-S105.

be developed by and for Africans not only to complete the decolonization process, but also to create a collective identity of being African.[63]

These ideas were clearly against the Soviet ideological understanding of the means and goals of its international cooperation, which led to ideological contradictions and intense attempts to influence the political mindset of the leadership of African students by Soviet authorities. As a reaction to the Soviet-mindedness of the Federation, in early 1963 compatriot associations of Ghana, Taganyika and Sierra Leone founded a competing nationalist-minded umbrella organization for the African students, titled the Pan-African Union.[64] Leadership of the Federation also soon changed into one that remained in power in 1963-1965 and criticized the Soviet authorities openly. The nationalist-minded head of the Federation stated in 1963:

> *The previous Federation was a Soviet product, completely dependent on Soviet organizations, which is why it could not become an organization that would respond to the interests of African students here. --- When it comes to our political platform, the main issue is African unity. In addition, we think that Asian nations understand the problems of our continent very well, which is why we thrive for local connections with them, as we can learn much from those countries of Asia that are waging the most consistent battle against imperialism.[65]*

In other words, this was a complete turnover in terms of political orientation and relation to the Soviet authorities. The influence of Maoism was clear in the political mood of the Federation's leadership. At the time, Maoist influence was not strong only among African students, but also among students from certain Asian countries, such as Japan and Indonesia. As a result, the Federation's ties to Soviet organizations were cut almost

---

[63] Katsakioris, "L'union soviétique et les intellectuels africains ", 26-28. For comparison on experiences of Tanzanian students in the GDR, see: Eric Burton, "Navigating global socialism: Tanzanian students in and beyond East Germany," Cold War History 19, no.1 (2019): 63-83.
[64] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.221, 38-45.
[65] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.221, 47-48.

entirely.[66] These developments raised a strong reaction among the Soviet leadership and in 1965, with heavy Soviet influence, the leadership of the Federation was changed into more Soviet-minded and cooperative individuals. By 1967, the Soviet authorities noted that the Federation was finally free from Maoism and fully supported the Soviet foreign and domestic policies. [67] In other words, the Federation was a highly fluctuating entity that was heavily influenced by the Soviet authorities that openly supported favored candidates to leadership positions.

As the case of Federation of African Students demonstrates, the regional organizations had potential to promote dissident political views widely among the foreign student population. Rhetoric and statements of the federation's leadership reflect wider political connections, movements and tendencies present within the international student community and highlight the political activism of compatriot associations and regional organizations. This field of political activism was especially vibrant in the early 1960s and potentially one of the most important factors causing political unrest at the university and resulting in wider standardization of education processes and student activities in the 1970s. The development taking place within this organization demonstrates the borders of Soviet flexibility concerning dissident political views and the ways in which the Soviet administration was ready to interfere in the activities of organizations it considered too openly political and oppositional.

---

[66] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.221, 49-52.

[67] For another detailed account of the events within the Federation in 1962-1965, see: Constantin Katsakioris, "Transferts Est-Sud. Échanges éducatifs et formation de cadres africains en Union soviétique pendant les années soixante," *Outre-mers* 94 no. 354-355 (2007): 101-104. By 1970 the most "enthusiastic" phase of Soviet interest towards Africa was fading due to both Khrushchev's fall from power in 1964 and the same happening to several pro-Soviet leaders, such as Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana and Modibo Keita of Mali. This development influenced the political activities of the students. For an overview on the development of Soviet-African relations, see: Maxim Matusevich, "Revisiting the Soviet Moment in Sub-Saharan Africa," *History Compass* 7 no.5 (2009): 1259-1268.

Foreign influence on students: activities of foreign embassies in Moscow

Previously discussed activities of foreign embassies in restricting or encouraging student participation in events of ideological nature where not the only form of foreign influence among the international student community. Western embassies in Moscow were active in promoting opportunities for studies in the West, especially in the US, Great Britain and West Germany. Gossip about events taking place in the embassies and opportunities for participation were widespread among the foreign students, while these activities were labeled as a Western propaganda campaign by the Soviet authorities.[68]

Certain members of the diplomatic corps in the US and Western European embassies were chosen directly to interact with the foreign student community. To provide an example, Norris Garnett, who was the only black person employed in the US Foreign Service at the time and fluent in both Russian and Swahili, was sent to Moscow to serve as a cultural attaché in 1964. In only few months, he had made contacts among the foreign student population, allegedly by offering them cigarettes, cognac, and jazz records at the embassy, and was soon expelled by the Soviet authorities.[69] To contrast these rather provocative statements, a Nigerian UDN alumnus told that he visited the US embassy in Moscow several times during his studies and got more information about studies and work in the US through the embassy, but did not mention receiving any

---

[68] Such information reached the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs also through discussions with foreign diplomats located in Moscow. For example, in November 1960 the Sudanese ambassador to the Soviet Union described the activities of US embassy in Moscow in discussion with the representative of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs. RGANI f.5, o.35, d.147, 173-174.

[69] Maxim Matusevich, "Expanding the Boundaries of the Black Atlantic: African Students as Soviet Moderns," *Ab Imperio* no. 2 (2012): 341-342; Tobias Rupprecht, "Gestrandetes Flaggschiff. Die Moskauer Universität der Völkerfreundschaft," *Osteuropa no.* 1 (2010), 100-101; Tobias Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin: Interaction and exchange between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 194-195.

other goods from the embassy.[70] These types of oral histories create a more realistic image of the activities of foreign embassies than the rather exaggerated archival narratives about active propaganda campaigns combined to intoxicants and promotion of Western popular culture that were aggressively denounced by the Soviet authorities.

However, not only Western embassies were eager to attract students to their events especially in the early 1960s. The Egyptian embassy was actively promoting studies in the university of Cairo and this promotion was especially influential among Arab students. The embassy was also hosting a club for Arab students and had a small cafeteria that served food that suited their tastes.[71] The Ghanaian embassy was very active in providing activities not only for Ghanaian students, but for African students more generally. Chinese influence was strong among the foreign student population, as Maoism was widely popular among them. Image of China as a developing country helping other developing countries on their paths towards socialism gained wide popular support. Activities to promote Chinese influence among the foreign student population was partly coordinated from the Chinese embassy in Moscow. Students possessed large amounts of Maoist books and magazines in several different languages, which were actively circulated in the dormitories.[72]

Foreign political influence was in constant fluctuation that reflected changes both in the international relations of the Soviet Union and in domestic politics of individual countries. Visible support and interest towards Maoist ideas was a phenomenon of the early 1960s, while the military coup that took place in Ghana in 1966 changed the position of the Ghanaian embassy in Moscow.[73] At the same time the Egyptian embassy

---

[70] Interview with Nigerian informant, 18.11.2020.
[71] RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.264, 100-101.
[72] RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.264, 87-88.
[73] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.136, 23-24, 29.

had withdrawn from many of its previous activities, such as the Arab cafeteria, as the Soviet-Egyptian relations had improved.[74] However, Cuban "ultra-leftism" attracted students in the 1970s, partly replacing the influence of Maoism.[75] Promotion of study opportunities and Western lifestyle continued in the embassies of the US, Great Britain and West Germany, which were also keen to point out problems such as racism and material deficiencies present in the Soviet society. In other words, the Soviet education project constantly experienced pressure from competing ideologies in its own territory aimed at the foreign student population.

Foreign and Soviet influence on student activism: case of demonstrations in December 1963

The most famous case of public student activism with foreign students organizing a demonstration against the Soviet administration took place in December 1963 as a reaction to the fate of Ghanaian student Edmond Assore Addo, who was found dead in the outskirts of Moscow.[76] African students were keen to interpret the death as hate-motivated crime, even though the conducted autopsy proved that the death was caused by the victim freezing to death in a state of drunkenness. A few days later 500-700 African students gathered on the Red Square to protest and present demands concerning their security in Moscow. This was the first spontaneous political protest on the Red Square since the late 1920s and raised wide international interest. It also forced the

---

[74] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.136, 42-43.

[75] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.63, 58-61.

[76] The demonstration on the Red Square in December 1963 was not a unique case of student unrest. A Komsomol Central Committee report from 1964 noted that different kinds of "provocations" had taken place in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Baku, Ulyanovsk, and Kherson. RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.353, 72-73. Neither was Edmond Assore Addo's case the only one of a foreign student dying while in the Soviet Union. In 1962 a student from Basutoland died in Kiev and in 1965 a Ghanaian student in Baku, both in unclear conditions. Katsakioris, "Transferts Est-Sud", 100.

Soviet administration to immediately employ its own methods of control to calm the situation.

Dozens of Ghanaian students had started to arrive to Moscow on December 9 to demand a 30% increase to their stipends. The Ghanaian ambassador later claimed that the students had gathered to Moscow with funds and support from Western governments and that the embassies of these countries had been active in spreading rumors and anti-Soviet attitudes among the students, while the Soviet authorities suspected that the Ghanaian embassy had encouraged the students to gather. [77] On December 14, the dead body of the Ghanaian student was found in the outskirts of Moscow. In a meeting organized at the Ghanaian embassy the students decided to organize a demonstration that took place on December 18 with UDN students from Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Kenya, Guinea, and Angola actively participating. The students held banners and shouted slogans that blamed the Soviet Union for racism. They also gave interviews to foreign media that had gathered on the square. Later, the students had a meeting with the Soviet ministers of education and health, rector of UDN, and representatives of the Committee of Soviet Youth Organizations to whom they presented a memorandum, which spoke openly about the incidents of racism that repeatedly occurred in the Soviet Union and demanded justice for Edmond Assore Addo.[78] The next day 80 students from

---

[77] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.127, 32-39. In his memoirs published in the West, William Anti-Taylor notes that the motivation for the students' demands was to spend the money received from the Ghanaian government abroad to buy better quality clothes than what was available in the Soviet Union. Anti-Taylor also notes that this additional scholarship was later approved and paid to Ghanaian students in the USSR in foreign currency. William Anti-Taylor, *Moscow Diary* (London: Robert Hale, 1967), 14-15, 19-20.

[78] In his memoirs, William Anti-Taylor notes that one of the Ghanaian students that participated in the autopsy had told that Assore Addo's head and arms were severely beaten and covered in bruises. According to Anti-Taylor, this information was silenced in public, as happened with killings of other African students that were declared accidents. Anti-Taylor, *Moscow Diary,* 16-17. Such claims cannot be confirmed with archival sources.

different universities, 20 of them from UDN, gave a statement to support the demonstrators.[79]

Komsomol, in cooperation with the Ministry of Higher and Special Education, reacted immediately to the events and employed different methods to stop the unrest from spreading. The demonstration was planned in several different dormitories around Moscow, including those of UDN. Information about this was leaked to Komsomol, and on December 18, several different Komsomol units were able to send their activists to the Red Square and the Manezh Square in central Moscow. All institutions of higher education and their dormitories were taken under control of the Ministry of Higher and Special Education in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, Kharkov, and other cities. Between December 19-22 Komsomol organized public discussions in the universities, especially with the African students. At the same time, UDN organized excursions and sightseeing in Moscow to keep the students away from further demonstrations. Organizers and participants of the events were separated from other students and UDN Komsomol held discussions with the African leaders of compatriot associations. Sudanese, Somalian, and Cameroonian student leaders immediately condemned the demonstrations as anti-Soviet, and the Soviet leadership actively encouraged the Federation of African Students to publicly take the same stance. UDN was seen as the center of rebellion, as heads compatriot associations of Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Taganyika and Ethiopia all studied at UDN and actively participated in the demonstration and its aftermath.[80]

---

[79] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.83, 341-348. For a detailed analysis of these events, see: Julie Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow: Race, Politics, and the Cold War," *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 47, no. 1-2 (2006): 51-60.
[80] RGASPI f.M-3, o.3 d.29, 18.

The rapid intervention of the Soviet authorities demonstrated their methods of control, which included immediately silencing the critical voices and drawing the attention of other foreign students elsewhere. Later the university was also active in providing the authorities' point of view to the events through lectures and discussions. In other words, the Soviet reaction to the situation demonstrates elements of control, but at the same time it heavily relies on intensifying forms of ideological work and cooperation with other actors, including embassies and compatriot associations. During the events, the Soviet administration was in tight contact with the ambassador of Ghana and the Ghanaian embassy was actively involved in calming down the moods of students in Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev.[81] The role of compatriot associations as assistants to the Soviet authorities in controlling their students and condemning any uncontrolled activities taking place outside their sphere of influence is also visible.

Students' political activism and demonstrations were ways to express political opinions and attempts to test the limits of Soviet tolerance, while attempts to silence them illustrate not only the methods of control employed, but also the importance of international students to the overall image of Soviet internationalism and transnational cooperation. In her analysis of the Red Square demonstration Julie Hessler has noted that the foreign students and Soviet institutions never stopped communicating with each other. Student protesters generally agreed on the progressive nature of the Soviet society and cooperated with the Soviet authorities, while the Soviet regime was willing to continue engaging with the students.[82] Similar principles were visible in relations concerning student-led organizations on a wider scale, as despite Soviet attempts to monitor political activities of foreign students and limit them in cases of visible

---

[81] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.98, 112-121, 146-148; GARF f.9606, o.2, d.135, 12; see also Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow".

[82] Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow", 56-57, 61.

appearances of oppositional political thought or criticism of the Soviet society, they still enjoyed a relatively wide freedom of expression. Comparatively few cases of anti-Soviet criticism caused active intervention of the authorities, while much small-scale dissent within the compatriot associations was quietly accepted. Relatively open social atmosphere of the Khrushchev era also gave space for more grass-root level political activism than the tightening ideological control over university activities during the Brezhnev era. At the same time, forms of political and ideological work among the students experienced few changes throughout the 1960s and 1970s, and its monotonous nature gained repeated criticism from the foreign student community. While the students' long residence in the Soviet Union placed certain challenges to planning and implementation of an attractive program of cultural and political activities, the activities also demonstrated a Soviet-centered view to internationalism that the students were keen to criticize by demanding a more equal transnational dialogue concerning questions of not only ideology and politics, but also social problems present in the Soviet society, including racism.

5. Living in Moscow: Everyday experiences and transnational encounters contesting ideology

This chapter looks at the life of foreign students in Moscow in environments that were not as openly controlled as university lecture halls. It starts by discussing life in the dormitories, moving on to cover different types of friendship and love relations of foreign students, and finally discussing problems encountered in relations with the Soviet citizens. The chapter argues that Soviet authorities struggled to control spheres of everyday life and encounters, which complicated not only ideological work by challenging idealized portrayals of "Soviet reality" present in the public sphere, but also image of the educational cooperation itself. As this chapter demonstrates, direct or indirect attempts to monitor and control the students were present also in the sphere of everyday life, and problematic features of everyday life were discussed in the public sphere by giving them ideologically appropriate explanations. Features of everyday life, such as living conditions in the dormitories and interaction with Soviet people, were also given ideological meanings, and the ways of dealing with practical problems encountered reveal the important role these features possessed for formation of an overall image of the Soviet system. However, this sphere of student activities and interaction was the most difficult one for the Soviet authorities to control, which resulted in a variety of phenomena such as intermarriages and racially-motivated violence that contested not only the ideological goals set for the education project, but also the image educational cooperation possessed in the Soviet public sphere.

Life in the dormitories

Dormitories of UDN were much more than places for rest and relaxation between studies. In addition to providing the foreign students new experiences about living independently together with other students, they were important ideological

playgrounds, where several forms of ideological work as well as observation and reporting took place. Most of this work was carried out by Soviet students that lived together with their foreign peers. At the same time, dormitory life was yet another way to demonstrate the superiority of the Soviet system to promote the ideological goals of the education project. In other words, conditions in the dormitory were meant to reflect the modernity of a socialist society, which is why material defects that occurred in dormitories were treated as not only practical, but also ideological defeats.

Ideals, culture shocks and everyday life

The Soviet state administration provided UDN students many benefits that made studying in the Soviet Union attractive for many different groups of foreign youth.[1] The stipend of international students at UDN was 90 rubles per month, which was equivalent of the monthly salary of a worker and notably higher than that of the Soviet students and students from the socialist world studying in the Soviet Union through bilateral agreements.[2] Students received stipend during holidays and sick leaves, without relation to their successfulness in studies. At the university they could study and use libraries and laboratories for free. Healthcare was free at university clinic and in Moscow hospitals when necessary. In addition, the students received 300 rubles for buying winter clothes to help in the acclimatization process.[3]

Family background of the students influenced how they experienced everyday life in the Soviet Union. For many students from farmer or working-class backgrounds the

---

[1] This preferential treatment of foreign students was similar to the one experienced by first foreign students in the USSR in the 1920s. Woodford McClellan, "Africans and Black Americans in Comintern Schools, 1925-1934," *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26, no.2 (1993): 376.

[2] For example, the Chinese and Vietnamese students received 50 rubles per month based on the bilateral agreements between their countries and the USSR, while the Soviet students received 30 rubles. GARF f.9606, o. 1, d.1532, 125.

[3] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.1235, 1-4.

living standards were a clear improvement to conditions back home, while for those coming from wealthier backgrounds the conditions were in many cases not as satisfactory.[4] For the majority of students, the generous stipend allowed them to live very comfortably, as it granted them a possibility to concentrate on their studies and enjoy life, as theatres, cinemas, museums, and other forms of entertainment were very affordable. Even everyday things, such as the possibility to take a hot shower any time of the day, were a luxury.[5] In addition, the Soviet Union provided them with additional activities, such as seaside holidays during the summertime, that few of them had experienced before.

Food was one of the biggest everyday culture shocks for the students. An Argentinian alumna described in detail different Russian foods and beverages, most of which were very strange to her.[6] While she and many other students experienced problems in trying to adapt to Russian food due to cultural and religious reasons, for a Pakistani alumnus food was one of the key factors in demonstrating a positive cultural difference between Pakistan and the USSR. For him, the Soviet Union created a space for breaking the norms of his own culture. By not following the cultural norms connected to food in Pakistan, he was able to demonstrate his new position in a different kind of society:

---

[4] The situation was very similar to the one described by Rachel Applebaum and Patryk Babiracki on their works concerning the Czechoslovak and Polish students in the USSR during late Stalinism: while the conditions in Soviet dormitories were a shock for the East European students, for most Soviet students they were a clear improvement to the conditions of living they had experienced in their childhood homes in the Soviet countryside. Rachel Applebaum, *Empire of Friends: Soviet Power and Socialist Internationalism in Cold War Czechoslovakia* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), 55-56; Patryk Babiracki, "Imperial Heresies: Polish Students in the Soviet Union, 1948-1957," *Ab Imperio* no.4 (2007): 202. Benjamin Tromly sees these transnational encounters between Soviet and East European students in dormitories reflecting the wider perception of Russian backwardness vis-à-vis Europe. Benjamin Tromly, "Brother or Other? East European Students in Soviet Higher Education Establishments, 1948-1956," *European History Quarterly* 44, no.1 (2014): 88.
[5] Tobias Rupprecht, "Gestrandetes Flaggschiff. Die Moskauer Universität der Völkerfreundschaft," *Osteuropa* no. 1 (2010): 107.
[6] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

> *Pakistan is a Muslim country, so there were many problems with food. People do not eat food that is not halal. It means that the meat is prepared in the Islamic way. They do not eat pork, that is also haram. I remember when in the first days we were given some sausage and it was said that there is pork in this sausage. People would not eat, but I started to eat straight away and said that I will eat in any case. You understand, when I arrived in the Soviet Union, I felt myself a free man and did everything I wanted.[7]*

This sense of freedom was also connected to life in the dormitory, where the students could live independently and free of charge without the control of their families, with three or four people sharing a room.[8] The students were responsible for cleaning and maintaining their rooms themselves. There was also a canteen at the dormitory serving dishes from different countries. Other services, such as clothes and shoes maintenance and a barbershop were available at the dormitory premises. The dormitories were administered by the university together with a dormitory council that welcomed also foreign students to participate in its activities.[9] When the first buildings of new UDN campus opened in autumn 1963, *Druzhba* described in detail the dormitories that offered everything the students needed for successful studies, highlighting the modernity, services and technology that were made available for the foreign students. This image of modernity and technological advancement was similar to the one used in the public images of UDN:

> *Students live in light and spacious rooms. All the students can use the dormitories and all the services they offer - bed sheets, lights, radio – for free! Every floor has special spaces for doing the laundry. Along with the buffet, located in the lower part of the building, students can use the well-equipped kitchens on each floor. Without leaving the building complex, students can access reading room, library, canteen, and other services.[10]*

---

[7] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.

[8] However, both Argentinian and Portuguese informants noted that it was at first difficult to get used to sharing a room with other students, and especially common showers and toilets for the entire floor required adapting. Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020; Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020.

[9] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.310, 144.

[10] *Druzhba* 23.10.1963, 1.

Although the Soviet state invested heavily in bringing foreign students to Moscow, problems with the upkeep of dormitories and other common spaces suggest that concern for their experience was inconsistent. In 1964, there was no hot water available in one of the dormitories and there were complaints that the dormitory was dirty. [11] These problems also remained for years, as in 1970 one of the dormitories had leaking roofs, it was cold in winter and broken windows had been fixed with pieces of plywood and even paper.[12] UDN canteen was too small to cater for all the students, as in the early 1960s it was temporarily functioning in an old shipping container.[13] The service staff could appear to their workplace drunk and late, did not take care of their appearance, and was rude to the students, while some of them invited students to their homes for socializing, which was also considered problematic behavior.[14] Some of the problems were also caused by the students themselves, as both foreign and Soviet students repeatedly broke the rules of living in the dormitories. Many refused to clean their rooms or common spaces, were smoking in the dormitories and other common spaces, and did not make their beds in mornings, while some students slept with their outdoor clothes and even shoes on.[15] Complaints also appeared in *Druzhba*, for instance in 1962 a student complained about the broken taps and lack of hot water in one of the dormitories, while in 1965 another one stated that the university clinic could not provide even basic medicine for everyday illnesses, such as colds, flus and stomach problems.[16]

---

[11] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.354, 103.

[12] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.79, 205.

[13] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.354, 103.

[14] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.3, 45.

[15] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.3, 7. The complaints of students are similar to the ones recorded in the 1920s, when African and African-American students at Comintern schools complained about food, laundry services, stipends and lack of heating, among other things. Woodford McClellan notes that this is most likely due to the semi-bourgeois backgrounds of the students and their experiences about standards of living in the West, as other groups of students, such as Asians, rarely complained about the conditions in the USSR. McClellan, "Africans and Black Americans in Comintern Schools," 386.

[16] *Druzhba* 15.12.1962, 2; *Druzhba* 18.10.1965, 2.

As a reaction to these incidents and complaints, UDN Komsomol was demanding already in 1961 that the dormitories should be regularly checked and searched, but these repeated demands did not produce immediate results. Locks of all dormitory rooms were identical, which meant that it was possible to access all rooms with one key, encouraging uncontrollable theft. As there were a lot of outsiders spending time in the territory of the dormitories and even eating in the canteens, there was a need for guarding the university territory. The university also demanded alcohol-selling kiosks and public saunas in the vicinity of the university buildings to be closed, as they attracted drunken people and caused fights.[17] In 1970, the issue was discussed again, as UDN CPSU unit noted that "introduction of propusk [access permit] system could bring an end to the disorder that reigns in our dormitories especially during weekends and holidays".[18] Propusk system was finally introduced in 1974, but it did not solve all the problems, as in 1978 Komsomol reported again that there were no guards employed in the campus, anyone could enter the dormitories and theft was a major problem.[19]

Dormitory life required adjustment to a new kind of environment, and especially factors such as Russian food, cold weather and living together with other students in one room were challenging to some students due to their different backgrounds. While for many students life in the Soviet Union provided improved material conditions compared to the ones they had experienced at home, the incapability of university administration to react to complaints and fix simple flaws in the dormitories highlighted the rigidity of the state socialist system. The thorough discussion around these practical problems lasted for years and highlighted the fears of Soviet administration that material conditions in the dormitories would make the foreign students question the image of

---

[17] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.5, 54-60.
[18] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.79, 200.
[19] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.55, 86-87.

Soviet society as modern and technologically advanced. Thus, inability to solve everyday problems affecting student experience was considered an ideological defeat.[20]

Living together with the Soviet students

Soviet administration aimed to enhance the foreign students' language learning by placing them into a same room with other foreign students that spoke different languages and one Soviet student, who was responsible for both supporting his roommates in their studies and reporting about their political moods and activities to Komsomol. This practice in theory forced the students to use Russian as their lingua franca in their everyday life and interaction with their roommates. A Portuguese alumna remembers that at first adapting to the situation was a challenge, as since the beginning of her studies she had three roommates from Martinique, Japan, and the Soviet Union with Russian as their only language in common.[21] However, there were also exceptions to the language policy. An Argentinian alumna remembered that during her years in Moscow she had roommates from Nicaragua, Argentina, El Salvador, and Chile. In other words, she constantly had roommates that spoke the same language as her and came from the same geographical region.[22]

When analyzing dormitory life from the point of view of ideological work, the widest attention was given to interaction between Soviet and foreign roommates in the dormitories. "Most foreigners did not come here only for science, but also to learn how to live and work the Soviet way", a report from Moscow State University noted in 1964.[23] This meant that a wide variety of ideological work and activities relied on Soviet

---

[20] Similar problems and fears had been encountered already during late Stalinist period with students from Eastern European countries. Babiracki, "Imperial Heresies", 210-211, 215-216, 222-223.

[21] Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020.

[22] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

[23] RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.264, 82-89.

students. These activities were rather ambitiously defined as supporting foreign students in learning Russian, overseeing that they were following the rules, familiarizing them with "Soviet reality", explaining them Soviet foreign and domestic politics, reporting and reacting to their moods and organizing cultural program.[24] Political tasks and obligations of the Soviet students were visible in interactions between them and foreign students, making these relations in some cases tense and hierarchical. A Sudanese student described his relations with the Soviet students at UDN Komsomol meeting[25] in 1964 as follows:

> *There is some kind of an invisible wall that restricts and does not allow us to establish truly friendly relations. And indeed, many Soviet students have very official relations with foreign students. --- I think that many Soviet students are afraid of such tight human relations, they are always afraid to make some kind of a mistake and approach a foreign student like an ambassador, not like a student, a comrade, with whom it is possible to have true brotherly relations.[26]*

Relations between Soviet and foreign students were further complicated with the duties of Soviet students to report on their foreign roommates to Komsomol. A Nigerian UDN alumnus shared his experience, which demonstrated the presence of surveillance and reporting in the dormitories. Once his Soviet roommate forgot his documents in the room when he went out for the day. The Nigerian student and his other foreign roommates got interested and decided to have a look at the documents. Among the documents was a KGB badge, which made the foreign students very scared. When the

---

[24] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.1022, 50-51. Svetlana Boltovskaja's informant Blaise from West Africa who studied at UDN in the 1970s noticed that while the atmosphere in dorm rooms could be genuinely friendly, in public the Soviet students were experiencing great pressure to build their future careers and fulfill their political obligations. Boltovskaja, *Bildungsmigranten aus dem subsaharischen Afrika in Moskau und St. Petersburg*, 75.

[25] Though foreign students could not become members of Komsomol, they were invited to participate in the biggest annual open meetings of UDN Komsomol, where they also had a chance to present their views on topics discussed.

[26] RGASPI, f. M-1, o.46, d.355, 5. This experience is similar to the one of the Pakistani UDN alumnus who described that while his Soviet fellow students were always helpful towards their foreign fellow students, these relations were not genuinely cordial and he did not consider them friendships. Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.

Soviet roommate returned, he asked whether they had seen his documents. The Nigerian and his friends refused, but their roommate saw that they were nervous and lying. He took out the badge, showed it to his foreign roommates and laughed saying that it did not mean anything. The Nigerian student had a fond memory of incident, which in his opinion proved that for Soviet students performing ideological tasks was necessary for political and social purposes but did not pose any real harm on foreign students.[27]

Reporting on foreign students was used for several purposes by the Soviet authorities. The most important of them was to observe the general political moods within the foreign student community. Most of the reports concentrated on compatriot organizations and their leadership, as these were considered important political actors in forming the foreign students' worldviews. Reports on individuals were used for kharakteristika, a short description of the personal qualities of foreign students, which included information about their family, social and political background and worldviews. A student with excellent kharakteristika, including good grades and flawless behavior was more likely to be accepted for post-graduate studies.[28] On the other hand, even students who failed in their studies or were ideologically suspicious rarely faced any serious consequences, except in the most extreme cases.

Previous research has presented contrasting views on the level of surveillance in the dormitories and its effects in the everyday life of foreign students. As Abigail Kret has argued, some students believed that at least some of their Soviet roommates were in fact

---

[27] Interview with Nigerian informant, 18.11.2020.
[28] Constantin Katsakioris, "Burden or allies?: Third world students and internationalist duty through Soviet eyes," *Kritika*: *Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 18 no.3 (2017): 562; Constantin Katsakioris, "Une superpuissance éducative: l'Union soviétique et la formation des élites du tiersmonde (1956-1991)," *Traverse: Zeitschrift für Geschichte = Revue d'histoire,* no.1 (2018): 117-118.

army-trained spies and were feeling highly uncomfortable about the situation.[29]

However, Constantin Katsakioris has pointed out that both the Komsomol executives

and the Soviet students were often careless regarding their duties of supervision and

reporting, which contradicts Kret's sources, which mostly consisted of student memoirs

published in the West, describing how "active members of Komsomol observed [them]

constantly with the utmost persistence and evil intentions."[30] Such memoirs provided

very negative accounts about everyday life in Moscow and highlighted the level of

surveillance and attempts of political influencing, while archival sources tend to agree

with Katsakioris' note on the carelessness of the Soviet students, as they were constantly

criticized for their lack of interest towards the foreign students.[31] As Tobias Rupprecht

has noted, surveillance did not include active attempts to influence foreign students

ideologically and reporting on political mindsets of the students mostly concentrated on

moods within national groups.[32]

Soviet students were a small minority among the whole student population of UDN in

the 1960s, which further complicated conducting efficient ideological work among

foreign students. To provide an example, in 1968 among second-year students of

medicine there were approximately one hundred foreign students and only 8 Soviet

students. The sheer numbers made ideological work with such a group demanding.[33]

Distant and cool relations between Soviet and foreign students that were mentioned in

---

[29] Abigail Judge Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge: The Peoples' Friendship University and Soviet Education for the Third World," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 245-246.

[30] Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge", 246. Spying, reporting, and tapping of phone calls has been discussed in detail in memoirs of black students in the USSR that were published in the West. See: Jan Carew, *Moscow is not my Mecca* (London: Secker&Warburg, 1964); William Anti-Taylor, *Moscow Diary* (London: Robert Hale, 1967).

[31] Katsakioris, "Burden or allies?", 562.

[32] Tobias Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin: Interaction and Exchange between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 198, 200-201.

[33] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.63, 92.

comments and oral histories of foreign students were also noted by Komsomol. In 1974, UDN Komsomol noted that Soviet and foreign students would gather in different rooms, and in study projects Soviet students preferred grouping together and were unwelcoming towards foreign students.[34] In the 1970s, many Soviet students of UDN also started to live in private apartments instead of dormitories due lack of space and approximately half of the foreign students ended up living in dormitories without Soviet roommates.[35] The situation did not reduce pressure placed upon Soviet students, as they were expected to lead a good example, conduct most of ideological work in the dormitories, as well as observe and report to the higher levels of Komsomol and university administration about the moods and behavior of their foreign peers. These demands also effected the selection process of new Soviet students, where importance of ideological competency was highlighted through a series of reforms while simultaneously rising the proportion of Soviet students within the student population.

Friendships and relationships outside the university

While living in the dormitories and studying at UDN, relationships formed outside the university were an important part of the foreign students' experience in the Soviet Union. These relationships that formed organically in spaces beyond direct ideological control allowed the foreign students to create connections that exceeded the ideas of ideological friendship based on solidarity and shared ideals that was promoted through different activities of ideological work. For many foreign students, friendships and even marriages with Soviet citizens were some of the strongest and most durable experiences of their stay. From the point of view of Soviet authorities, all contacts between Soviet citizens and foreign students had to be supervised and controlled, as phenomena

---

[34] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.27, 30.
[35] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.286, 1-5, 14-18.

connected to these relationships, such as black-market trade and intermarriages, were considered extremely problematic.

Making friends outside the university

Experiences of foreign students concerning their friendships and relationships were mixed. A Nigerian alumnus noted that soon after his arrival in Moscow he found a Soviet girlfriend, lived with the girl and her family for certain periods of time and overall felt that he was quick to adapt to the Soviet society.[36] For many other students, such emotional relations with the Soviet citizens were not established as easily and not all foreign students made friends with Soviet citizens at the university of outside it. Some foreign students were so preoccupied with their studies that they rarely explored Moscow independently. A Portuguese alumna stated that the students were living relatively segregated lives from the Soviet citizens in their dormitory complex that offered everything needed for everyday life. She did not have close contacts with Russians or Russian friends outside the university. During her 5 years in the Soviet Union, she noted that she mostly concentrated on her studies and visited only once or twice the house of her Russian teacher.[37] Also a Pakistani alumnus mentioned that "when we were students we did not know much about the everyday life of Russians and how they lived at home"[38] and an Argentinian alumna even noted that going outside the dormitory was not recommended.[39]

Foreigners were in general wealthier than the Soviet youth and those who could afford to travel abroad were often involved in trading Western goods, such as stockings, jeans,

---

[36] Interview with Nigerian informant, 18.11.2020.
[37] Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020.
[38] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.
[39] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

and music records. Especially many young Soviet women from outside the university actively sought friendship with foreign male students involved in black-market trade. This way, the foreign students that were supposed to serve as models of Soviet internationalism, were in fact also a gateway to Western goods and popular culture.[40] According to the Soviet officials it was mostly "bad girls" interested in material benefits that made friends with the foreigners. Who were these "bad girls" then? A meeting among foreign students that took place in summer 1965 to establish a volunteer patrol to monitor people entering the dormitories provides a vivid image. A student from Bahrain opened the discussion by stating that:

> *Girls have gotten worse. They are dependent on the students who waste money on them (in cafes and restaurants). --- There are some taxi drivers that bring girls here. --- I was shocked to see these drunken girls climbing in through windows.*[41]

The following comment by a Soviet student supplements the image about trade and relations taking place in the dormitories:

> *Maybe I am wrong, but I have seen how our girls try on things that our students have brought* [for them]. *They try them on in the forest. Forgive me, but after* [seeing] *this, a question rises: "Might this be in connection to similar events of selling goods in the* [dormitory] *rooms?" And when the girls knock on the guys' doors at night to get into their rooms? Are these decent girls?*[42]

---

[40] Rupprecht, "Gestrandetes Flaggschiff", 107. TsMAM f. P-3061, o. 1, d.158, 65. Svetlana Boltovskaja's informant Blaise from West Africa noted that the black-market trade allowed most African students to live very comfortably while in the USSR. Boltovskaja, *Bildungsmigranten aus dem subsaharischen Afrika,* 83, 85. The situation was similar when the first foreign students from socialist countries of Eastern Europe arrived in the USSR during Stalinism: Rachel Applebaum has noted in her research that many young Soviet women were keen to seek friendship of the young male students from states of the Eastern bloc in hopes of emigration. Applebaum, *Empire of Friends*, 63. William Anti-Taylor describes the trading on foreign goods that took place in the dormitory by recounting how Soviet acquaintances were keen to buy his foreign-made clothes. Anti-Taylor, *Moscow diary*, 137-140.
[41] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.294, 137.
[42] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.294, 140.

These scenes vividly describe the nature of interaction between certain local young women and foreign male students, at the same time pointing out the contradictions of socialist ideals and realities the students encountered in their everyday life in Moscow. The continuation of discussion in the meeting further visualized the situation, as tasks of the planned patrol would have included guarding the dormitories and, in the words of one of the participants, "go inside the rooms where a scandal is taking place and demand it to stop".[43] Another participant added that it would be important to work not only "against the girls" but try to influence the students. Sometimes single men, especially Africans and Arabs, would bring 16-year-old girls to the dormitories, so it would be important to control the behavior of the students, to "explain them in a good comradely way that meetings of a 25-year-old with a 16-year-old are not normal."[44] These kinds of relationships with Soviet girls connected to black-market trade through which it was possible to obtain goods that were not available otherwise and that were especially attractive to Soviet teenagers due to popularity of Western popular culture.[45] Such relationships based on the comparatively wealthy position of foreign students were a well-known phenomenon among the foreign student community.[46]

As these examples demonstrate, certain forms of interaction between Soviet citizens and foreigners were described in very negative terms. Young women engaging in relationships with foreign students were described as harming the Soviet people with their behavior, often drunk, and interested only in material benefits relationships with

---

[43] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.294, 139.

[44] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.294, 139.

[45] See, for instance: Sergei Zhuk, *Rock and Roll in the Rocket City: The West, Identity, and Ideology in Soviet Dniepropetrovsk, 1960–1985* (Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2010).

[46] For instance, Nigerian journalist Olabisi Ajala dedicates most of his Moscow travelogue to relations between African students and Soviet young women that were invited to parties and get-togethers at the foreign students' dormitory. The girls were, according to Ajala, very interested to get to know foreigners despite language barriers and other practical difficulties. Olabisi Ajala, *An African Abroad* (London: Jarrolds, 1963), 80-90.

foreigners entailed. In other words, they were not "decent" and did not correspond to idealized images of Soviet youth present in the public sphere. Many descriptions equate the women's activities with prostitution. While the women's motivations for friendships with foreigners were condemned and seen as questionable, the narratives were simultaneously supporting stereotypes of especially African and Arab men as ideologically unstable and sexually hyperactive, not shying away from relationships with underaged girls.[47] Besides these narratives connected to black-market trade and its side effects, friendships of the students received little attention from Soviet authorities, which again suggests that only the most problematic forms of interaction were condemned. As oral histories on the topic suggest, student experiences concerning interaction with Soviet citizens outside the university were mixed and many stated that at UDN they lived a life that was rather segregated from the surrounding Soviet society.

Marriages between Soviet citizens and foreigners

While the number of relationships that did not lead to marriage between foreigners and Soviet citizens was high, there were also numerous couples who got married and later tried to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Most of these relationships were formed between Soviet women and foreign men, and male and female students in general had different experiences concerning intimate relationships during their stay in the Soviet Union as few female students sought relationships outside their compatriot community, possibly due to stricter morality codes applied to them.[48] Both interaction around black-

---

[47] Similar ideas about "lascivious African man and his counterpart, the promiscuous German woman" stemming from times of imperial Germany were prominent in GDR and widely visible in attitudes towards interracial couples. Sara Pugach, "African Students and the Politics of Race and Gender in the German Democratic Republic," in *Comrades of Color: East Germany in the Cold War World*, ed. Quinn Slobodan (New York: Berghahn, 2015), 131-156.

[48] Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin,* 214; Constantin Katsakioris, "Students from Portuguese Africa in the Soviet Union, 1960-1974: Anti-colonialism, Education, and the Socialist Alliance," *Journal of Contemporary History* (2020): 19-20. Benjamin Tromly has also analyzed marriages

market trade and marriages of Soviet women with foreign males were allegedly motivated by the women's greed for material benefits. Potential emigration from the Soviet Union due to marriage was also deeply condemned by the Soviet authorities. These attitudes were widely presented in Komsomol meetings and other similar ideological events aimed mainly for the Soviet students, while in reality marrying a foreigner did not guarantee a permission for the Soviet wife to emigrate, which left many intercultural couples in a problematic situation.

Soviet authorities considered marriages between foreigners and Soviet citizens extremely problematic. Soviet women were often blamed in public for unacceptable behavior with foreigners, thus setting norms for proper behavior in relation with foreign citizens that applied especially to Soviet women. In 1965, UDN CPSU unit noted that around 200 marriages had been formed among the foreign students, most of them mixed marriages between foreign students of different nationalities.[49] Among a student population of approximately 3000 foreign students, this means that approximately 10% of students got married during 1960-1965. Still, already in 1964, Moscow city CPSU unit demanded changes to current legislation concerning marriages as especially Soviet wives emigrating with their husbands were seen as a wide-scale ideological problem that encouraged other Soviet young women to follow this example.[50] Marriages between foreign students and Soviet faculty members or students were most condemned. UDN Komsomol criticized instructors of Russian language for their communication with students and even clothing. It was noted, among other things, that wearing bright

---

as part of his research on Eastern European students in the USSR during late Stalinism. Tromly, "Brother or Other?", 92-94.

[49] TsAODM f. P-4376, o.1, d.25, 96.

[50] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.353, 92-97.

colors was not suitable behavior for someone working with foreign students, as it created wrong types of sensations in them.[51]

By 1965, approximately 50 children had been born out of marriages between foreign students, Soviet and foreign students or Soviet faculty members and foreign students. As UDN did not have possibilities to provide apartments for the young families, the administration encouraged young parents to place their children in local orphanages. However, several incidents that caused deaths of children had taken place in these institutions, which made the parents suspicious and most of them refused to be separated from their children. This complicated the situation in dormitories that were not planned to cater for foreign students living together with their spouses and children.[52]

For Soviet young women who married foreigners the possibility to follow their husbands abroad was a strenuous bureaucratic endeavor even in cases where the couple already had children together. A Pakistani UDN alumnus noted that he was forced to return to Pakistan after graduation despite the fact that he had gotten married and his daughter was two months old. In Pakistan he found a job to support his family and sent an invitation letter for his wife to follow him, but she was not given a passport or an exit visa. In the end, the Pakistani alumnus applied for graduate studies in the Soviet Union and the couple ended up living together in Moscow.[53] In other words, the common perceptions about Soviet women using marriages with foreigners as methods to emigrate from the country did not correspond to reality, as in many cases emigration was restricted even in cases of clear family connections. Tobias Rupprecht has noted that approximately half of relationships between Soviet women and foreign men broke

---

[51] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.5, 57-60.
[52] TsAODM f. P-4376, o.1, d.25, 96.
[53] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.

up when the student-fathers returned home after graduation.[54] Many such experiences were probably caused by strict policies concerning emigration.

In the public sphere Soviet women were warned about the dangers of marrying foreigners, even though also positive stories about multicultural families appeared to stress internationalism and friendship. Officially worries about marriages between Soviet women and foreign men were mostly connected to Soviet women not understanding what kind of a commitment they were about to make, as culture and customs of certain regions, such as the Arab world, were very different from the Soviet Union. This worry was also present in the media, as for example *Komsomol'skaia Pravda* published a story about a Soviet girl who married an African student and was sold to a harem once the couple returned to the husband's home country. After protests of foreign students, editors of the newspaper admitted that the story was fictional.[55] However, also positive narratives about intercultural marriages appeared in the public sphere. In 1963, *Druzhba* published a story of a Sudanese student of engineering and his Soviet wife. The couple married a year after they first met, and soon had a daughter, "the first Russian-Sudanese child in the world", who was named Nadezhda [Hope].[56] These varying narratives suggest that family life of Soviet women and foreign men could prosper in the Soviet Union, but narratives about Soviet women emigrating to follow their husbands were presented in a threatening and negative manner.

Public and private discussions concerning intimate relationships between Soviet and foreign students are perhaps the most telling examples about contradictions between ideals of internationalism and practices transnational connections. Public images and

---

[54] Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin,* 214-215.
[55] Both William Anti-Taylor and Jan Carew mention this article in their memoirs about life of black students in Moscow. Anti-Taylor, *Moscow Diary*, 13; Carew, *Moscow is not my Mecca,* 139-140.
[56] *Druzhba* 23.3.1963, 3.

stories tended to stress comradely behavior and cooperation at the university, while the Soviet administration condemned intimate relations between Soviet young women and foreign men, as they brought together many elements considered problematic for the Soviet education project, including emigration, black-market trade and alleged prostitution. While some Soviet young women went through the complex bureaucratic procedures and managed to emigrate with their new families, this was not the case with all couples despite the common perceptions of Soviet women using their marriages as a justification for emigration from the Soviet Union. In addition to the problem of emigration, intermarriages were breaking the boundaries of ideological friendship based on solidarity and shared ideals, as foreign students were not expected to integrate or mix with the Soviet population, but to return home to build their societies after graduation. As Berthold Unfried has noted concerning the case of GDR, according to the officials, foreign students should be "treated as comrades, but at a reasonable distance, as people whose difference ('habits' and 'culture') had to be respected."[57]

Violence and crime

Often incited by relations between Soviet girls and foreign men, negative attitudes towards the foreign students were relatively widely spread among the Soviet citizens. While all negative attitudes were not connected to race, but also to higher social status and wealth the foreign students possessed compared to their Soviet peers, violence against foreign students, especially African and Arab males, was a fairly common phenomenon with incidents of violence reported weekly especially during holiday seasons and in neighborhoods where the foreign students' dormitories were located.[58]

---

[57] Berthold Unfried, "Education as a Paradigm and as a Part of Institutionalized 'International Solidarity' of the German Democratic Republic," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, ed. Ingrid Miethe & Jane Weiss (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020): 86.
[58] The situation was similar in the GDR, as Sara Pugach has demonstrated in her research. See: Sara Pugach, "Eleven Nigerian Students in Cold War East Germany: Visions of Science, Modernity, and

For example, in 1978 Komsomol stated that 38 crime reports were filed in the whole country against the foreign students, while the foreign students had filed 232 crime reports concerning crimes against them. [59] These numbers suggest that crimes against foreign students were significantly more common than crimes committed by foreign students, though it is also clear that only a minority of the cases were officially reported.

Negative perceptions leading to violence

The Soviet media provided stories about Soviet aid projects in the developing world as signs of solidarity and internationalism, portraying foreign students as needing assistance from the USSR. This presentation had a contradictory impact on popular attitudes, as socio-economic conditions in the Soviet Union were demanding for the local population and foreign visitors alike. The foreign students' high scholarships and unrestricted opportunities to travel abroad caused jealousy and aggression among the Soviet youth. A common popular opinion was that students from the developing world were ungrateful for the aid they were offered. In other words, as Constantin Katsakioris

---

Decolonization," *Journal of Contemporary History*, 54, no. 3 (2019): 551–572. The situation in the 1960s and 1970s was thus drastically different from the one during the interwar period, when the foreign visitors, especially African American and Afro-Caribbeans, were keen to note that they did not experience any kind of discrimination during their stay in the USSR and the official ideology of no racial discrimination seemed to have real influence in popular attitudes among Soviet citizens. See: Maxim Matusevich, "An Exotic Subversive", 63-64, 66-67. For example, in his memoir *Black Man in Red Russia*, African American journalist Homer Smith repeatedly states that while he and his circle of friends experienced various hardships during the 1930s and 1940s in the Soviet Union, these were never due to their racial features. Instead, Smith notes that on several occasions people of color were given preferential treatment compared to Soviet citizens. Discussing the experiences of himself and his acquaintances, Smith writes that "Despite the fact there were fewer of the material amenities in Russia than they had known in America, I never heard any of these Negroes make any complaints about life in Russia. There were shortages of everything: there was none of the freedom of speech they had known in the United States. Yet, Negroes felt that the full racial equality they were experiencing fully compensated for any material shortcomings." Homer Smith, *Black Man in Red Russia: A Memoir* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 1964), 206. For comparison, Woodford McClellan has described incidents of racism and general negative attitudes the first African and African-American students experienced during their stay in the USSR in the 1920s. Woodford McClellan, "Africans and Black Americans in Comintern Schools", 384-385. For an overview of racism and attitudes towards people of African descent in late imperial Russia and the Soviet Union, see: Maxim Matusevich, "Black in the USSR: Africans, African Americans, and the Soviet society," *Transition* no. 100 (2009): 56-75.

[59] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.714, 36-39.

has pointed out, the foreign students were "not only culturally and racially alien, they were also politically and socially alien, petit bourgeois, and as such breaking the cohesion and formal unity of the Soviet society."[60] In other words, negative attitudes towards foreign students were not necessarily racially motivated, as other factors highlighted their otherness within the Soviet society and contrasted popular hierarchical perceptions about the position of foreign students from the developing world in comparison to Soviet citizens.

Violence against foreigners was relatively common in Moscow and some of these incidents seemed to be racially motivated. A Pakistani UDN alumnus noted that all non-European students were considered "black" in the Soviet context and were thus under a threat of racist incidents, especially in the vicinity of their dormitories. He diminished the scale of this problem by stating that such incidents happened "one or two or three times but caused a great hassle".[61] However, for instance in summer 1962 several attacks against African students were recorded within ten days in the Sokol and Cheremushki neighborhoods, where most of the foreign students' dormitories were located. In three of the attacks Soviet citizens beat four students from Mali and Niger so badly that the victims had to be taken to hospital.[62] Julie Hessler has noted that racism was enough of a problem in the USSR in the early 1960s to affect African students on

---

[60] Katsakioris, "Burden or allies?", 558-563. Benjamin Tromly has pointed out similar tendencies concerning the East European students in the USSR during late Stalinism. Benjamin Tromly, "Brother or Other?", 91-92. Dayana Murguia has noted that participants of the Isla de la Juventud education program in Cuba received their scholarships in dollars, which were unobtainable for the Cuba population at the time. Thus students, mostly from Africa, could use hotels, taxis and shops for foreigners that were inaccessible for the local population, which raised anger among the Cubans. Dayana Murguia, "Socialist Education and International Cooperation: An Introduction to the School Program on the Isla de la Juventud in Cuba," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, ed. Ingrid Miethe & Jane Weiss (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020), 120-121. See also: Maxim Matusevich, "Expanding the Boundaries of the Black Atlantic: African Students as Soviet Moderns," *Ab Imperio* no. 2 (2012): 325-350.

[61] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.

[62] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.77, 187.

the level of their physical security. While most instances of racial harassment were comparatively minor, also actions that qualified as hate crime occurred.[63]

Incidents of violence aimed against foreign students were silenced in the public sphere and student reactions to these events were seen as an indicator of ideological maturity. In 1962, two students from Panama had been beaten at a bus stop and later arrested by the police instead of their perpetrators. The report noted that because the Panamanians were communists, they did not turn the event into a political statement. "But what if they had been Arabs or Africans?" asked the report, clearly stating that these two groups of students had a tendency to "scandalize" violence they experienced. [64] Stories about violence against foreigners were passed from student to student by word-of-mouth, and though in some cases they may have been magnified in the process, Soviet authorities' failure to address the episodes openly only increased the students' sense of insecurity.[65] African students were, according to UDN Komsomol report from 1962, "constantly worried about their safety" and the circulating rumors about racial violence that was strengthening anti-Soviet sentiments among the students. [66] Such behavior was considered anti-socialist, as according to Soviet authorities the violence taking place was not racially motivated, but individual incidents of hooliganism.

Attempts to improve the situation

Violent incidents led to requirements to educate both the foreign students and the Soviet citizens concerning norms of accepted behavior. Especially UDN Komsomol and CPSU units were actively trying to promote internationalism at the university and in the city

---

[63] Julie Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow: Race, Politics, and the Cold War," *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 47, no.1-2 (2006): 38-39.
[64] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.310, 141.
[65] Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow," 38-39.
[66] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.310, 141.

of Moscow more generally. The city of Moscow CPSU unit created a detailed plan to improve the students' experiences already in 1963-1964. The plan called for more training for the police to reduce discrimination, more discussion against racism on the press, and more films and other works of art discussing international solidarity. Foreign students were also encouraged to visit local school and factories to perform songs and dances.[67] However, creating friendly transnational encounters outside the university to diminish discriminative attitudes was not an easy task, as the organized encounters were often too ritualistic to create deeper mutual understanding between foreign students and the Soviet population. In other words, the Soviet state administration acknowledged that crime targeted against foreign students was an issue, but most methods to improve the situation were connected to providing more internationalist education to Soviet citizens, the results of which were difficult to measure. In other words, as Julie Hessler has noted, the Soviet Union's ideological self-confidence limited its capacity to react constructively to social problems, such as racism, and the suggested methods to improve the situation were mostly connected to forms of ideological work already employed.[68]

In public the image of Soviet Union as a non-racist society remained intact and publications concerning questions of transnational encounters between Soviet citizens and foreigners concentrated on providing narratives of hospitality and curiosity as dominant features of Soviet citizens. A guide for new UDN students from 1963 noted that especially children could make gestures or expressions towards Asian and African people that might create "a false image of the Soviet people":

> *Soviet people, whose characteristic feature has always been hospitality, are especially warm towards people of nations that have only recently fought for their independence or who still languish under colonial*

---

[67] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.353, 92-97. The discussion to prepare the plan had started in late 1962, see: RGANI f.5, o.33, d.194, 99-102.
[68] Julie Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow", 38-39.

oppression. At the same time, due to not knowing our habits, an erroneous interpretation of one or another gesture or expression might create, especially during the first days, a false image of the Soviet people. As an example, one can take the curiosity that a certain proportion of the population, especially children, might demonstrate towards the representatives of African and Asian countries. This can be explained through a specific approach to foreigners that is caused by the fact that tight relations between the USSR and many countries of Asia and Africa were created only recently, and not so long-ago representatives of other continents appeared on our streets, which is why, naturally, they might create some curiosity.[69]

The text is rich in highlighting the novelty of contacts between the Soviet Union and countries of the developing world that had "only recently fought for their independence". As regions such as Africa possessed virtually no shared history with the Soviet Union, the foreign students' arrival created an atmosphere of curiosity connected to transnational encounters between Africans and Soviet citizens.[70] While the excerpt stresses Soviet solidarity towards foreigners, it also suggests that internationalism, despite being in the center of current Soviet foreign policy, had previously appeared in the everyday lives of Soviet citizens only on the level of ideology, not in practice. Efforts of bringing Soviet citizens and foreigners together were important to create more natural interaction between the two groups within the framework of ideological friendship and solidarity. The guide also requests patience from foreign students, thus suggesting that despite the public image of modernity, the Soviet Union was still developing in terms of transnational communication in spite of previous Soviet experience in creating friendship among peoples within the Soviet state.

Despite the relatively high number of attacks against foreigners and occasional discriminative attitudes, incidents of violence did not touch the majority of foreign

---

[69] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.336, 191.

[70] Despite events such as the Festival of Youth and Students organized in 1957 in Moscow. Maxim Matusevich, "Expanding the Boundaries of the Black Atlantic: African Students as Soviet Moderns," *Ab Imperio* no. 2 (2012): 328-329, 342-343.

students living in the Soviet Union. A Nigerian UDN alumnus of medicine stated that he had never felt as safe as in Soviet Moscow, where any negative attention he would receive due to his skin color was quickly condemned both by the police and most citizens.[71] A Pakistani alumnus also noted that when incidents of public arguments between Soviet citizens and foreign students took place, other Soviet citizens would often get involved to support the foreigners.[72] In other cases the police would interrupt situations that were potentially threatening or discriminating against foreigners. Nigerian journalist Olabisi Ajala described an incident when a taxi refused to accept him and his African friends as clients. A police officer immediately interrupted in the situation and gave a serious warning to the driver in question.[73] A Nigerian UDN alumnus recounted in detail an incident that occurred during the Moscow Olympics in 1980. He was spending the evening in the nightclub and asked some girls to dance with him. This made Russian young men jealous and aggressive. Due to the nightclub's location in an official Olympic hotel, the tourist police were present and had a very strict attitude towards hooligans, threatening them with imprisonment if they did not leave the Nigerian student alone. The alumnus felt that the Soviet police had zero tolerance for racism and was ready to help when necessary.[74]

Experiences of foreign students and other visitors to the USSR concerning Soviet citizens and police interrupting cases of discrimination and potential violence portray a different side of life in the Soviet Union as a foreigner. While violence against foreigners could occur and rumors about racially motivated crimes were widely spread, it seems that ideals of non-racism and internationalism were adopted by many Soviet

---

[71] Interview with Nigerian informant, 18.11.2020.
[72] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.
[73] Ajala, *An African Abroad*, 85-86.
[74] Interview with Nigerian informant, 18.11.2020.

citizens. Alongside the otherness and exoticism connected to foreign students, also the novelty of contacts with the developing world created a variety of different reactions among the Soviet population in situations of transnational communication. While Soviet authorities were able to monitor and educate actors such as the police concerning discriminative attitudes towards the foreign students, it remains unclear whether ideological work and ritualized events bringing together Soviet citizens and foreign students influenced common perceptions and popular attitudes towards the foreigners on a wider scale.

Crimes committed by foreign students

Acts of violence taking place in Moscow in the 1960s and 1970s were not one-sided and if racism was a subject that was mostly silenced in the public sphere, even more so were the crimes committed by the foreign students. In one of the cases, two students from Zanzibar raped a 16-year-old Russian boy in Moscow in 1962. The event was discussed in the highest administrative levels of Komsomol, and the two students were deported from the USSR silently, avoiding any publicity.[75] Cases of expelling and deporting foreign students were relatively rare and often required continuous hooliganism or active promotion of anti-Soviet, in most cases Maoist, opinions. Only the most extreme cases of violence, such as this one, led to immediate consequences for the students involved.

In addition to serious crimes which resulted in deportation, there were numerous cases of smaller-scale incidents that built distrust between foreign students and Soviet citizens. UDN Komsomol report from 1964 listed some events that had taken place in Moscow

---

[75] RGASPI, f.M-3, o.3, d.29, 545.

recently and had involved UDN students. These incidents included a group of Nigerian students beating up a taxi driver, a Malian and a Nigerian student harassing passers-by on the street and beating up a police officer, a Nigerian student hitting a Soviet women in the face on the street, a Ghanaian student harassing and beating passers-by on the street, a Sudanese student beating up a taxi driver, a Congolese student hitting a woman in the head on the street so that she fell down, drunken Somali students harassing people in a restaurant and beating up police officers. A month later one of these Somali students was again drunk and beating students. His hooliganism went on for over half a year before he was finally deported, which serves as another piece of evidence that deportation was not an obvious consequence of misbehavior.[76]

Cases of crime against the foreign students as well as crimes committed by the foreign students posed a serious threat to the public image of Soviet educational cooperation. Crime involving foreigners was efficiently silenced in the public sphere, while attacks against foreigners were explained as individual cases of hooliganism. Discriminative attitudes leading to these incidents were caused not only by the racially and culturally alien status of the foreign students, but also their social position and "otherness" within the Soviet society. Simultaneously, intimate relationships between Soviet citizens and foreigners were also considered problematic, as they were connected to emigration, black-market trade, and alleged prostitution, all silenced phenomena in the Soviet society. Thus, both positive and negative uncontrolled interaction between foreign students and Muscovites caused not only practical, but also ideological problems. Attempts to improve the situation highlight how the Soviet authorities aimed to control human relations of the foreign students by bringing Soviet citizens and foreign students

---

[76] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.357, 54-57.

together in a ritualized manner. However, results of these numerous attempts to "educate" citizens of Moscow are difficult to measure, as the problem of crime against foreigners persisted. Various everyday interactions with the Soviet citizens, combined to material conditions in the dormitories, provided the foreign students a deeper and more multifaceted image about life in the Soviet Union than the one that was conveyed to them during lectures and excursions, which harmed the ideological goals of the education project.

6. Holidays outside Moscow portraying development

Holidays served an important educational purpose as they were the time when students had a chance to explore "Soviet reality" outside Moscow, especially development that had taken place in the peripheries during years of Soviet rule. This chapters looks at different forms of holiday-making, starting from holidays at the Black Sea coast and Moldova, moving on to work brigades in Siberia and Kazakhstan, excursions to Central Asia, and finally to independent forms of travel. The chapter argues that visiting the peripheral regions of the Soviet Union had an important role for the education process as a whole in portraying development models that were applicable to conditions present in the students' countries of origin, thus providing "hands-on" experiences about socialist development to balance the more theoretical studies and ideological work organized in Moscow. Especially for the period of summer holidays, the university administration offered students a variety of options and destinations for holidaymaking that they could choose from, while participation in these programs was not obligatory and students could also choose to remain in Moscow or travel abroad. Experiences gained during holiday periods contributed to the goal of creating a multi-faceted image of "Soviet reality" and different ways of life in the socialist state. While observing different realities in various parts of the Soviet Union, the students also had an important role in promoting internationalism among local population mostly through folkloricized performances of their cultures.

Holidays as times of internationalism and learning

Student holidays were an organized form of group travel that incorporated multiple educational goals. Domestic tourism in general was a Soviet project for building knowledge and strengthening the body. A socialist vacation, whether taken in one place,

such as a rest home, or spent on the road, healed and strengthened the organism and restored the vacationer's fitness for work. Soviet holidays were also connected to social construction and essentially meant travel in groups, stressing the role of the collective and producing knowledge that helped to develop the individual and improve his ability to contribute to the collective good.[1] Group travel was not just a form of doing, but also seeing, and excursions were highly valued. Activities provided could be nature-based, such as hiking, or explicitly ideological, such as listening to lectures, in some cases combining the two aspects.[2] All these features were present in holiday programs for foreign students. Physical activities and learning by doing were visible in physical labor that was an essential part of the student building brigade experiences and holiday programs in Moldova, while holidaymakers could gain new knowledge through seeing on excursions to different parts of the Soviet Union. For Soviet citizens holidays were a form of patriotic education, but for foreign students these were chances to experience "Soviet reality" in its multiple forms. Holiday programs included visits to both cultural destinations and locations of agricultural and industrial production. They were in general tightly scheduled and provided few opportunities to explore independently or genuinely connect with the local population, which demotivated some students from participating in them.[3]

---

[1] Diane P. Koenker, *Club Red: Vacation Travel and the Soviet Dream* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013), 257.

[2] Anne E. Gorsuch, *All This is Your World: Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad after Stalin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 4, 6-7, 9, 34. See also Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker (eds.) *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006); Diane P. Koenker, "Travel to Work, Travel to Play: On Russian Tourism, Travel, and Leisure," *Slavic Review* 62 no. 4 (2003): 657–665; Diane P. Koenker, "Whose Right to Rest? Contesting the Family Vacation in the Postwar Soviet Union," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 2 (2009): 401-425; Koenker, *Club Red*.

[3] For instance, a Nigerian UDN alumnus noted that he participated in organized holiday program only during his first summer in the USSR and due to the strictly organized and controlled nature of this program preferred to travel independently in the following summers. Interview with Nigerian informant, 18.11.2020.

Organization of holidays

The Ministry of Higher and Special Education was responsible for organizing student holidays, working in cooperation with universities and numerous local actors around the Soviet Union, such as kolkhozes and holiday homes. Student excursions were organized in cooperation with actors on several administrative levels, most importantly with local friendship societies.[4] The most important goal set for the foreign students' holiday programs was that they would learn about everyday life of workers as well as industrial and agrarian production in different parts of the country. This goal was set as a response to problems experienced in earlier decades. In the 1950s, students arriving from countries of the socialist bloc had very few chances to see Soviet factories, talk to the workers or experience life at kolkhozes and sovkhozes, which meant they were unprepared to talk about these topics upon return to their home countries.[5] These problems were to be avoided with the wide mass of foreign students from the developing world that arrived in the Soviet Union since the early 1960s by offering them a variety of holiday programs that would prepare them to propagate the Soviet model of development in their countries of origin.

Promoting internationalism among local populations living in different parts of the Soviet Union was another important goal of student holidays. Soviet media had a major role in popularizing and propagating internationalism and friendship both for domestic audiences and foreigners through Soviet publications aimed for international audiences. Allowing local media to record foreign students' activities was an important part of the Soviet strategy of creating public images and narratives about internationalism and

---

[4] GARF f.9576, o.2, d.239, 5; GARF f.9576, o.2, d.243, 2,5; GARF o.9576, o.2, d.247, 1-2.

[5] RGANI f.4, o.16, d.902, 28-31; Patryk Babiracki, "Imperial Heresies: Polish Students in the Soviet Union, 1948-1957," *Ab Imperio* no.4 (2007), 225-226.

friendship of peoples. Local journalists were keenly invited to report on excursions and other activities of the foreign students to prove that they had full freedom to communicate with the Soviet citizens, which was a message aimed especially for foreign audiences to balance the claims of a restrictive and ideological education process present in the Western media.[6] Presenting students working in construction brigades alongside the Soviet citizens was an important way of showing foreign audiences that the students could travel and communicate with people freely, while demonstrating for domestic audiences the international enthusiasm towards building socialism. Presenting foreign students in a positive light was also important for controlling the prejudices and discrimination they were facing, as well as for promotion of the Soviet internationalist foreign policy and cooperation with countries of the developing world locally in different regions of the Soviet Union. Especially in the Soviet peripheries, images and stories of foreign students working together with the local population carried a powerful message about the reciprocal nature of cooperation.

Holiday programs were varied and aimed to familiarize the foreign students with different features of life around the Soviet Union. As the summer holidays were two months long, most students participated in two different holiday programs that they could choose from different options available. Holiday programs were planned at the Ministry of Higher and Special Education and their contents was similar for all foreign students with each university having their own holiday destinations, usually kolkhozes and holiday homes, with whom they cooperated.[7] The summer holiday destinations of UDN students were several Moldovan villages, such as Merenishti and Koshnici, where the students would participate in work at local kolkhozes, and holiday home Makopse

---

[6] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.1, 14.
[7] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.869, 66-70.

close to Sochi on the Black Sea coast.[8] Students had also two weeks of winter holidays, which they spent mostly in destinations near Moscow. For example, in the winter holidays of 1962 the students visited factories in Moscow city and the surrounding Moscow region, participated in lectures and various get-togethers, and practiced winter sports, such as skiing and skating.[9] In some years, the students could also spend their winter holidays in holiday home *Energetik* in Leningrad region or on excursions to different Soviet cities[10]

Soviet administration tried to advertise and highlight the benefits of holidays with more educational contents, but this rarely showed in the preferences of students. For instance, the plan for summer holidays in 1961 was to send 500 students to Moldova, 320 to Makopse, and altogether 250 on excursions to Georgia, Uzbekistan, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Leningrad, Kiev, Riga, and Tallinn. In reality, 197 students spent their holidays in Moldova, 281 in Makopse and 195 on trips around the Soviet Union, while the rest either stayed in Moscow or traveled abroad. [11] In other words, holidays on the seaside and excursions were more popular options for holidays than work experience at a Moldovan kolkhoz. Especially since the mid-1960s, the Soviet administration encouraged the students more actively to spend their holidays in Moldova or in the building brigades, as these had a more educational contents than the other holiday options. This stress on benefits of gaining work experience during holiday times was related to the overall development of educational programs highlighting the importance of practical training.

---

[8] Information from the permanent exhibition of RUDN museum, visited in March 2018.
[9] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 86-87.
[10] Information from the permanent exhibition of RUDN museum, visited in March 2018.
[11] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 60-63.

As a result of these various offerings for holiday programs, each student could visit a variety of holiday destinations during their stay in the Soviet Union. An Argentinian UDN alumna spent her winter holidays in Moscow Region holiday homes, Leningrad, Georgia, and Ulyanovsk, and summer holidays twice in Makopse, and on excursions to Turkmenistan, Kiev, Tajikistan, and Azerbaijan. In addition, she completed two internships in Yalta and the Kuban region during the spring-summer period.[12] While some of these excursions were rewards for good study performance, this individual student experience also demonstrates the wide variety of travel options within the Soviet Union that were available for foreign students. While students were encouraged to choose work-oriented travel, they were not compelled to go to destinations they did not want to go. There was always an option to remain in Moscow and not participate in any organized activities.

Student holidays were not only meant to provide students opportunities for rest and relaxation, but they carried an important educational meaning both for the students themselves and the local people living in regions that were destinations of student holidays. Student holidays incorporated many features of Soviet domestic tourism, including stress on physical activities and learning by participating in group excursions and other activities. Such activities aimed to balance the more theoretical forms of ideological work the students participated in Moscow. While the students could experience life in different parts of the Soviet Union and ideally learn practical skills through work alongside Soviet citizens, the arrival of foreign students provided opportunities to promote Soviet internationalist foreign policy among local Soviet populations living in peripheral regions and create spaces for transnational

---

[12] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

communication between Soviet citizens and foreign students. These opportunities to travel, interact and gain hands-on experiences were often met with enthusiasm among the students, as organized holidays were something few of them had had access before.

Seaside and kolkhozes in Makopse and Moldova

Holidays in Moldova and Makopse were organized every year as the basic options for spending holidays. These destinations were also the most popular ones among students year after year and could easily accommodate large numbers of holidaymakers. Even though the program organized in these locations during the 1960s and 1970s did experience some changes, especially as study circles of classics of Marxism-Leninism were included in the program of Makopse holidays in the 1970s, the main activities remained the same. While holidays in Makopse provided opportunities for relaxation in a rest home in addition to hiking and other sports, holiday programs in Moldova combined a wider variety of activities, including practical work experience and wider opportunities to meet and connect with local Soviet people.

Seaside holidays in Makopse

Despite the supposed difference between tourism [turizm] and rest [otdykh], the former concentrating on physical development and the latter on relaxation and healing, the boundary between the two was porous in the 1960s and 1970s.[13] This showed also in UDN student holidays, as holidays at the Black Sea Coast were combining relaxation at the beach to sports activities to develop the physical strength of students. Soviet citizens in need of healing or relaxation traveled to a health spa [kurort] or rest home [dom otdykha]. In the case of UDN students, the sick and weak students were in general

---

[13] Gorsuch, *All This is Your World*, 8.

sent to sanatoria, while holidays at Makopse rest home were available for all students.[14]

Rest homes were vacation rest houses, often in natural settings, that provided meals and simple lodging.[15]

The seaside holidays in Makopse were filled with activities, though in general these were of a less organized nature than the holidays in Moldova and did not include compulsory work. Accommodation was organized in rooms shared by 3-4 people and meals were included in the holiday plan. In addition to sunbathing and hiking, students were taken on excursions to nearby cities, and meetings with local people were organized. Holiday program included also lectures and discussions, Soviet movie screenings, and plentiful sports events. Many students played sports such as volleyball, badminton, and table tennis.[16] Thus, holidays at Makopse were following the general pattern of holiday program organized in most rest homes. This type of holidaymaking was a common practice in the Soviet Union and, as Anne E. Gorsuch has noted, organized holidays often resembled an adult version of a pioneer camp.[17]

For the students, holidays in Makopse were a relaxing and affordable experience, a luxury that few of them had experienced before. An Argentinian alumna spent her holidays in Makopse in 1968 and wrote a letter home describing her experiences that included sunbathing, taking walks to the waterfall, enjoying the food, and participating in a festival where an international orchestra played. The holiday program cost 140 rubles, out of which the university covered 100 rubles and the students had to pay only 40 rubles.[18] A Pakistani alumnus remembered that 30-40 rubles felt like "a small sum"

---

[14] For instance, in 1962, approximately 100 students were sent to sanatoriums for the summer holidays. RGASPI f. M-1, o.46, d.294, 91-94.

[15] Gorsuch, *All This is Your World*, 8.

[16] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 100-105.

[17] Gorsuch, *All This is Your World*, 34.

[18] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

of money for such a holiday program for a whole month and described Makopse as a perfect holiday destination, where the students could fully concentrate on relaxation.[19]

Since the 1960s, vacation facilities were more actively used to educate the whole person and the vacationers could expect that their vacation would bring cultural uplift and knowledge as well as fun. New activities introduced were directed towards education and mobilization, healing the body, and elevating the mind.[20] This development started to show at Makopse since the late 1960s, when the Latin American students started to organize an additional summer school of Marxism-Leninism in cooperation with the Spanish-speaking faculty of philosophy and political economics from UDN. These summer schools had 3-4 hours of lectures per day with around 60 participants from different Latin American countries in summer 1968. Next summer, the number of participants had doubled to 120.[21] This summer school that had started as a student initiative gained a lot of positive attention among Soviet authorities and was used as an example of ideological student-led activities during holiday times.

Makopse represented a typical form of socialist holidaymaking in a rest home that allowed students to concentrate on relaxation while participating in sports activities that were meant to restore their fitness for studies with relatively little directly educational contents. Such organized holidays on seaside were a luxury that few students had experienced before, which made Makopse the most attractive holiday option year after year. However, in an ideal case a month spent in Makopse was combined to another month of holiday program with a different kind of contents, either an excursion or work experience in a Moldovan kolkhoz. While in Makopse the students could enjoy holidays

---

[19] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.
[20] Koenker, *Club Red*, 181, 183.
[21] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.138, 1-3.

that were very close to tourism and rest offered for Soviet citizens, in other locations the UDN holiday programs were more distinctly educational and tailored for the needs of the foreign student population.

Experiencing life of a Moldovan village

Soviet holidays did not free the individual from obligations to work, develop oneself physically and help in the agricultural production.[22] The goal of holiday programs in Moldova was not only to allow students to enjoy rest and relaxation in a countryside environment, but also to experience work at a kolkhoz. At the same time, student holidays allowed the local population to experience internationalism. As one of the main goals of the holiday times was to help the students to make friends with kolkhoz workers, various meetings and celebrations of different countries' national holidays were organized. The daily program included 4 hours of work at the kolkhoz, while students spent the remaining time doing sports, listening to lectures, and learning practical skills, such as swimming. Soviet movies were the most important form of entertainment offered. In addition, excursions to factories, kolkhozes and sovkhozes were organized.[23]

Published descriptions of holidays in Moldovan villages tended to stress the development that had taken place during the years of the Soviet power: the village of Koshnici had "a large club, library, stadium, atelier, kindergarten, school and other establishments necessary for maintaining high standards of living".[24] A Nigerian student repeated similar themes in his description of holidays in Moldova published in *Druzhba* in 1964. The article concentrates on educational contents of holiday programs with excursions to destinations portraying technological advancement, such as a fruit

[22] Koenker, *Club Red*, 257.
[23] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 92-99.
[24] *Druzhba* 5.2.1964, 3.

conserve factory and a hydroelectric power station. Visualizing technological development to the students through visits to power plants and factories was a theme that was present during most visits to Soviet peripheries. Public descriptions about holidays in Moldova aimed to highlight the themes of technological development and connect them to friendship. In other words, Moldova provided students an opportunity to experience life of the welcoming common people in settings where rapid technological advancement had taken place under socialism. Ideologically, these types of holidays stressed the process of learning from the workers in an environment that was both technologically advanced and welcoming, thus providing the students with models of development that were applicable to their countries of origin.[25] The description published in *Druzhba* highlighted details of a non-capitalist development path, such as organization of collective economy and mechanization of work, combined to notes about friendship with the local workers and interesting leisure time activities to encourage other students to participate in such an educational and "joyful" holiday program that provided opportunities both for learning and relaxation:

> *The most interesting part of my stay in Moldova was working at the state-owned farm (sovkhoz), which mostly included harvesting fruit. Excursions to kolkhoz, fruit conserve factory, and hydroelectric power station in Anzari were also very interesting and instructive. In the kolkhoz, I was very interested in the organization of collective economy, especially how its members fulfill their responsibilities, how they live, how they spend their leisure time. I was interested in the character of different type of work, and the level of its mechanization. The attitudes towards us were very friendly. In addition to work, we also, naturally, had leisure time. Almost every day we watched interesting films and concerts and danced a lot. Life in the village was very joyful.[26]*

---

[25] As Diane Koenker has noted, these visits to factories were often a popular part of excursions for the Soviet tourist groups, as they allowed them to meet with local workers and exchange experiences. In the case of foreign students, it seems that the encounters with Soviet workers tended to have a more ceremonial nature. Koenker, *Club Red*, 245.

[26] *Druzhba* 15.9.1964 2.

Participation in holiday activities was a sign of ideological maturity and students' attitudes towards work and other activities were monitored. After the holiday period, Soviet students and faculty presented their reports on holiday activities to UDN Komsomol and CPSU organizations. Details listed in these reports, such as the students' attitude towards work, served as signs of socialist mindset and friendliness towards the Soviet state. In practice this meant that reports from Moldova were much more detailed than those from Makopse, as in Moldova the students had more opportunities to develop themselves and work alongside Soviet workers instead of just rest and relaxation. For instance, in autumn 1961, the reporting stated that most students who spent their holidays in Moldova engaged in farm work with enthusiasm. Work tasks mostly consisted of gathering fruit and vegetables, and only a few students tried to refuse from work. [27] In 1965, the Komsomol reported that Arab students had worked most enthusiastically and engaged in friendly conversations with the local people.[28] As these examples demonstrate, reports about holidays concentrated on results of organized activities and personal attitudes of students towards work, which formed one part of political profiling of students.

In comparison to Makopse, holidays in Moldova provided the students more directly educational and ideological holiday program that stressed practical work experience and learning from the workers. Attitudes towards work were an important signal about ideological maturity that were carefully recorded to reporting about holidays. Despite public descriptions about holidays in Moldova highlighting technological advancements and the friendship with local workers, participation in holiday programs in Moldova was not as attractive as seaside holidays in Makopse, which shows in

---

[27] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 92-99.
[28] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.5, 15-16.

unfulfilled quotas for holiday programs in Moldova. In late 1960s and especially in the 1970s, many students interested in gaining practical work experience preferred to participate in building brigades, as these carried significant ideological prestige in the public sphere and provided attractive material benefits.

Building brigades in the Virgin Lands and Siberia

Alongside the Soviet space program, massive agricultural development projects in the Virgin Lands of northern Kazakhstan and the construction project of Baikal-Amur railway line in Siberia were the brightest examples of technological successes of state socialism during the Cold War period. Participation in these colossal projects was possible through student building brigades that combined state-controlled construction projects to popular enthusiasm and became a generational experience for the Soviet youth of the 1960s and 1970s. Foreign students participated in the brigades for the first time in 1964, and over the next two decades, thousands of UDN students volunteered in building projects both in distant locations and in Moscow, building the new UDN campus and later sports facilities needed for the 1980 Moscow Olympics. Though most participants in these projects were Soviet, international volunteers always gained wide media publicity, highlighting themes of internationalism and cooperation.

Building brigades in the 1960s

In 1964, building brigades with international students were organized for the first time, when a brigade with 77 UDN students was sent to Virgin Lands of Kazakhstan and another brigade started work in Moscow. In 1965, alongside the Virgin Lands brigade, a brigade bringing together Soviet and international students from UDN, Moscow Energy Studies Institute, and Institute of International Affairs was sent to the building project of Abakan-Taishet railway, which later became part of the BAM line close to

its western terminus. A decade later the construction of Baikal-Amur mainline started,

turning later into a "construction project of the century", as stated by Leonid Brezhnev.

Thus, Abakan-Taishet was one of the early precedents of BAM, working as a testing

ground for voluntary youth construction work in Siberia. This also showed in the

visibility of this project, as the international brigade gained wide publicity during and

after the working period, in a manner that resembled BAM enthusiasm of the 1970s.

Building brigades were often described as an extreme form of gaining work experience

in difficult conditions. Working days in the brigade were 10 hours long and

accommodation was organized in tents. The first attempt to send a big multinational

brigade for work at Abakan-Taishet was carefully monitored by the Komsomol in a

similar manner as other holiday programs organized. Reports from the brigade stated

that participating international students had filled the work norms on the same level as

Soviet students and their knowledge of Russian language had significantly improved

during the summer. In addition to work, the students organized internationally themed

events and concerts, visited the local workers' families, clubs and dormitories.[29] The

published accounts about the activities tended to be very positive, stressing the value

and results of work, and serving the purpose of encouraging other students to participate

in the construction projects. The university newspaper *Druzhba* published a detailed

description by an Iraqi student about work at Abakan-Taishet in summer 1965:

> *The first working days showed that our guys are hard-working and able*
> *to deal with all the difficulties, but I have to say that out work schedule*
> *was strict: wake up at 6:40, to work at 8, and at 7:30 in the evening we*
> *finished work. But none of the guys ever complained about difficulties,*
> *quite the opposite, the daily work results of our international brigade ---*
> *fulfilled the plan by 250% and later by 360%. We speeded up every day.[30]*

---

[29] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.221, 153.

[30] *Druzhba* 6.9.1965, 2.

Despite these allegedly positive experiences, a Komsomol report from autumn 1965 pointed out several deficiencies in the organization of the work brigade. Students' behavior was criticized, as the report noted that students would sit by the campfires until 2am singing songs. Local workers were also keen to befriend the foreigners, inviting especially the Congolese students to drink with them. A variety of cultural program had been planned for the participants, but in practice the local Komsomol was not interested in assisting in the organization. An example was a friendship evening, which was planned to start at 9pm, but no one from the local Komsomol organization came on time. Even the secretary arrived only at 10:30pm, while another local Komsomol member gave a lengthy opening speech in a state of deep drunkenness.[31] The report describes problems often encountered in promotion of ideological friendship and solidarity. While the problems in cooperation with the local Komsomol organization demonstrate the general lack of interest and commitment to projects concerning promotion of internationalism, transnational encounters in the brigade indicate the ideologically problematic nature of contacts that involved genuine interaction between local workers and foreign students, but also drinking and other behavior that was condemned in the Soviet context. In other words, creating interest towards internationalism while maintaining boundaries between Soviet citizens and foreigners was a problem that was constantly present in ideological work.

In addition to problems with students and local actors, activities of building brigades suffered from material deficits and lack of coordination. In the annual UDN Komsomol meeting of 1966, a Soviet student noted that work in building brigades was poorly

---

[31] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.5, 17-23. This is a very interesting example of reporting from the brigades, as it discusses the encountered problems very openly and in detail, which especially in the 1970s became a rarity.

organized and the constructions completed were of low quality.[32] A year later it was again reported that the local leadership of building projects made the students build objects that were not included in the plan, and the building equipment was of poor quality, which caused danger to the students. In some cases, the brigades could not finish all their construction projects, as there were not enough building materials left.[33] These comments demonstrate that despite the important ideological role of building brigades and impressive statements in the public sphere about overfulfilling the workplans, material problems connected to these activities were numerous. As few students had previous experience about construction, work security was not always on high level and accidents took place. Logistics and transportation connections in rural areas were also problematic. As the popularity of the brigades grew, material problems and harsh working conditions persisted. Still in 1973, UDN Komsomol report on the activities of the building brigade in Ust-Ilimsk, Siberia, requested that future brigades sent to Siberia would receive sleeping bags, as during the previous summer the weather had been exceptionally cold, which made living in tents unbearable.[34] These notes on material conditions and results of work supplement public narratives that highlighted strict work schedules and impressive results of building brigade activities.

Participation in brigades was motivated both by ideological factors and material benefits. All Soviet students that participated in the building brigade were members of either Komsomol or CPSU, which demonstrated that for them participating in a building brigade was often a political duty.[35] Money was another major motivator for participation especially for Soviet students, as by working in a brigade for one of two

---

[32] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.6, 83.
[33] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.7, 24-35.
[34] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.19, 113-117.
[35] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.68, 99-101.

months, a Soviet student could earn over 1000 rubles that in practice was more than the annual stipend for Soviet students at UDN.[36] The salaries for foreign students were significantly lower, and in the 1960s, foreign students would earn approximately 230 rubles for their participation in building brigades in addition to their stipend.[37] In other words, for the foreign students participation in a building brigade was often motivated by ideological enthusiasm connected to these prestigious public construction projects. Due to lower salaries and stronger ideological commitment, foreign participants were a cheaper and more motivated group of workers than the Soviet students.[38] For both foreign and Soviet students participation in the brigades was a good way of demonstrating ideological competency combined to material benefits.

In the late 1960s, the brigades started to gain wider popularity among the student population due to their active public promotion. Siberia, Kazakhstan, and later Karelia became permanent locations of projects, and brigades were sent there annually. In 1967, a Komsomol report noted that there had been many more students willing to participate in the building brigades than there were places available. As a result 190 students, out of them 65 foreign students, participated in three building projects. These were in Tselinograd region in Kazakhstan, and Korshunovskii mining plant and Bratsk hydroelectric power plant in Irkutsk region in Siberia. The Bratsk brigade was a collaboration of several universities, while in Tselinograd and Korshunovskii UDN formed its own brigades.[39] Already in the 1960s, brigades were also sent to Karelia, as

in 1968 a UDN brigade built a railroad between Keret and Chupa in northern Karelia.[40] This popularization of building brigades reflects popular enthusiasm connected to these projects as well as stress on learning practical skills that was highlighted as part of the developing Soviet education policy and would reach an even higher level in the 1970s.

Building brigades in the 1970s

In the 1970s, the building brigades started to get more popular than ever. By the end the decade, brigades gathered over 1600 participants annually, 45% of them foreigners.[41] In practice this meant that by in the late 1970s, building brigades became a truly generational experience especially for male students.[42] Work in the famous BAM construction project was attractive to many, while also the Virgin Lands of Kazakhstan maintained their position as a location portraying agricultural and technological development. However, not all students possessed enthusiasm towards building brigades. For instance, a Nigerian alumnus noted that he never considered participating in a building brigade, as he considered the work physically demanding and dull.[43]

In the 1970s, UDN sent building brigades mostly to BAM railway construction project in Siberia and to the Virgin Lands in Kazakhstan, both of which carried important ideological meanings connected to Soviet technological advancement. Especially BAM gained a reputation as the most important destination for building brigades. During the period of 1974-1984, over half a million people, including 10 000 foreigners, participated in the construction project. BAM represented the quintessential Soviet big

---

[40] *Druzhba* 6.9.1968, 2.
[41] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.59, 43. In the summer 1971 altogether 612 UDN students participated in the building brigades, 244 of them international students TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.12, 28. In 1972 the numbers were altogether 1071 students, out of whom 350 international students. TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.19, 29-30.
[42] Women also participated in the international brigades, mostly as cooks or nurses.
[43] Interview with Nigerian informant, 18.11.2020.

engineering project and an epic victory of humankind over nature.[44] The Virgin Lands in Kazakhstan remained another important location for building brigade activities. Development taking place in the region was conveyed in the public sphere with grandiose proclamations about improving agricultural production that later turned into a Virgin Lands cult that Michaela Pohl has called "a bureaucratized Soviet version of a Wild West epic".[45] This popularized image was actively used to attract students to participate in construction projects in the region.

Locations of construction projects were actively negotiated within the Komsomol. In the beginning of 1970s, UDN Komsomol recommended that future brigades would be sent to Siberia instead of Kazakhstan, as during the season of harvesting and hay-mowing it was impossible to get the local villagers to participate in lectures and concerts organized by the students. According to Komsomol, workers in Siberia had more leisure time, they were more welcoming and more interested in foreigners that the people of northern Kazakhstan. [46] These concerns provide an interesting view to realities of building brigade activities even in the most prestigious and ideologically significant locations, both of which epitomized the Soviet model of modernity and non-capitalist development. In Siberia students were mostly working with workers from all parts of the Soviet Union that were less occupied with everyday problems than the local village population in Kazakhstan. Like case of building brigade in Abakan-Taishet in 1965, this discussion reveals the practical level of planning and implementing activities to promote internationalism among local populations and the problems encountered in this

---

[44] Ward, *Brezhnev's Folly,* 2-3, 8, 134, 143-144.

[45] Michaela Pohl, "From White Grave to Tselinograd to Astana: The Virgin Lands Opening, Khrushchev's Forgotten First Reform," in *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960*, ed. Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 276, 290, 293, 299-300. See also: Westad, *The Global Cold War*, 71.

[46] TsAODM f.P-4447, o.1, d.12, 28, 36, 44.

work even in locations that held the most ideologically significant positions in portraying Soviet technological and agricultural advancement for domestic and foreign audiences.

Popularity of the building brigades demonstrates their position in the Soviet public sphere as key ideological projects of the era. They provided the students with most concrete experiences of participation in "building of socialism" through physical construction work. In addition to significant ideological meanings and political prestige connected to this work, it also provided students with practical work experience that had an important role in Soviet education programs. International participants created symbolic value to the construction projects through their participation and promotion of internationalism, which was actively highlighted in the public sphere. At the same time, public prestige connected to projects in Siberia and Kazakhstan did not translate to local interest towards ideological work, such as friendship evenings and concerts, conducted in cooperation with foreign students, as such activities were distant from the everyday realities of Soviet citizens living in the peripheral regions. The material conditions in which the students spent their summer holidays also remained very humble throughout the 1960s and 1970s, lacking even the most basic amenities.

Excursions to different parts of the Soviet Union

Another important form of holiday program were excursions around the Soviet Union. The goal of these excursions was to familiarize the students with life in different parts of the country, stressing especially industrial and agricultural development that had taken place under socialism. On the other hand, also major cities of historical importance, such as Leningrad, were constantly popular destinations for excursions. The Soviet administration saw that especially excursions to the Baltic states and

Ukraine did not "teach the students enough about Soviet reality"[47] and provided more excursions to Central Asia instead, as these republics had a major role in visualizing cultural and industrial development that provided especially suitable models for the developing world to follow. Thus, especially these regions were actively presented to foreign audiences from Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Central Asia as the preferred destination of excursions

Soviet authorities proudly advertised Central Asia and brought students from the developing world to see how non-capitalist development had effected these most backward regions of the Soviet Union. This was direct continuation of activities in the interwar period, when foreign activists from the colonial states had keenly noted during their excursions that the Central Asian peoples were also "peoples of color" and thus identifiable to the masses of people living in the colonial states.[48] According to the Soviet narrative, the Central Asian republics, once populated by shepherds, veiled women, and nomads, were now home to modern Soviet men and women, universities, electric plants, and factories.[49] To overcome perceptions of the Soviet Union as neo-colonial, Central Asia became an important link in relations between Moscow and the developing world. Highlighting similarities between non-European Soviet regions and decolonizing countries and providing evidence that socialism could flourish in the latter

---

[47] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.295, 54-57.

[48] Maxim Matusevich, "An Exotic Subversive: Africa, Africans and the Soviet Everyday," *Race&Class* 49, no.4 (2008): 62-63.

[49] Abigail Judge Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge: The Peoples' Friendship University and Soviet Education for the Third World," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33 no. 2 (2013): 251. Mirroring historical experiences of socialist countries to the progress taking place in the developing world was present in the public sphere of many socialist countries. James Mark and Péter Ápor have analyzed the case of socialist Hungary in their research. James Mark and Péter Apor, "Socialism Goes Global: Decolonization and the Making of a New Culture of Internationalism in Socialist Hungary, 1956–1989," *The Journal of Modern History* 87, no. 4 (2015): 862-867. See also: Artemy M. Kalinovsky, "Not Some British Colony in Africa: The Politics of Decolonization and Modernization in Soviet Central Asia, 1955–1964," *Ab Imperio* no. 2 (2013): 191–222; Paul Stronski, *Tashkent: Forging a Soviet City, 1930–1966* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010).

as in the former made the Soviet modernization model based on non-capitalist development path attractive.[50]

Theme of equating Central Asian republics with countries of the developing world was present in the public sphere. In an article published in *Druzhba* in 1966 concerning experiences of Ceylonese and Syrian students on an excursion to Tajikistan, themes of learning from the Soviet experience, alleged similarities between Tajikistan and home countries of the students, and friendship among peoples were highlighted. An excursion to Soviet Tajikistan had provided Ceylonese and Syrian students models that they could apply in the conditions of their own countries, and sense of community among the three nationalities was created by similarities that would guarantee potential for development for Syria and Ceylon in a similar manner as in Soviet Tajikistan:

> *We promised to remember, take pride, and use the experience of Tajikistan in our own countries. After all, our climate is very similar, and people are equally hard-working. We are sure that on free land miracles are made. The example of Tajiks guarantees that.[51]*

Cultural and religious factors were also of major importance in presenting the Soviet development model and modernity to partners from the developing world. According to the Soviets, the example of Central Asia had the potential to serve as a model and inspiration especially for post-colonial Arab modernizers without offending their religious sensibilities.[52] Religion and local customs were constantly visible to students visiting Central Asia, in many cases creating an interesting cultural background to the recent technological development of the region. While for certain groups of students,

---

[50] Christine Varga-Harris, "Between National Tradition and Western Modernizations: Soviet Woman and Representations of Socialist Gender Equality as a 'Third Way' for Developing Countries, 1956-1964," *Slavic Review* 78, no.3 (2019): 759-760.
[51] *Druzhba* 12.10.1966, 3.
[52] Constantin Katsakioris, "Soviet Lessons for Arab Modernization: Soviet Educational Aid to Arab Countries after 1956," *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no. 1 (2010): 90.

such as Arabs, this provided opportunities to connect with the local population, for students from other parts of the world a visit to Soviet Central Asia was an exotic experience like "out of the stories of thousand and one nights", as an Argentinian alumna described her visit to Ashgabat, capital of the Turkmen republic, in August 1968:

> *When we arrived at the airport in Ashgabat there was a herd of camels to transport the luggage, the men wore a hat called tiubieka and the women robes with traditional patterns, only the Russians dress in European style. Everything was very interesting and strange for me.* [53]

Soviet understanding of students from the developing world identifying and connecting with the Central Asian experience did not apply to all students, as for many these visits provided exoticism that they found very foreign. While the Argentinian student's group was taken to see factories, hydroelectric plants, and other objects portraying technological advancement and development that had taken place during the years of Soviet rule, she found that the most interesting part of their stay was a visit to a local family home, where traditions and religion coexisted with modern commodities:

> *We were received in the dining room, but had to take off our shoes and sit on the floor that was covered with a large carpet and full of pillows. No chairs, no table. But there was a refrigerator, a television, electric fans, and a large library. ---- Between talking, prayer time came, and Mohamed* [a Syrian fellow student] *asked if they had the Quran. Immediately the book was brought, and he read in Arabic. While he was reading, the older people attending cried with emotion, because they had never heard the reading in Arabic. They repeated it by heart, but were not very clear about the meaning, so Mohammed translated into Russian.* [54]

During the excursions it was not only important to allow foreign students experience the development taken place under socialism, but also to bring internationalism to the peripheries by stressing the friendly nature of Soviet connections with the foreign countries. The Argentinian alumna's experience in a Turkmen family home was one

---

[53] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.
[54] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

example of such organized friendly encounters between foreign students and the local population, yet the same time it was a novel and personal form of encounter compared to organized meetings in schools and workplaces. Besides coexistence of modern technologies and traditional lifestyle, the presence of religious practices and literature in a modern Soviet household is notable. The Turkmen family that was chosen to host the visit was most probably a representative of Soviet progressive religious family, which provided another model applicable to the conditions present in the foreign students' countries of origin concerning practices of combining socialist modernity with religious beliefs and traditions.

One of the main issues highlighted in the Soviet narratives of development in the peripheries was the position of women in Soviet Central Asian societies. Presentations of Central Asian women during the imperial era as veiled, uneducated, and tied to their homes were plentiful in Soviet publications. These narratives were contrasted with contemporary ones of Soviet Central Asian women freed from illiteracy and restrictive customs, taking visible positions in the public sphere, and stressing female agency in changing the women's position.[55] However, for foreign females from non-Muslim countries visiting Central Asia, these ideals were not always visible in the everyday life they encountered. During her visit to a Turkmen home the Argentinian alumna encountered many traditions that seemed to contrast the narrative about position of women in contemporary Soviet Central Asia. She was not allowed to sit at the table together with the men as she was wearing pants and was given a traditional dress to settle in. All the female family members had their faces covered and lived in houses built around the courtyard. One year later, she traveled to Tajikistan, where she also

---

[55] Varga-Harris, "Between National Tradition and Western Modernizations", 766-769, 780.

"felt out of place" with her miniskirt compared to the local female population. Her looks got her to uncomfortable situations that made her scared.[56] While these experiences lack the perspective that a woman with Muslim background would have in evaluating the position of women in Soviet Central Asia in comparison to Soviet narratives present in the public sphere highlighting modernity and female agency, experiences of the Argentinian alumna highlight the fact that students from the developing world were often treated as a unified group despite their various backgrounds that allowed them to make different evaluations about things they saw during excursions in different parts of the Soviet Union. While for an Arab woman the everyday realities encountered in Soviet Central Asia might have provided evidence about Soviet modernity supporting female agency, this was not the experience of an Argentinian female visiting the region.

Students traveling to Central Asia not only saw technological and cultural advancement in the form of construction work, power plants, mechanized agriculture, schools, museums, and theaters, but also experienced the influence of religion and traditions in the region. While for some students this might have created a sense of community with the local population, for many others experiencing everyday life in Central Asia was an experience filled with "a thousand and one nights" exoticism combined to Soviet modernization efforts in technology and culture. Especially female visitors from non-Muslim countries encountered the region in a way that was not included in the public narratives of developed Soviet Central Asia. However, the model of maintaining certain local customs and traditions simultaneously with socialist development was actively promoted as feasible for the future development of countries of the developing world.

---

[56] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

Independent travel

In addition to organized excursions and internships, the students could travel independently abroad or within the Soviet Union. This type of travel was not encouraged and organizing an independent trip in the USSR could be challenging with document checks upon boarding trains and difficulties in finding accommodation that would accept independent tourists. As UDN students were chosen by the university, their movement was not restricted by any bilateral or other types of contracts, which made both domestic and international travel possible for students who could afford it. While many students returned to their countries of origin for the summer holidays, some traveled to Western Europe to work odd jobs and earn hard currency. This kind of behavior was considered highly problematic by the Soviet authorities and there were repeated attempts restrain independent travel both within the Soviet Union and abroad.

Independent travel of foreign students was restricted on several occasions and rigidly controlled by universities. For instance, after the demonstrations at the Red Square in 1963, Soviet universities were advised by the Ministry of Higher and Special Education to allow students to travel only with a written permission from the university rector. Even in cases when the embassy of the students' home country was asking them to travel to Moscow, the permission to do so was not guaranteed.[57] Despite the difficulties, some students managed to complete independent trips to other cities in the Soviet Union. A Portuguese UDN alumna made a short trip to Novgorod during winter holidays in the early 1960s. Her description of the events lists the difficulties for a foreign student in traveling independently, as hotels were hesitant to accept foreign students who permanently lived in the Soviet Union and told her that they did not have free rooms.

---

[57] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.337, 17-23.

Finding accommodation was largely dependent on unofficial networks, and in this case, the alumna stayed at a university dormitory with help of other foreign students she met in Novgorod. She noted that because she was only 19 years old at the time, she did not understand that independent travel was not supported, which suggests that UDN did not actively prevent students from traveling independently within the Soviet Union.[58]

In the early 1960s, traveling abroad was a popular choice to spend holidays for those who could afford it, as airfare tickets were very expensive for students relying solely on their stipend paid in rubles. For instance, in 1962, 164 students traveled to their countries of origin during the summer holidays. In comparison, 43 students traveled to capitalist countries and 19 students to socialist countries, including China and Yugoslavia.[59] Most students who traveled to capitalist countries did so to make extra earnings by finding a summer job during holiday trips to Sweden, West Germany, Great Britain, France, and even the United States and Canada. Since 1972, travel restrictions became more strict and foreign students could travel abroad during summer holidays only after three years of studies at UDN.[60] The students were creative in avoiding these restrictions and used innovative methods to get an official permission to leave the USSR. An African student who studied at UDN in the 1970s described how the students would ask their relatives or acquaintances to send them a telegram explaining that a close

---

[58] Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020. Her experience is quite different from those of Latin American students interviewed by Tobias Rupprecht, who noticed that travel across the Soviet Union independently was easy for foreign students. Tobias Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin: Interaction and Exchange between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 210.
[59] RGASPI f. M-1, o.46, d.294, 91-94.
[60] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.96, 56.

family member of the student was critically ill in the country where the student wanted to travel. Such explanations easily guaranteed a permission to leave the country.[61]

For the Soviet administration, traveling abroad was a major problem that carried strong ideological meanings. A Pakistani alumnus noted that students who had worked in Sweden or elsewhere during the summer returned with 200-300 dollars in cash and goods, such as jeans, leather jackets, or electronics that they could later sell through black-market trade.[62] The students were also accused of making contacts with foreign organizations during their stays abroad.[63] These activities were a major ideological and practical problem for the Soviet administration, as illegal activities related to black-market trading caused various kinds of problems and unrest in Moscow. In addition, students who traveled to the West during holidays often brought contraband literature and other publications to the Soviet Union that then circulated within the foreign student community. The students' holiday travel was also criticized by states sending students to UDN. In 1970, a representative of the Nigerian trade unions stated during his visit to UDN that the Nigerian students' visits to western Europe were "numerous". During these visits they would work, bring back their salaries in foreign currency, and sell foreign goods to Soviet citizens with speculated prices.[64]

---

[61] Svetlana Boltovska, "Dreams and Everyday Life of African Students in the Country of Victorious Socialism: Education for Sub-Saharan Africans in the Soviet Union," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, ed. Ingrid Miethe and Jane Weiss (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020), 241.

[62] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020. All Svetlana Boltovskaja's informants who studied in the USSR in the 1970s and 1980s were involved in black market trade, mostly traveling to West Germany during holiday times and bringing back western goods, especially jeans. Some also received scholarships from their states in foreign currency, which allowed them to buy goods in specialized Beriozka stores. Svetlana Boltovskaja, *Bildungsmigranten aus dem subsaharischen Afrika in Moskau und St. Petersburg: Selbst- und Fremdbilder* (Herbolzheim: Centaurus, 2014), 81-82.

[63] Organizations, such as the Otto Benecke Foundation in West Germany, were claimed to actively seek contact with students during their holiday trips to Western Europe. V. Prasolov and V. Zolototrubov, "Ob ideologicheskoi diversii protiv SSSR na kanale mezhdunarodnogo studencheskogo obmena," *Sbornik statei ob agenturno-operativnoi i sledstvennoi rabote komiteta gosudarstvennoi besopasnosti SSSR* no. 93 (1982): 41-42.

[64] TsMAM f. P-3061, o. 1, d.158, 65.

While independent domestic travel was made difficult to foreign students with different kinds of restrictions and requirements, discouraging students from pursuing such travel was rarely present in the public sphere. Student travel to the capitalist world, however, carried within itself both practical and ideological problems, such as connections to black-market trade, which meant that students were actively discouraged from this kind of travel. However, for most students, foreign travel was not possible without financial support from their families, and many students did not travel even to their home countries during their study years in the Soviet Union. Instead of independent explorations, group travel in the Soviet Union was strongly encouraged as it pertained to important educational goals. Holiday programs aimed for foreign students included elements such as gaining practical work experience or first-hand experiences about non-capitalist development that were considered important parts of the Soviet education program. Many students were also enthusiastic about the opportunities for travel the different holiday programs offered for them. Their holiday experiences were actively used in the public sphere in different contexts, such as portraying students learning from the workers, experiencing socialist development, and building socialism. The holiday experiences aimed to widen the students' perspectives concerning Soviet modernity and different forms of "Soviet reality", while offering them models of development they could identify with. All these activities aimed to balance the more theoretical knowledge and ideological work the students experienced in Moscow.

7. Leaving Moscow: Good friends and fierce critics

This chapter looks at the students' return home after their studies at UDN, and provides an overview to their experiences after leaving Moscow and outcomes of the Soviet education project, explored through the case of UDN. First, the chapter discusses students that left the university before graduation due to a myriad of different reasons, including problems experienced at the university and in everyday life, while the second part of the chapter moves on to look at the majority of UDN students who graduated and returned to their countries of origin, highlighting the different reception they encountered in different countries. The chapter argues that outcomes of the education process were diverse, reflecting the different backgrounds, interests and networks of the international students as well as the domestic politics in their countries of origin, and thus demonstrating the limits of Soviet ideological work and public diplomacy. Among those students who left Moscow without graduating a small minority later criticized the conditions at UDN in public, while for the majority the reasons for leaving were connected to unsatisfactory study performance and personal problems in adapting to life in the Soviet Union. While the majority of UDN graduates returned home and found employment, the reception they received in their countries of origin was varied, depending on the state of bilateral relations with the USSR. Some problems had to do with negative assumptions about the quality of Soviet education in general, while others were very specifically concerning graduates of UDN. This again underlines the flagship position this institution had compared to other Soviet universities due to its presence and visibility in both Soviet and foreign media.

Those leaving UDN before graduation

A significant proportion of foreign students left the university without graduating, and even the percentage of Soviet students that were expelled or moved to other universities was notable especially in the 1960s. Every foreign student leaving the USSR before graduation was not only a significant waste of public money, but also an ideological defeat. Most students left UDN without graduating either due to poor performance in studies or by their own request. While the former group points out the problems in the education process itself due to the disadvantaged educational background of many students, the latter might refer to problems present in the Soviet society, starting with difficulties to adjust to the weather in Moscow to wider-scale social problems. Some cases of students interrupting their studies in the USSR and migrating to the West turned into instances of propaganda war, with both Western and Soviet media keen to highlight their points of view on the topic.

High dropout rates

The students who decided to interrupt their studies and leave the USSR early did so for a myriad of reasons. During the years 1960-1968, out of the approximately 4800 international students enrolled at UDN, 690 discontinued their studies before graduation.[1] In practice this meant that around 14% of foreign students left the university without graduating. This percentage was significantly higher than in other Soviet universities, were the dropout rates of international students tended to be below 5%.[2] In the 1970s, the dropout rates lowered at UDN but remained on the level of

---

[1] Out of these cases, 68 students left due to sickness or inability to adjust to the climate, 49 students due to family reasons, 226 on personal request, 225 were expelled due to unsatisfactory behavior, 122 did not return from holidays. RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.143, 10.

[2] Constantin Katsakioris, "The Lumumba University in Moscow: Higher education for a Soviet-Third World alliance, 1960-91," *Journal of Global History* 14, no. 2 (2019): 289, 294. Comparing to other groups of foreign students in the USSR, the number of students leaving on personal requests, family

around 10% for foreign students, which was still approximately two times higher than in most Soviet institutions of higher education. The most common reasons for interrupting studies at UDN were based on personal requests or caused by unsatisfactory behavior, while a minority of students left the university due to sickness or family reasons. Most dropouts happened during the first two years of the students' stay in Moscow, which reflected difficulties in adapting to studies in the preparatory faculty and transferring to specialized faculties.[3] The high dropout rate was most probably caused by the high number of students requiring special attention owing to their educational background and problems with the language. The large proportion of foreign students also allowed dissatisfaction to grow and spread in private discussions, encouraging students to leave in groups. In other Soviet universities this was not possible, as despite the large numbers of foreign students studying in different universities, most students in these universities were Soviet.

In some cases, it seems that the attitudes of university staff and other actors belittled negative experiences of foreign students, which demonstrates inability to react constructively to problems encountered. Comments on the students' negative experiences reflected ideals present in the public sphere about Soviet modernity and absence of phenomena such as racism or discrimination. When an Indonesian student returned home without graduating due to negative attitudes towards him from the side

---

reasons or other similar causes was significant. Among the group of Polish students in the Soviet universities in 1940s and 1950s that Patryk Babiracki has analyzed these reasons are not mentioned at all, but instead students would leave the USSR without graduating only due to health issues, dissatisfactory academic performance, and different types of misbehavior. Patryk Babiracki, "Imperial Heresies: Polish Students in the Soviet Union, 1948-1957," *Ab Imperio* no.4 (2007): 221-222.
[3] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.143, 10.

of both Soviet students and faculty after four years in the Soviet Union, a member of

UDN administrative staff noted that:

> *I told him that in the Soviet Union foreign students are given all favorable conditions for studies and work, and from the side of Soviet students they are given all necessary support in their studies. Thus, his situation must be a result of misunderstanding.*[4]

UDN Komsomol and CPSU organizations created numerous plans to improve the

situation. These, like the plans made to reduce violence against foreigners, tended to

stress the importance of providing internationalist education for Soviet citizens, but at

the same time the plans themselves reflected hierarchical attitudes present within the

university community. For example, UDN Komsomol report from 1964 provided a

detailed plan to fight discrimination and improve the atmosphere at the university, but

concluded the analysis with a statement that "the majority of foreign students, especially

from Africa, Asia and the Arab world, are people of low cultural level, and it is our task

to raise that level".[5] In other words, the position of the Soviet people as providers of aid

to disadvantaged peoples of the developing world instead of a more equal model of

transnational communication was present in the way activities to improve conditions at

the university were planned and conducted. These attitudes seemed to have caused

negative feelings in some foreign students, even to the degree that they returned home

without completing their studies.

At the same time, problems with the students' behavior, while lesser in numbers than

personal reasons and requests, were still a significant cause for leaving the university.

This was an especially common cause for Soviet students to leave the university before

graduation. During the period 1960-1968, approximately 7-10% of the intake of Soviet

---

[4] GARF f.9606 o.1 d.77, 110.
[5] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.357, 32-44.

students were expelled due to unsatisfactory behavior or poor performance in their studies.[6] These numbers show that despite the meticulous selection process of Soviet students, some of them still lacked motivation to perform well in their studies and other tasks. While Soviet students of UDN hardly ever participated in serious misbehavior, the criticism towards their inattentive participation in lectures and disinterest towards Komsomol activities was recurring. Prolonged, these minor faults might have become reasons to expel the student or move him to another university due to the special flagship position of UDN.

The situation concerning students leaving the university without graduating remained the same throughout the 1970s, which shows that the Soviet administration was not successful in controlling this outflow of students despite the constant attempts to improve the selection process of students and to provide them various forms of support during their studies. In 1970-1971, the most typical reasons for dropouts for foreign students were expelling the student due to poor performance in studies or moving him to another educational institution. This reflects not only the performance of students in their studies, but also the new policy of restricting studies at the preparatory faculty to one year and sending students unprepared for university studies to institutions of technical and vocational education. A rather significant proportion of dropouts also happened upon the students' personal requests. This is a significant change compared to the situation in the 1960s, when poor performance in studies was not listed among the reasons for leaving the university. The difference is mostly likely due to different methods of forming the statistics, as certain proportion of students who left the university due to unsatisfactory behavior in the 1960s might have in reality failed in

[6] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.286, 14-18.

their studies, and some students leaving by personal requests have possibly been advised or forced to submit such request due to their poor performance in studies. For the Soviet students, the most typical reasons for leaving UDN were poor performance in studies and personal requests. However, their dropout rate of 3,5% was on the same level as that of other Soviet universities, while for the foreign students the dropout rate was 9%.[7] The diminishing proportion of Soviet students interrupting their studies suggests that the changing policies of selecting the Soviet students might have resulted in a more ideologically capable student body than in the 1960s.

The relatively small annual numbers of students dropping out accumulated to a significant group during a longer timeframe. 3421 students, including 2432 foreign students, graduated from UDN in the period of 1971-1975. This was 95 foreign students less than what the Soviet authorities had calculated, despite the fact that the original plan based on the experiences of the 1960s had also anticipated a certain number of students to drop out or require a longer time to complete their degrees.[8] In other words, the dropout rates were higher than predicted, with dozens of international students leaving the UDN annually mostly upon their personal requests or due to poor study performance. The numbers indicate that despite efforts to improve the student selection process, studies proved to be too demanding for approximately 10% of the annual intake of international students, a proportion twice higher than in other Soviet universities.

---

[7] In 1970-1971 there were altogether 3092 international and 969 Soviet students at UDN. The reasons for dropout for international students were 81 students moving to other institution of higher education, 92 expelled due to weak study performance, 12 expelled due to dissatisfactory behavior, 14 left due to illness, 47 left by their own wish, 44 left or expelled for other reasons. While for the Soviet students the reasons were 4 students moving to other institution of higher education, 7 expelled due to weak performance in studies, 4 expelled due to dissatisfactory behavior, 3 left due to illness, 7 left by their own wish, 9 left or expelled for other reasons. GARF f.9606, o.1, d.4561, 19.

[8] An estimated dropout rate of approximately 5% was included in the plans, reflecting the situation in other Soviet universities. GARF f.9606, o.1, d.6592, 30.

Providing education for the foreign students was a very costly process and every student leaving the country without a diploma was both an ideological and a financial failure for the Soviet state. To provide an example, in the period of 1960-1971, 40 Nicaraguan students returned home from the USSR, but only 10 of them had graduated. 20 students had been expelled due to poor study performance and 10 had left the university upon personal request. The Soviet state had wasted approximately 120 000$ on these students.[9] In other words, foreign students dropping out of their study programs meant a significant waste of public money. Financial losses were often pointed out when discussing improvements to the process of selecting students and supporting them in their studies, as the education project created expenses for the state and the expectations connected to its results were high.

Relatively high dropout rates revealed contradictions between Soviet administration adjusting its educational policies and pushing for more strict selection process of students, shorter times to be spent in the preparatory faculty, and more concentration on basic skills in the specialized faculties to ensure that the students would graduate on time, and the reality with no significant changes appearing in the numbers of foreign student dropouts. The number of students interrupting their studies indicated that the Soviet insistence to provide education especially for students from disadvantaged family backgrounds created a situation where a rather significant proportion of students could not complete their studies despite the personal assistance provided to them in the preparatory faculties and during their further studies. The situation challenged the educational objectives set for UDN activities in terms of the number of graduates, but

---

[9] RGASPI f. M-1, o.39, d.373, 22-27.

was also an ideological defeat, contrasting the image of pedagogical and technological superiority and modernity of Soviet education provided at UDN.

Propaganda war with the West

Students leaving the USSR were not only a financial loss, but perhaps more importantly, an ideological one. While the majority of foreign students who decided to the leave the USSR before graduation did so with little publicity, in some cases the students moved principally to Western Europe and published their in some cases heavily edited stories about grim everyday life in the Soviet Union as interviews or memoirs. These stories published in Western media or as books and other publications aimed for audiences both in Western Europe and the developing world supported the ideological divisions present in the Cold War atmosphere by offering exaggerated narratives highlighting material deficits and surveillance present in the Soviet society. Soviet administration was keen to contest these narratives in public due to the influence they had on foreign students residing the Soviet Union, as Western publications imported from abroad tended to circulate among the foreign student population and raise discussion.

Memoirs and interviews of foreign students started small-scale propaganda wars, with both Western and Soviet media keen to provide explanations for the students leaving the USSR. Around 50 foreign students were expelled annually from Soviet universities and left the country as political provocateurs.[10] Such situation required significant breaking of norms for a prolonged time. Few of these students received publicity after they left the Soviet Union. However, in some cases, such students were keen to seek publicity with their interviews circulating in newspapers both in the West and the

---

[10] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.338, 136.

developing world. A significant amount of memoir literature was also published in the West to attract audiences both in Western Europe and the developing world. This body of literature has been widely used as a source to analyze the experiences of students in the Soviet Union despite the context in which these types of sources were produced.[11]

Visible cases of students leaving the USSR for the West were significant media events in both Western media that was keen to spread horror stories about the students' experiences in the Soviet Union, and in the Soviet media that openly blamed students for misbehaving.[12] One of the most notable early cases of a foreign student leaving the Soviet Union without graduating was a Nigerian student of Moscow State University who left the USSR for Great Britain in 1960 and was later interviewed about his experiences in the *Daily Express*, where he made very negative remarks about racism and other problems he faced while in the Soviet Union.[13] From the Soviet side this event was explained through personal qualities and behavior of the student himself, as he had been expelled from university due to unsatisfactory behavior. He had indeed experienced an incident of racially motivated violence, because he attempted to dance with a Russian girl while intoxicated and was later beaten by the girl's friends.[14] This first prominent case of a foreign student leaving the USSR and later talking in public about his negative experiences demonstrated the polarized rhetoric connected to these cases, with the Western media portraying the Soviet Union as a deeply racist and

---

[11] Most of Cold War era Western research on Soviet education refers to these memoirs as sources. They are also the main source Kret uses for her analysis on UDN. Abigail Judge Kret, "We Unite with Knowledge: The Peoples' Friendship University and Soviet Education for the Third World," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 33 no.2 (2013): 239-256.

[12] In the case of demonstration organized by African students in December 1963 the Soviet administration was also keen to demonstrate that the students involved were funded and supported by Western embassies. GARF f.9606, o.2, d.127, 32-39.

[13] *Daily Express* 14.7.1960, 4, 6; *Daily Express* 8.8.1960, 2.

[14] GARF f. 9540, o.1, d.63, 10-14, 59.

authoritarian society, while the Soviet media accounts concentrated on personal qualities of the student in question.

Cases of foreign students leaving the USSR and later commenting on their experiences in the West continued throughout the 1960s. In 1963, several Somali students from UDN left the Soviet Union after participating in events organized at the West German embassy. Later they arrived in West Germany, where they were widely interviewed in the media about their mainly negative experiences in the USSR.[15] It was not only African students who left the USSR and spread negative opinions about the Soviet Union abroad, though Africans tended to get the most foreign media attention due to their visible position in the global anti-colonial movement. In 1970, two Guatemalan students had been expelled from UDN due to poor study performance. They traveled to Sweden, where they were actively spreading rumors that the reason for being expelled were political disagreements.[16] Common denominators for interrupting studies in Moscow in the 1960s for these groups of students were alleged negative experiences of Soviet racism, rigid political atmosphere, and everyday difficulties, as well as Western influences spread through foreign embassies in Moscow.

Despite the small number of students publishing their accounts in the West, these publications had a damaging effect on the Soviet education project due to their circulation in the Soviet Union. According to Julie Hessler, memoirs and interviews published in the West "shaped the perceptions and actions of the African students themselves, since the articles validated the most suspicious interpretation of Soviet intentions while articulating grievances that many students shared."[17] Soviet

---

[15] RGASPI, f.M-3, o.3, d.28, 513-514, 739-740; RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.29, 27.
[16] TsMAM f. P-3061, o. 1, d.158, 14.
[17] Julie Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow: Race, Politics, and the Cold War," *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 47, no. 1-2 (2006): 45.

administration was keen to silence or downplay societal problems foreign students experienced during their stay in the Soviet Union, and thus the students could mirror their own experiences to the Western articles and student memoirs. At the same time, Hessler's analysis shows that two thirds of the articles published in the West in 1960-1963 used interviews of only four African students from Uganda, Nigeria, and Togo as their sources. This demonstrates that the majority of students who left the Soviet Union accused as "political provocateurs" did not discuss their experiences in public. In addition, most of the published interviews do not deal with racism, but concentrate on the repressive political climate and exploitation of Africans for political ends.[18] In other words, the grim narratives were first and foremost related to the students' political disagreements and disillusionment with socialism, not to racism and other everyday problems as such, even though these issues could connect to overall dissatisfaction that led to the students leaving the country.

The Soviet government handled the presented criticism poorly by simply denouncing the vocal critics and creating campaigns against them in the local media instead of addressing the problems highlighted in the interviews that were published in the West. Students who continued their education in the West were a topic of active Soviet counterpropaganda. Blaming Western media for blackmailing UDN, its students, and the Soviet Union in general was a constant topic both in the university newspaper *Druzhba* and other Soviet media.[19] As foreign students in the Soviet Union had unofficial access to Western media and interviews of students who had left the USSR, Soviet newspaper stories tended to provide rather simplified responses to the presented criticism by concentrating on personal qualities of the critics without attempts to react

---

[18] Hessler, "Death of an African student in Moscow", 45-49.
[19] See for example *Druzhba* 20.4.1966, 1.

constructively to the problems raised to discussion. Narratives about Soviet education published in Western media and the Soviet responses to this criticism repeated clichés that solidified ideological divisions of the Cold War atmosphere. However, stories about students who had left the USSR for West circulated among the student population and raised discussion among them, which might have encouraged certain students to leave the USSR before graduation.

Different realities of homelands for the new graduates

Returning home to build their countries was a patriotic duty of UDN graduates that combined both educational and ideological goals of UDN activities as returning students would ideally form new Soviet-minded elites while working in their fields of expertise and promoting friendly relations with the Soviet Union. However, target countries of educational cooperation had diverse attitudes concerning Soviet university degrees that often reflected the state of bilateral relations with the Soviet Union. While there was a general need for professionals of different fields and many graduates were warmly welcomed home after completing their studies, professional success rarely resulted in visible political positions or even interest from the students' side to maintain contact with Soviet authorities. This was a disappointment not only for the Soviet authorities, but also for the local communist parties and other organizations that had originally recommended the students for studies in the Soviet Union. In certain countries UDN graduates experienced discrimination or even threat of violence due to their connections with the Soviet Union. While the Soviet authorities actively negotiated with foreign states to improve the position of the graduates through practical means, such as adjustments made to the curricula, in the most exceptional cases students could prolong their stay in the Soviet Union to avoid persecution in their countries of origin, which demonstrates the limits of Soviet public diplomacy.

Challenges and expectations

The first group of 228 students graduated UDN in 1965, exactly five years after they had started their studies.[20] The program in medicine was planned to last for six years, with first students graduating in 1966. The first student intake in 1960 had been 539 foreign students, which means that less than half of the first cohort of students completed their degrees in five years.[21] Based on characterizations of foreign students created by the UDN faculty and Soviet students, most of these graduates possessed a pro-Soviet mindset, which meant that both educational and ideological goals of UDN activities were fulfilled and these students were ready to return home.[22] By October most of them had left the USSR.[23] Thus, the majority of graduating students had friendly attitudes towards the Soviet Union and returned to their countries of origin immediately after graduation. The only major problem was that less than half of the students were able to complete their degrees within the set timeframe, even considering that medicine was usually the most popular choice of specialization and required one extra year of studies compared to other fields.

Graduates found employment in various institutions and positions. The first three graduate classes were employed mostly in state administration and institutions of higher education.[24] Many UDN graduates were met warmly in the home countries regardless of the country's political position, as there was general prestige attached to foreign

---

[20] 184 of the graduating students came from 46 developing countries: 57 from Asia, 32 from Middle East, 38 from Africa and 58 from Latin America. The most popular specialization was economics and legal studies with 74 graduates, followed by engineering (63 graduates), humanities (35 graduates), agronomy (30 graduates) and natural sciences (26 graduates). RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.264, 112-113.

[21] RGASPI f.M-3, o.3, d.264, 112-113.

[22] 161 graduates were stated to possess a pro-Soviet mindset, while 23 people were classified as politically unreliable and 3 as hostile. TsAODM f. P-4376, o.1, d.25, 14-15.

[23] 153 new graduates had returned to their countries of origin, 13 had remained in the Soviet Union as graduate students, 9 had found employment or internship in the Soviet Union, and 8 had remained in the Soviet Union due to reasons unknown to the university. TsAODM f. P-4376, o.1, d.35, 78.

[24] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.143, 1.

diplomas. Especially for students who had specialized in a practical field, such as engineering or medicine, there was a need for their expertise. As a Panamanian graduate of medicine later remembered in an interview, the fact that he had studied in the Soviet Union was less important than the fact that he was newly graduated doctor willing to work in Panama. Graduates returning home received extensive positive publicity and were provided interesting work opportunities due to their university degrees:

> *News about two Panamanians that had studied in the Soviet Union, graduated from medical school, and planned to work in Panama were shown on TV. Many doors were open for us. Assistant of the healthcare minister told us that in the field of science and medicine the world is united and round, the most important thing was that we are Panamanian, that we are doctors and that we have the right to work in our own country.[25]*

Soviet administration placed high hopes on foreign graduates to gain leading positions in their home countries and take pro-Soviet stand in directing their countries' political orientation. Soviet-educated graduates would demonstrate the superiority of Soviet science and education system with their skills and bring the perspective of progress back home, which would in turn push their countries towards a non-capitalist path of development and modernization. The graduates would thus have a significant role in promotion of socialism in their home countries and opportunities to influence the course of reforms. [26] While this idea of technocracy was functioning in the Soviet Union, leading political positions in the developing world belonged to local elites and specialists of social sciences, most of whom received their education in the West, while foreign graduates of Soviet universities in the fields of law, economics, and social sciences were often facing suspiciousness vis-à-vis their degrees. However, a clear majority of foreign students in the Soviet Union graduated from programs of medicine,

---

[25] Frolov et al. *Ocherki po istorii Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov* (Moscow: RUDN, 2009), 139.
[26] Constantin Katsakioris, "Soviet Lessons for Arab Modernization: Soviet Educational Aid to Arab Countries after 1956," *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no. 1 (2010): 100.

engineering, and natural sciences that supported practical interests of their home countries and thus provided good career opportunities outside the field of politics. In other words, the expectations placed on capabilities of Soviet-educated graduates to influence the political developments in their countries of origin were overly optimistic.

Despite the positive welcome many foreign UDN graduates received in their countries of origin and their generally successful career development, there were a few key problems connected to the Soviet education project. These included the relatively high dropout rate from studies and the large proportion of graduates working outside their professional field, even though in general finding employment was not a problem. A detailed listing of the current employment of foreign UDN graduates from 1970 stated that less than half of them were working in their fields of specialization.[27] These two problems relate to the educational goals of UDN that concentrated on providing highly-skilled workforce for the developing world. From the ideological point of view, the goal of turning students into "good friends" of the Soviet Union did not realize on the level planned by Soviet authorities, because the predominantly positive or neutral personal attitudes towards the Soviet Union rarely translated into concrete political action, as few graduates gained visible political positions after graduation or possessed significant roles in advancing socialism around the world.

Adjusting programs to international standards

Due to claims about ideological and low-quality education, the contents of UDN study programs and validity of diplomas was questioned by several states. This caused graduates many practical problems, as they had to take additional courses after

---

[27] Out of the 597 Latin American graduates 551 were employed, but only 286 were working in their own field. For Arab students, the numbers were 318/296/134, for African students 451/409/222. TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.79, 66.

graduation or settle for lower-paying and less prestigious jobs compared to graduates from Western universities. UDN took significant measures to adjust its degrees to the demands of the international job market and negotiated intensively with several states to get its degrees recognized as equivalents of Western master's degrees.[28] Discussion on program contents serves as another evidence about problems connected to the reputation UDN had, as well as the Soviet interest in proving the high quality of education it was providing by negotiating with foreign state administrations to gain international recognition for UDN degree programs. Recognition of diplomas was negotiated through diplomatic means in cooperation with Soviet embassies, Ministry of Higher and Special Education, and the university representatives.

UDN tried to adjust the content of its degrees to the demands of job markets in the students' home countries. Soviet degrees in social sciences were especially problematic due to different socio-economical and jurisdictional structures, as differences between study programs based on Soviet-style system of planned economy and demands of local administrative systems and market economy made it in some cases demanding for the graduates to find employment. Until the late 1960s, all lawyers graduating from UDN specialized in international law, while few graduates found employment in this field. Instead, more opportunities to specialize in administrative legislation were needed, and to answer this demand a second specialization on state legislation and administration was added to the faculty. There were similar problems in the field of economics, as originally the only specialization offered was planning of national economy, which provided practical skills needed for Soviet economy but did not benefit the foreign

---

[28] In the early 1960s there was an intensive discussion within UNESCO concerning the conformity of degrees of higher education in different countries. Soviet universities were a problematic case, as the specialist degrees they provided was higher than a bachelor's but lower than a master's degree. GARF f.9519, d. 72, 281-282.

students. As a response, courses on finance, statistics and trade were offered to the students, and new specializations on foreign trade and finance were introduced. Some courses of these fields were lectured by visiting foreign professors from countries such as Sweden, and they were also available for Soviet students.[29] Even in more technical fields of study, study plans, materials, and contents of the courses were designed to fit the conditions of the developing world, and thus supported the employment possibilities of graduates. In practice this meant considering the climate, building materials available, presence of tropical diseases, and other similar conditions in the courses of agriculture, engineering, medicine, and other fields.

In certain countries, local authorities did not accept diplomas from Soviet universities as equivalents of Western master's degrees, because a 4-year Soviet specialist degree was between Western bachelor's and master's degrees in terms of study contents. This was especially the case with diplomas from the faculty of medicine, and UDN and the Ministry of Higher and Special Education worked actively to solve the issue. For example, Iraqi authorities did not recognize the degrees awarded by the UDN faculty of medicine until the late 1960s. Ahmed Al-Hani, professor at the University of Baghdad, visited Moscow in June 1968 to investigate the situation of Iraqi students in the USSR and noted that the students received better grades than they deserved, adding that "the level at UDN " was "lower than other Soviet institutions of higher education".[30] The Iraqi authorities also noted that Soviet-educated graduates of medicine could not pass the examinations required for employment and could thus only serve as medical assistants.[31] The situation was partly caused by the structure of the study program in

---

[29] RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.143, 10-18.
[30] GARF, f. 9606, o. 1, d. 3529, 35-36. The comment raised wide criticism among the students, who petitioned against this kind of discrimination. GARF, f. 9606, op. 1, d. 2703, 36-38.
[31] GARF, f. 9606, op. 1, d. 3962, 79-80.

medicine, which a Nigerian student addressed in his long article published in *Druzhba* in 1965. To find work as a doctor in Nigeria, he would require a Bachelor of Medicine or Bachelor of Surgery diploma in English, and was foreseeing problems to get his diploma recognized. At this point UDN administration was only planning to introduce a 6-month obligatory internship in a hospital to degrees awarded in the faculty of medicine. The Nigerian student pointed out that in most Western universities degrees of medicine included at least one year of practical training in a hospital and that an official certificate about completing such training was necessary in order to find employment. [32] Lack of comparability and incompatibility of different education systems was a constant problem with Soviet diplomas. Thus, discussion on degrees in medicine reflects the wider discussion and problems concerning the validity of UDN diplomas and the level of educational programs offered.

Acceptance of Soviet diplomas in different countries also depended on state of bilateral relations with the USSR, and especially in the case of UDN the institution's reputation further complicated the situation. In addition to general practices, personal features and potential influential networks, several parameters played a role in rejecting or accepting Soviet diplomas. A graduate from a prestigious university, who had obtained his high school diploma before entering a Soviet university, had better chances to get his university diploma recognized. Local socio-economic conditions created a need for different specialists in the public and private sectors. There was always a great demand for graduates from certain professional fields, such as doctors and pharmacists, who rarely faced problems in finding employment, though at times UDN graduates had to settle for less prestigious jobs, such as serving as a medical assistant instead of a doctor,

---

[32] *Druzhba* 16.1.1965, 1.

as the case of Iraq suggests.[33] Constantin Katsakioris has even argued that instead of succeeding in the mission of promoting socialist-minded elites, UDN created "a group of disadvantaged specialists – its own graduates".[34] While this is a rather strong statement, in many countries the position of UDN graduates tended to be weaker than that of graduates from Western or even other Soviet universities. An Argentinian alumna mentioned that she could not get her UDN diploma validated in Argentina and ended up working as a teacher instead of her specialization in agricultural sciences.[35] A Pakistani alumnus described his attempts to find employment with UDN diploma in the early 1980s Pakistan by stating that "while there were certain problems connected to Soviet diplomas in general, UDN degrees were especially problematic", because UDN was considered "a political university that does not give good education". He sent applications for work, but was not accepted to any governmental jobs, including positions in state-owned factories.[36]

The problem of getting UDN diplomas recognized persisted until the 1980s, and several factors influenced how the graduates' diplomas were perceived in their countries of origin. A report from 1969 noted that students from Syria, Iran and Cameroon were facing problems in having their diplomas recognized by their countries' authorities[37] and previous research has detected similar cases from different countries and continents, such as Ghana, Ecuador, and Mexico.[38] While UDN administration was actively adjusting degree program contents to fit the international standards and participated in diplomatic negotiations to get recognition for the diplomas, the widely spread negative

---

[33] Costantin Katsakioris, "Les étudiants de pays arabes formés en Union soviétique pendant la Guerre froide (1956-1991)," *Revue européenne des migrations internationals* 32, no. 2 (2016): 29.

[34] Constantin Katsakioris, "The Lumumba University in Moscow", 294.

[35] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

[36] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.

[37] RGASPI f.M-1, o.46, d.343, 1-2.

[38] Constantin Katsakioris, "The Lumumba University in Moscow", 294.

image of the institution made finding employment with UDN diplomas challenging for many graduates.

Hostilities against UDN graduates

Despite issues with recognition of diplomas and other practical problems that could make returning home challenging for UDN graduates, in most cases they could return safely and start looking for employment. The situation was very different in cases when domestic political situation in the target countries put the graduates into danger upon return home. The case of Indonesia from mid-1960s provides a vivid example about the procedures graduates from Soviet universities had to go through before settling in their home countries. However, Indonesia was not a unique case, and similar situations were created by coups and other political turmoil in different parts of the world. In these cases, the Soviet administration demonstrated flexibility and tried to organize internships or jobs for the students, so they could prolong their stay in the Soviet Union.

One of the most extreme cases of unexpected change of political atmosphere that posed a threat of violence to UDN graduates upon return home was the situation of Indonesian graduates from the mid-1960s onwards. Political upheavals that started in Jakarta and spread to other parts of Indonesia in autumn 1965 created a strong anti-communist movement that was supported by the United States and other Western countries and targeted members of the Communist Party of Indonesia, their sympathizers and other alleged leftists. The situation led to mass killings with approximately one million victims by early 1966. As a result of these events, communists were purged from social, political and military life. President Sukarno fell from power in 1967 and was replaced by Indonesian army leader Suharto, who established an authoritarian presidency that

lasted until the 1990s. Hundreds of thousands of Indonesians living abroad were not able to return home and formed a large population of exiles.[39]

A report by the Soviet embassy in Jakarta from autumn 1965 noted that most of the returning students were immediately recruited to the army upon their arrival home. Employers did not accept their "hammer and sickle" diplomas that were associated with the Indonesian Communist Party. Diplomas of UDN were especially problematic as they were issued by the university in two languages, Russian and English, French, or Spanish, with Soviet emblems. Other Soviet universities issued their diplomas only in Russian and later the students could get official diploma translations from the Soviet embassy in Jakarta without the communist symbols. Thus, Indonesian UDN graduates were considered communists and none of the 31 graduates in the group that returned home in autumn 1965 could find employment. After a few months approximately 30% had found a job but were living under constant threat of losing it. Unemployment was combined to economic hardship, as many graduates were forced to sell everything they owned, some were starving, and traveling to their hometowns or staying in contact with their families was not safe. The graduates had brought Russian novels, scientific and political literature with them that now put them under a threat. The graduates sent telegraphs to their countrymen in Moscow, warning that return home would be perilous.[40]

Situation of UDN graduates worsened further in the late 1960s, following the developments in domestic politics of Indonesia. After president Suharto de facto came to power in 1966 as the lieutenant general of the Indonesian army, all Indonesian

---

[39] Ann Laura Stoler, "On the Uses and Abuses of the Past in Indonesia: Beyond the Mass Killings of 1965," *Asian Survey* 42 no. 4 (2002): 642-650.
[40] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.172, 23-24a; GARF f.9606, o.2, d.267, 28-29.

graduates from Soviet institutions had to go through a re-education program. Since 1967, upon arrival to Indonesia the graduates had to go through an interview concerning their membership in different organizations, why they wanted to study in the USSR, with whom they spent time in Moscow, and where did they go for holidays.[41] The Ministry of Higher and Special Education reacted to the situation by sending universities a letter in spring 1967 with a request to provide a list of graduating Indonesians that were unwilling or unable to return to Indonesia due to political reasons.[42] In early summer 1967, UDN responded with a list of 20 Indonesian new graduates critical towards the Indonesian government and reluctant to return home. All of them were recommended for jobs and internships in the USSR.[43] Even though Indonesia was probably the most visible case of such practice, it was not unique. For instance, in spring 1967 also six students from Paraguay, Peru, Chile, and Jordan expressed their wish to stay in the USSR for work or an internship due to political reasons.[44]

UDN graduates who decided to return home after graduation regardless of prevailing anti-communist political mindsets in their countries of origin faced practical difficulties and threats. In 1965, a group of Bolivian students had to return home secretly through Chile, because the Bolivian state had refused to receive them. Another similar case was Chile after Pinochet's rise to power. At least five UDN alumni were killed in the persecutions that followed September 1973.[45] An Argentinian alumna could also provide a list with several names of UDN alumni, who were killed or had gone missing during the rule of different military juntas in Latin America due to their leftist

---

[41] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.263, 150-154.
[42] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.264, 29.
[43] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.263, 225-227.
[44] GARF f.9606, o.2, d.263, 229-230.
[45] Tobias Rupprecht, "Gestrandetes Flaggschiff. Die Moskauer Universität der Völkerfreundschaft," *Osteuropa* no. 1 (2010): 109.

worldviews.[46] Studies at UDN could potentially put the graduates under significant risk after return home. These cases of threats against graduates of UDN and other Soviet institutions demonstrate the limits of Soviet influence on the developing world. Graduates' return to countries with hostile attitudes towards the USSR or unexpected changes in local political situation affected the outcomes of the Soviet education project with graduates becoming outlaws and the Soviet administration having few opportunities to influence the situation.

Staying in touch with the Soviet authorities

UDN graduates were expected to remain in contact with the university and other Soviet institutions, such as embassies and cultural institutes, after they returned home. Soviet authorities were also keen to keep track of these contacts and the overall political mindsets of the graduates. In 1978, the Soviet Ministry of Culture reported that alumni organizations were established in 21 countries. These were important actors in promotion of Soviet achievements and building relations by organizing lectures, exhibitions and conferences, while maintaining contact with the Soviet embassies and cultural institutes, the Ministry of Higher and Special Education, institutions of higher education, and other organizations, such as Komsomol.[47] This model for successful alumni relations created and maintained grass-root level connections between Soviet administrative organs and active graduates of Soviet institutions globally. However, already in 1970, UDN CPSU organization noted that the university did not have information about the current location and activities of about a third of its foreign

---

[46] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.
[47] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.8665, 9-10.

graduates.[48] In other words, many graduates were reluctant or unable to remain in contact with the Soviet authorities.

Finding employment with a Soviet diploma and simultaneously answering to the ideological demands of the Soviet authorities and the local political organizations was a challenge for UDN graduates, and few of them were interested or capable of promoting socialism on a scale that the Soviet administration expected. Most graduates did not conduct large-scale social and political work upon arrival to their home countries. Soviet interest in the graduates' ideological consciousness and readiness to work actively in promotion of socialism becomes clear in this excerpt of a speech from the vice-secretary of the UDN engineering faculty's politburo at UDN CPSU organization's meeting. The speech placed ideological work on the same level of importance as the graduates' ability to find employment in their field with UDN diplomas:

> *We must be sure that our foreign graduates will not only be good specialists, but also active propagandists of the socialist lifestyle, the socialist system, and our faithful friends. Lately, all of us have been primarily interested in the problem of employment of our graduates, whether they work in their specialization, or whether they are accepted for work with UDN diplomas. The recognition of our diploma is of great importance in itself, but now we should be interested not only in the employment of our graduates. The university must know the ideological, political face of our graduates.[49]*

Analysis on the ideological consciousness of graduates was an essential tool for planning future activities and evaluating the outcomes of the education project in general. Alumni organizations were in a key position to provide information about activities of their members and to serve as a link between UDN and its graduates. In ideal conditions, these organizations held a close contact with Soviet embassies abroad

---

[48] The university held correspondence with 500 alumni, while the faculty members held personal correspondence with 215. The university had information about the activities of 1205 graduates and had lost all contact with 490 alumni. TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.79, 68; RGASPI f.M-1, o.39, d.286, 22-27.
[49] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.96, 13-14.

and actively monitored the activities of their members. Most alumni organizations worked in direct connection and under the supervision of Soviet cultural institutes or friendship societies. However, the Soviet administration did not have contact with all the organizations, and many of them were passive or even illegal, which caused their activities to have little influence. Many organizations were also small, consisting of up to a few dozen activists.[50] In other words, the contacts with the alumni were often weak and the organizations fulfilled requirements and expectations set by the Soviet administration only in a minority of cases. This made gathering and analysis of information about global ideological influence of the education project demanding.

However, some alumni organizations were actively monitoring activities of UDN graduates. An interesting report concerning the activities of Bolivian alumni in 1970 started by noting that the activities of UDN graduates "do not give those positive results" that the local communist party had expected, and thus the local party organization refused to send more young people to study at UDN, as "those who return are not the people that are needed". [51] In other words, the education received in Moscow did not answer to the ideological and political needs of the local communist party. At this time, also communist parties of Uruguay and Argentina refused to recommend students for studies at UDN due to the low level of ideological education included in the degrees, which served as another example of the expectations placed on Soviet education not only in providing professional skills, but also ideological education needed by grass-root level communist movements globally.[52] A few years earlier, leaders of communist parties of Ecuador, Colombia and other countries even wrote to the Central Committee

---

[50] GARF f.9606, o.1, d.8665, 15-28; GARF f. 9576, o.14, d.248, 24-27.
[51] TsMAM f. P-3061, o. 1, d.1584, 8.
[52] TsAODM f.P-4376, o.1, d.79, 170.

of CPSU and asked to close down UDN. [53] The university, on the other hand, was seemingly ignoring these specific demands of foreign communist parties and stressed the common cause of providing education and opportunities for development of a pro-Soviet worldview for all students in an equal manner instead of training ideological cadres for the needs of foreign communist parties.

Contradictions between expectations of both Soviet authorities and foreign communist parties alike and the reality of graduates' activities after return home are highlighted in reports collected by alumni organizations. The statement on lack of positive results with the Bolivian graduates was confirmed by short characteristics of 40 Bolivian UDN alumni. Nine of them actively cooperated with the local communist party, while ten alumni did not participate in any political activities and another ten were supporters of Maoism or participated in guerilla movements in Central America and Cuba.[54] The report noted that four alumni, all of them medical doctors, mastered their profession very poorly. On the other hand, only two alumni were unemployed.[55] In other words, only a quarter of the Bolivian UDN alumni collaborated with the local communist party after their return home, even though the party had provided all 40 individuals the required recommendations for studies at UDN, and thus expected active cooperation after their return home. The number of graduates who were involved in Maoist or pro-

---

[53] Frolov et al. *Ocherki po istorii Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov*, 162-166. While these demands did have an impact, no discussion concerning potential closing of UDN took place. In comparison, in Czechoslovakia in response to the high cost of providing education for foreign students and the ideologically suspicious character of students arriving to the country, in 1974 the Czechoslovak authorities decided to close the University of 17th November that had been opened in 1961 specifically to receive students from the developing world. Barbora Buzássyová, "Repositioning of Czechoslovak Educational Strategies to the 'Least Developed Countries': The Rise and Decline of University of 17th November," in *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, ed. Ingrid Miethe and Jane Weiss (Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020), 189.

[54] Participation in militant political movements varied greatly depending on the region. Many Latin American alumni participated due to wide interest towards the Cuban model of socialism and wide-spread leftist guerilla movements in many countries of the region, while in other continents involvement in such movements was probably on a lower level.

[55] TsMAM f. P-3061, o. 1, d.1584, 9-11

Cuban movements or were politically inactive was double compared to the number of alumni that cooperated with the Bolivian Communist Party. On the other hand, very few graduates were unemployed and only the medical doctors were claimed to master their profession poorly.

Despite the small number of Bolivian alumni, this case provides an interesting insight into one group of UDN graduates and suggests that while the political mindsets among graduates were diverse, in general they did not experience great difficulties in finding employment. In other words, while the educational goal of UDN activities to provide highly-skilled professionals for the developing world seemed to have been accomplished, the situation concerning ideological results of the education process were more varied. A small minority of graduates actively collaborated with the Soviet authorities and the local communist party, while the majority of them were either politically indifferent or actively involved in movements that contested Soviet-style socialism. This caused discontent not only in Soviet authorities, but also among local political actors. In other words, few graduates were "active propagandists of the socialist lifestyle" that was required from them in political speeches.

Great hopes for the future

Providing education for students from the developing world remained an important task of the Soviet state administration until 1991. Universities and other actors were keen to improve the education process by making it more effective and better responding to the demands of job markets in the students' countries of origin. The Soviet state was also willing to adjust its goals and methods of educational cooperation, as the turn to state-

to-state cooperation in the 1970s demonstrated.[56] Changes in educational cooperation reflect the wider context of changes taking place in Soviet international relations and domestic politics. The Soviet administration also aimed to develop its educational cooperation further. Central Committee of Komsomol noted in 1978 that while there were currently 65 000 foreign students in the USSR studying in 100 cities and 220 institutions of higher education, the goal was to increase this number to 100 000 by 1990.[57] This note clearly shows that despite the continuous discussion on problems concerning the education process, the Soviet administration had strong faith in improving the situation and providing higher education to wider masses of students.

Oral narratives highlight that many foreign students were satisfied with their experience in the Soviet Union. On personal level, study years at UDN were life-changing experiences that many students remembered as the best years of their lives despite the material flaws and societal problems they encountered during their stay.[58] Many positive things were remembered for decades after leaving the Soviet Union. A Portuguese alumna repeatedly noted how her stay in the Soviet Union was a great experience, especially concerning the opportunities to meet and make friends with other students from many different countries,[59] while a Pakistani alumnus stated that his study years at UDN "made him the person he is today".[60] An Argentinian alumna noted that she and her husband, also a graduate of UDN, were connected by "love and ideals."[61] Even considering the obvious nostalgia connected to these oral histories, it seems clear

---

[56] Similar preference for "all-purpose and mutually advantageous" bilateral cooperation can be found in Czechoslovak development aid policies in the 1970s. Buzássyová, "Repositioning of Czechoslovak Educational Strategies to the 'Least Developed Countries'", 199-200.
[57] RGASPI f.M-1, o. 39, d.714, 11-15.
[58] Rupprecht, *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin,* 221-225.
[59] Interview with Portuguese informant, 10.11.2020.
[60] Interview with Pakistani informant, 30.11.2020.
[61] Correspondence with Argentinian informant, 6.11.2020.

that these graduates of UDN were pleased with their experience in the Soviet Union. Most of the students' positive memories were connected to friendships with other foreign students and the Soviet people, opportunities to travel around the Soviet Union for free or for a minimal price, and the possibility to gain a high-quality university degree, which would not have been possible elsewhere for most students.

However, comparing these positive experiences of individuals to the ambitious goals set for the university activities, outcomes of the education project become more diverse. From an educational point of view, most students graduated and found employment, though many had to settle for jobs outside their field of specialization. Many also never returned home to develop their countries or soon migrated elsewhere, thus failing their "patriotic duty" towards their home country that was highlighted in Soviet ideological work. For instance, none of the informants interviewed for this research made careers in their field of specialization in their countries of origin. From an ideological point of view, while the informants did possess a generally positive attitude towards the Soviet Union on a personal level, this was mostly due to positive experiences obtained during study years. Only one of the informants noted that during his stay in the Soviet Union he was deeply interested in ideological topics, was keen to study Marxism-Leninism, and participated in different kinds of political events. After graduation this individual returned to the Soviet Union and temporarily worked for Radio Moscow, broadcasting news in his native language to foreign audiences. Thus he is the only one among the informants that was active in ideological work after graduation.

These individual life stories reflect the wider image concerning outcomes of Soviet educational cooperation found in other sources. In educational terms, the project of providing higher education degrees for students from the developing world can be

considered fairly successful despite certain persistent dilemmas, such as the relatively high dropout rate and the rather large proportion of graduates finding employment in fields outside their specialization. Thousands of foreign students who did not have access to higher education elsewhere graduated from UDN despite practical problems caused by their educational background, the language of instruction and other factors. However, outcomes connected to ideological expectations on UDN activities were more diverse, as relatively few students were actively promoting the cause of Soviet-style socialism after graduation, which was a disappointment both to Soviet authorities and local political parties that had provided the students recommendations needed for studies in the Soviet Union. While a minority of graduates cooperated with Soviet institutions after graduation, an even smaller minority of them were actively working against the Soviet Union. In other words, the majority of graduates remained politically passive and concentrated in building their professional careers either in their countries of origin or elsewhere despite the presumably positive or neutral personal views on the Soviet Union. Thus, various forms of ideological work conducted during lectures, leisure time, and holidays combined to encounters and interaction with Soviet citizens in and outside the university resulted in deep and multi-faceted impressions about life in a socialist state, in some cases even in ideological friendship and solidarity with the Soviet people. However, only relatively few graduates were in a position to actively promote political connections and cooperation with the Soviet Union after returning to their countries of origin. Instead, educational cooperation created a mass of Soviet-educated professionals working in different fields, thus bringing diversity to environments previously dominated by Western expertise.

Conclusion

The Soviet Union educated approximately 500 000 foreign individuals in its institutions of higher education during the whole Cold War period, thousands of them graduating from UDN.[1] A retrospective reading of Soviet educational cooperation, which takes the collapse of the Soviet bloc as a starting point, is more likely to highlight disillusionment and acknowledge total failure. However, Soviet cooperation with the developing world has wider significance in international history due to its cultural, political, and economic dimensions. Cooperation created exchange between states and peoples with different historical backgrounds and cultural horizons, shaping and affecting both the Soviet Union and the target countries through individuals crossing both physical and mental boundaries. At the same time, in terms of political and economic history, Soviet educational cooperation was a significant contribution to construction of national economies of the target countries during the struggle for national liberation and state construction.[2] Rather than being "brainwashed" during their stay, students from the developing world were catalysts of student activism that tested the limits of internationalism by confronting rituals of state socialism. As Eric Burton has noted, in this perspective students from the developing world were "politicized and politicizing agents who forcefully resisted ideological patronage".[3] All these different dimensions are present in the story of UDN during the period of 1960-1980.

---

[1] Natalia Tsvetkova, "International Education During the Cold War: Soviet Social Transformation and American Social Reproduction," *Comparative Education Review* 52, no. 2 (2008): 209.

[2] Constantin Katsakioris, "Soviet Lessons for Arab Modernization: Soviet Educational Aid to Arab Countries after 1956," *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no. 1 (2010): 103-104.

[3] Eric Burton, "Navigating global socialism: Tanzanian students in and beyond East Germany," *Cold War History* 19, no. 1 (2019): 64-65.

This institution is a significant part of the overall narrative of Soviet educational cooperation and its influence on the developing world. The university was founded as a Thaw-era public diplomacy project based on growing Soviet interest towards the developing world. Education was a peaceful way to build new partnerships alongside more direct forms of development aid. Through the university, Soviet expertise and technological advancement was promoted globally to different audiences. Partnerships were created with countries that were oriented towards socialism as well as with capitalist countries interested in Soviet technology and expertise. As a result of widening Thaw era cooperation and internationalism, countries with both socialist and capitalist orientations were welcomed to cooperate with the Soviet state.

Establishment of UDN was directly connected to Soviet foreign policy goals as part of the cultural Cold War and competition between the two superpowers. The university was created for both educational and ideological goals, as while it educated new professionals for the needs of the developing world, the students were also expected to return home as "good friends" of the Soviet Union. The institution was a flagship of Soviet modernity and technological advancement combined to altruistic support to the developing world, which positioned Soviet education as an anti-colonial alternative to education provided in Western universities. In the West, UDN was portrayed as a low-level institution providing ideological training, while the Soviet Union was keen to promote it as "the first internationalist university in the world". These different positions were reflected in the public image and reputation of the institution, with the Soviet authorities highlighting the narrative or friendship and cooperation in the public sphere, while condemning criticism presented in the Western media.

UDN and its changing position in the field of Soviet higher education connected the macro level of state administration to the micro level of university students and faculty. Events taking place at the macro level followed political developments in Soviet domestic and foreign policies. With change of leadership from Khrushchev to Brezhnev, also the position of UDN changed as the contents of its study programs were standardized with programs offered in other Soviet universities, most importantly by making courses of social sciences obligatory for students of all fields. This meant that the greatest period of enthusiasm towards the developing world was over due to changes in political atmosphere in the USSR and the target countries, where a growing number of ethnic conflicts and other disputes took place. Selection of new students for UDN in the 1970s was based on bilateral negotiations with the target countries instead of communication with local political organizations through which a rather mixed group of students, including political activists, had arrived to UDN in the 1960s. Study programs were no longer tailored to match the specific needs of the developing world, as education processes were more controlled and unified across the Soviet state. While UDN was still a widely used example of Soviet international cooperation in the public sphere, it lost its special position as an institution providing non-ideological education.

At the micro level of analysis, student narratives tend to be either highly critical, as in narratives published in the West during the Cold War period, or highly nostalgic, as in interviews collected for the purposes of this research. Personal interview narratives about life in the multicultural UDN community highlight things that were experienced most positively, such as interactions within the international student community, the high quality of education offered, and the opportunities to travel around the Soviet Union during holiday times. At the same time, these different narratives shared the idea of foreign students' position simultaneously as insiders and outsiders in the Soviet

society. Foreign students lived in the Soviet Union for several years and thus gained an insider's view to everyday life in a socialist society, but as foreigners they were also perceived as outsiders, which showed in incidents of violence and negative attitudes of Soviet authorities towards phenomena such as intercultural marriage. These different perspectives the students gained during their stay made higher education programs rather challenging projects of public diplomacy.

Between these two levels of high politics and everyday experiences functioned the university that had been assigned a task to turn its students not only into professionals of their respective fields, but also "good friends" of the Soviet Union. The idea of friendship present at the level of planning and implementation of the university activities was based on an ideological conceptualization that was applied also to other types of Soviet internationalist connections: in the university's attempts to familiarize the students with "Soviet reality" in Moscow and other regions of the USSR, the main motivation was to provide the students with concrete models to develop their own societies and to create interest and sympathy towards the socialist way of life through excursions and ritualized meetings with local workers in different parts of the Soviet state. In other words, this ideological "friendship" was based on alliances created by solidarity and shared ideology, and included moral and political dimensions that underlined the expected behavior of foreign students during and after their studies. However, everyday life rarely corresponded to these expectations. Quite the opposite, in many cases foreign students' interaction with young Soviet people led to relationships and even marriages that were far beyond the limits of ideological friendship based on mutual solidarity that the Soviet state highlighted in its activities.

UDN was both an ideological and a political project that had a central position in the field of Soviet educational cooperation, as it promoted Soviet internationalism both for foreign and domestic audiences in all its activities and through public images highlighting friendship and cooperation within the multinational student body as well as with the Soviet people. For foreign audiences, these images provided a view to alternative and anti-colonial Soviet modernity, highlighting the peaceful nature of Soviet cooperation in sharing its technological advancement and expertise with partners around the world. For domestic audiences, images and narratives present in the public sphere as well as visits of foreign students to different locations around the Soviet state carried a powerful message in support of Soviet internationalist foreign policy. In other words, ideology in the case of UDN was not only theory pertained to lectures, but also a way of doing things as a part of public life and activities at the university, a performance the students participated in not only through excursions, but also through describing their experiences later in *Druzhba*.

This ideological view to the institution and its task was often contradicted by everyday realities. Foreign students of UDN were a diverse group of people, some of them possessing a pro-Soviet mindset since the beginning of their studies, while others were either indifferent towards the state ideology or even anti-Soviet in their opinions. Soviet authorities did not always take into account the varying needs and interests of different groups of foreign students, and the ideological activities tended to be fairly Soviet-centered and unified in content for all students. While UDN attempted to influence the students' ideological stand through different kinds of activities at the university and outside it, in many cases the students were giving these activities different meanings than the Soviet administration had intended. A holiday trip to Soviet Central Asia was first and foremost an adventure and a chance to see and experience something new and

exciting, not an opportunity to develop political consciousness or deepen understanding about non-capitalist development models, though in many cases these personal and ideological goals and motivations did not contradict each other.

Different forms of ideological work tended to promote the idea of Soviet-led internationalism instead of transnational communication between equal partners. This position raised criticism among the foreign students, who often pointed out the specific conditions present in their countries of origin that were not addressed in the sphere of ideological activities provided by UDN. Compatriot associations offered the foreign students spaces to discuss these problems, and functioned as the core of student-led initiatives and political activism. While the Soviet authorities were closely monitoring the political mindsets and activities of these organizations, the students possessed wide networks of cooperation and would sometimes engage in public activism of openly political nature, such as the demonstrations of 1963. The position of compatriot associations serves as another evidence of the outsider position the students possessed inside the Soviet society, which gave them opportunities to engage in political activism in ways that would not have been possible in the sphere of Soviet organizations. At the same time, the activities of these organizations reflect wider global tendencies of student activism in the 1960s and the vibrant political atmosphere and discussions present in post-colonial settings that the foreign students brought with them to Moscow.

Expectations set for the students' life after graduation were connected to foreign policy goals of the Soviet state, but in reality outcomes of the cooperation were highly dependent on the target countries and local interests, thus demonstrating the limits of Soviet public diplomacy. Local interests and needs were visible in the processes of selecting students for studies abroad and encouraging them to choose specializations

that were needed in their countries of origin. In the 1960s these interests and needs were largely negotiated with local political organizations sending students for studies in the Soviet Union and stressing the ideological expectations connected to higher education in the Soviet Union, while in the 1970s the aspirations connected to international education reflected state-level interests. In many cases, the target countries and local political organizations maintained contact with the students throughout their studies, monitoring their political mindsets and loyalty. Political situation of the target countries shows also in the varying opportunities for employment and political influence for foreign graduates of Soviet universities after their return home. Thus, realities of Soviet educational cooperation demonstrate the negotiations taking place on different levels of state-to-state relations and the changes these relations experienced over time.

Despite the Soviet trust in education as a changing force in the society, in practice Soviet-trained engineers and doctors rarely raised to visible political positions after graduation. While the situation reflected personal aspirations and career goals of the graduates, it also demonstrated the difficulties of applying Soviet ideas of technocracy to contexts of post-colonial states that had inherited most of their societal structures from their previous colonizers. Professional prestige rarely translated into visible political positions and a rather small proportion of graduates actively cooperated with Soviet authorities after returning home, while some took political positions opposing the Soviet state administration. However, in some cases societal change initiated by Soviet-trained specialists took place. Social transformation was most likely to occur in countries with socialist orientations, in countries with poor economies and moderate sized populations, and in countries in which a national liberation movement gained

power. Some graduates of Soviet universities also established political organizations opposed to local political power or became leaders of a coup d'état.[4]

Concerning the educational goals set for cooperation, the outcomes of the project were fairly positive as thousands of Soviet-trained specialists found employment and experienced significant social mobility that would have otherwise been unattainable for them. However, ideological results of the cooperation were more varied, as few graduates actively promoted socialism after returning home. Nonetheless many of them maintained a positive or neutral perception of the Soviet Union on a personal level, and with their Soviet university degrees they brought diversity to environments that had previously been dominated by Western expertise. In addition, public image of the educational cooperation that stressed friendship, technological advancement, and modernity was a highly powerful one for Soviet public diplomacy, as it contested dominance of Western higher education and knowledge, providing an alternative to previous connections that were largely based on networks deriving from the colonial era between metropolises and peripheries. Compared to these connections, the Soviet Union created a new and attractive image of foreign relations based on solidarity and sharing its expertise with countries of the developing world.

Importance of the Cold War era Soviet educational cooperation shows also in the fact that it is experiencing continuation in contemporary Russia. Internationalization of education, in other words public or educational diplomacy, is still closely linked to Russian foreign policy goals. Until the end of the Cold War, international education was connected to motivations related to foreign policy, national security, technical assistance, and promotion of peace and mutual understanding. From the point of view

---

[4] Tsvetkova, "International Education During the Cold War", 209-211.

of foreign policy, education of international students created connections with the Soviet Union and facilitated future political and economic relations with the students' home countries.[5] Rhetoric of friendship originating in the Soviet period has remained an important part of Russian public diplomacy: foreign students completing their studies in Russian universities are still expected to become friends of Russia during their study years, form life-long ties with the country, serve as experts of Russian language and culture, and favor the political and economic interests of Russia when they return home.[6] In other words, graduates from Russian universities will constitute the "political, intellectual elite of their own countries and are interested in strengthening relations with Russia" as Dmitrii Medvedev stated in a speech at the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2012.[7] In public discourse studying in a Russian university is still an experience that contributes in a positive way to Russia's external image.[8]

UDN, nowadays known as the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia [Rossiiskii Universitet Druzhby Narodov, RUDN], is still one of the most international universities in Russia. It celebrated its 60th anniversary in 2020 in the Kremlin concert hall with participation of many visible Russian politicians and graduates of the university. Contemporary RUDN is alma mater to thousands of foreign students from over 150 countries, though currently 75% of students come from Russia. The university aims to spread its international influence by founding training centers of Russian language and pre-university studies to foreign countries especially in Latin America, but also in Asia

---

[5]Sirke Mäkinen, "In Search of the Status of an Educational Great Power? Analysis of Russia's Educational Diplomacy Discourse," *Problems of Post-Communism* 63 no. 3 (2016): 185, 189; Hans de Wit, *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe. A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2002): 84-85.
[6] Mäkinen "In Search of the Status of an Educational Great Power?", 189.
[7] Dmitrii Medvedev "Rossotrudnichestvo—silnyi, effektivnyi, gibkii instrument vneshnei politiki", https://interaffairs.ru/news/show/8738; accessed January 20, 2020.
[8] Mäkinen "In Search of the Status of an Educational Great Power?", 189.

and the Middle East.[9] Many current foreign students of RUDN have chosen to study there based on the experiences of their parents and even grandparents, who studied at UDN during the Soviet period. In other words, legacies of the Soviet period are still present in the everyday activities of the institution.

International higher education during the Cold War was a battle for "hearts and minds", a part of Thaw-era Soviet enthusiasm towards the developing world, and a case of East-West rivalry at the time of decolonization that aimed to transform international politics. However, Cold War era international education in the Soviet Union was a process different from the promotion of a world revolution that had taken place in the interwar period. This time, it would be Soviet-educated doctors, engineers and teachers who would not only develop and modernize their home countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, but also create new networks of Soviet-led internationalism. While this turned out to be a project more challenging than was predicted due to political realities of the target countries and varying backgrounds, interests, and contacts of the students who arrived in Moscow in the 1960s and 1970s, it was still a form of globalization that brought new political and cultural influences to the Soviet Union and created a group of highly-educated people, who possessed different background and experiences than the preceding generations in similar societal positions in countries of the developing world. In the center of this movement, interaction, networks and aspirations was a microcosm that was promoted as "the first internationalist university" of the world, the Peoples' Friendship University.

---

9 *RUDN: 2016 – the year that has changed the university* brochure, 2016, 29-30.

Sources and Bibliography

Archival sources

Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation, GARF)

> fond 5451 *Vsesoiuznyi tsentral'nyi sovet professional'nykh soiuzov, VtsSPS* (All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions)

> fond 9519 *Kommissiia SSSR po delam IUNESKO* (USSR UNESCO Commission)

> fond 9540 *Sovetskii komitet solidarnosti stranami Azii i Afriki* (Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Countries of Asia and Africa

> fond 9576 *Soiuz Sovetskikh obshchestv druzhby i kul'turnoi sviazi s zarubezhnymi stranami, SSOD* (Union of Soviet Friendship Organizations and Cultural Relations)

> fond 9606 *Ministerstvo vyshego i srednego spetsial'nogo obrazovaniia SSSR, MINVUZ SSSR* (Soviet Ministry of Higher and Special Education)

Rossiiskoi Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Sotsial'no-Politicheskoi Istorii (Russian State Archive of Political and Social History, RGASPI)

> fond M-1 *Tsentral'nyi Komitet VLKSM 1918-1991* (Central Committee of Komsomol)

> fond M-3 *Komitet molodezhnykh organizatsii SSSR 1956-1991* (Committee of USSR Youth Organizations)

Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Noveishei Istorii (Russian State Archive of Contemporary History, RGANI)

> fond 3 *Politbiuro TsK KPSS 1952-1990* (Politburo of the Central Committee of CPSU)

> fond 4 *Sekretariat TsK KPSS 1952-1990* (Secretariat of the Central Committee of CPSU)

> fond 5 *Apparat TsK KPSS 1949-1991* (Apparatus of the Central Committee of CPSU)

Tsentral'nyi Arkhiv Obshchestvennykh Dvizhenii g. Moskvy (Central Archive of Social Movements in the City of Moscow, TsAODM)

fond P-4 *Moskovskii gorodskoi komitet KPSS* (Moscow city committee of CPSU)

fond P-4376 *Partorganizatsiia Universiteta Druzhby Narodov imeni Patrisa Lumumby, Brezhnevskii raion g. Moskvy 1960-1983* (Party Organization of Patrice Lumumba Peoples' Friendship University)

fond P-4447 *Komitet VLKSM Universiteta Druzhby Narodov imeni Patrisa Lumumby, Brezhnevskii raion g. Moskvy 1961-1991* (Komsomol Committee of Patrice Lumumba Peoples' Friendship University)

Tsentral'nyi Munitsipal'nyi Arkhiv Moskvy (Central Municipal Archive of Moscow, TsMAM)

fond P-3061 *Universitet Druzhby Narodov ministerstva vyshego i srednego spetsial'nogo obrazovaniia SSSR (1960-1961)/ Universitet Druzhby Narodov imeni Patrisa Lumumby ministerstva vyshego i srednego spetsial'nogo obrazovaniia SSSR Peoples' Friendship University(1961-)* (Patrice Lumumba Peoples' Friendship University)

Newspapers

Daily Express

Druzhba

Komsomol'skaia pravda

Ogonek

Pravda

Sovetskie Profsoiuzi

The New York Times

Brochures

Moscow Friendship University [in English] (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov, ca. 1975)

Peoples' Friendship University [in four languages] (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970)

Universitet Druzhby Narodov imeni Patrisa Lumumby (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov, 1962)

Bibliography

Ajala, Olabisi. *An African Abroad*. London: Jarrolds, 1963.

Aksiutin, Iuri. *Khrushchevskaia "ottepel'" i obshchestvennye nastroeniia v SSSR v 1953-1964 gg.* Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2010.

Alexander, Jocelyn, and JoAnn McGregor. "African Soldiers in the USSR: Oral Histories of ZAPU Intelligence Cadres' Soviet Training, 1965-1979." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 43, no.1 (2017): 49-66.

Amar, Andrew Richard. *A Student in Moscow.* London: Ampersand, 1961.

Anti-Taylor, William. *Moscow Diary.* London: Robert Hale, 1967.

Applebaum, Rachel. "A Test of Friendship: Soviet-Czechoslovak Tourism and the Prague Spring." In *Socialist Sixties. Crossing Borders in the Second World*, edited by Anne Gorsuch and Diane Koenker, 213-234. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Applebaum, Rachel. *Empire of Friends: Soviet Power and Socialist Internationalism in Cold War Czechoslovakia.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019.

Babiracki, Patryk. "Enemy to Friend: Soviet Union, Poland, and Refashioning of the Imperial Identity in *Pravda*, 1943-47." In *Bridging Disciplines, Spanning the World: Inequality, Identity, and Institutions*, edited by Rachel Beatty Riedl, Sada Aksatova and Kristine Mitchell, 132-154. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Babiracki, Patryk. "Imperial Heresies: Polish Students in the Soviet Union, 1948-1957." *Ab Imperio* no.4 (2007): 199-236.

Babiracki, Patryk. "Interfacing the Soviet Bloc: Recent Literature and New Paradigms." *Ab Imperio*, No. 4 (2011): 376–407.

Bittner, Stephen. *The Many Lives of Khrushchev's Thaw. Experience and Memory in Moscow's Arbat.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.

Blitstein, Peter A. "Nation-Building or Russification? Obligatory Russian Instruction in the Soviet non-Russian School, 1938-1953." In *A State of Nations: The Soviet State and Its Peoples in the Age of Lenin and Stalin*, edited by Ronald G. Suny and Terry D. Martin, 253-274. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Blitstein, Peter A. "Cultural Diversity and the Interwar Conjuncture: Soviet Nationality Policy in its Comparative Context." *Slavic Review* 65, no. 2 (2006): 273-293.

Blitstein, Peter A. "Nation and Empire in Soviet History, 1917-1953." *Ab Imperio* no. 1 (2006): 197-219.

Blum, Françoise, and Constantin Katsakioris. "Léopold Sédar Senghor et l'Union soviétique: la confrontation, 1957-1966." *Cahiers d'études africaines* 235, no. 3 (2019): 839-865.

Boden, Ragna. "Cold War Economics: Soviet Aid to Indonesia." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 10, no. 3 (2008): 110–128.

Boltovska, Svetlana. "Dreams and Everyday Life of African Students in the Country of Victorious Socialism: Education for Sub-Saharan Africans in the Soviet Union." In *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, edited by Ingrid Miethe & Jane Weiss, 229-252. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020.

Boltovskaja, Svetlana. *Bildungsmigranten aus dem subsaharischen Afrika in Moskau und St. Petersburg: Selbst- und Fremdbilder.* Herbolzheim: Centaurus, 2014.

Brands, Hal. *Latin America's Cold War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Brooks, Jeffrey. *Thank You, Comrade Stalin!: Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Burton, Eric. "African Manpower Development during the Global Cold War: The Case of Tanzanian Students in the two German States." In *Africa Research in Austria: Approaches and Perspectives*, edited by Andreas Exenberger and Ulrich Pallua, 101-134. Innsbruck: Innsbruck University Press, 2016.

Burton, Eric. "Navigating global socialism: Tanzanian students in and beyond East Germany." *Cold War History* 19, no.1 (2019): 63-83.

Buzássyová, Barbora. "Repositioning of Czechoslovak Educational Strategies to the 'Least Developed Countries': The Rise and Decline of University of 17th November." In *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, edited by Ingrid Miethe & Jane Weiss, 183-204. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020.

Carew, Jan. *Moscow is not my Mecca.* London: Secker&Warburg, 1964.

Chatterjee, Partha. *The Nation and its Fragments: Colonial and Post-Colonial Histories.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Connelly, John. "Polish Universities and State Socialism, 1944-1968." In *Universities under Dictatorship*, edited by John Connelly and Michael Gruttner, 181-208. University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005.

Connelly, John. "The Sovietization of Higher Education in the Czech Lands, East Germany, and Poland during the Stalinist Period 1948-1954." In *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe,* edited by Michael David-Fox and György Péteri, 141-178. Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000.

Connelly, Matthew J. "Taking off the Cold War Lens: Visions of North–South Conflict during the Algerian War of Independence.*" American Historical Review* 105, no. 3 (2000): 739–69.

Coumel, Laurent. "The Scientist, the Pedagogue and the Party Official. Interest Groups, Public Opinion and Decision-Making in the 1958 Education Reform." In *Soviet State and Society Under Nikita Khrushchev*, edited by Melanie Ilic and Jeremy Smith, 66-85. London: Routledge, 2009.

Cull, Nicholas J. "Public Diplomacy: Taxonomies and Histories." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616 (2008): 31–54.

Cullather, Nick. *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2010.

David-Fox, Michael. *Revolution of the Mind: Higher Learning among the Bolsheviks 1918-1929*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

David-Fox, Michael and György Péteri. "On the Origins and Demise of the Communist Academic Regime." In *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe,* edited by Michael David-Fox and György Péteri, 3-38. Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000.

David-Fox, Michael. "The Assaults on the Universities and the Dynamics of Stalin's 'Great Break', 1928-1932." In *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe,* edited by Michael David-Fox and György Péteri, 73-104. Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000.

David-Fox, Michael. "Russian Universities Across the 1917 Divide." In *Universities under Dictatorship*, edited by John Connelly and Michael Gruttner, 11-40. University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005.

David-Fox, Michael. "The Implications of Transnationalism." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12, no. 4 (2011): 885-904.

David-Fox, Michael. *Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2015.

DeBlasio, Donna, ed. *Catching Stories: A Practical Guide to Oral History*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2009.

de Wit, Hans. *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe. A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2002.

Djagalov, Rossen, and Masha Salazkina. "Tashkent '68: A Cinematic Contact Zone." *Slavic Review* 75, no. 2 (2016): 279-298.

Djagalov, Rossen. "The Afro-Asian Writers' Association and Soviet Engagement with Africa." *Black Perspectives* 2 (2017), https://www.aaihs.org/the-afro-asian-writers-association-and-soviet-engagement-with-africa/, accessed 8.7.2021.

Djagalov, Rossen. *From Internationalism to Postcolonialism: Literature and Cinema between the Second and Third Worlds*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2020.

Drachewych, Oleksa, and Ian McKay. "Introduction: Left Transnationalism? The Communist International, the National, Colonial, and Racial Questions, and the

Strengths and Limitations of the 'Moscow Rules' Paradigm." In *Left Transnationalism: The Communist International and the National, Colonial, and Racial Questions*, edited by Oleksa Drachewych and Ian McKay, 3-45. Montreal: McGill University Press, 2019.

 Dvořáček, Jan, Linda Piknerová and Jan Zahořik. *A History of Czechoslovak Involvement in Africa: Studies from the Colonial Era through the Soviet Eras.* Lewiston: Mellen Press, 2014.

Ekbladh, David. *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Engerman, David C., Nils Hilman, Mark Haefele, and Michael E. Latham, eds. *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.

Engerman, David C. "Ideology and the origins of the Cold War, 1917–1962." In *The Cambridge History of the Cold War, vol. 1*, edited by Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, 20-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Engerman, David C. "Second World's Third World." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 12, no.1 (2011): 183-211.

Engerman, David C. "Learning from the East: Soviet Experts and India in the Era of Competitive Coexistence." *Comparative Studies in South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 227-238.

Engerman, David C. *The Price of Aid: The Economic Cold War in India.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. *Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union 1921-1934*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. "Introduction." In *Stalinism: New Directions*, edited by Sheila Fitzpatrick, 1-15. London: Routledge, 2000.

Friedman, Jeremy. "Soviet Policy in the Developing World and the Chinese Challenge in the 1960s*." Cold War History* 10, no. 2 (2010): 247–272.

Friedman, Jeremy. *Shadow Cold War: The Sino-Soviet Competition for the Third World.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Frolov, V.A., A.D. Gladush, V.M. Savin, D.P. Bilibin, and L.S. Rumiantseva. *Ocherki po istorii Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov.* Moscow: RUDN, 2009.

Fürst, Juliane. "The Arrival of Spring? Changes and Continuities in Soviet Youth Culture and Policy between Stalin and Khrushchev." In *The Dilemmas of De-Stalinization: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era*, edited by Polly Jones, 135-153. London: Routledge, 2006.

Fürst, Juliane. *Stalin's Last Generation: Soviet Post-War Youth and the Emergence of Mature Socialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Fürst, Juliane. *Flowers through Concrete: Explorations in Soviet Hippieland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Gienow-Hecht, Jessica C. E. "What Are We Searching for? Culture, Diplomacy, Agent, and the State." In *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, edited by Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and M. C. Donfried, 3-12. New York: Berghahn, 2010.

Gienow-Hecht, Jessica C. E. "The Model of Cultural Diplomacy: Power, Distance and the Promise of Civil Society." In *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, edited by Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and M. C. Donfried, 13-30. New York: Berghahn, 2010.

Gilburd, Eleonory. "The Revival of Soviet Internationalism in the Mid to Late 1950s." In *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960s*, edited by Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd, 362-401. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu, Irina Macovei, Adrian Netedu, and Carmen Olaru. "Les étudiants africains en Roumanie (1970-1990): De l'internationalisme militant à la commercialisation des études." *Revista de psihologie sociala* 2, no. 34 (2014): 117-128.

Gilman, Nils. *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.

Ginelli, Zoltán. "Hungarian Experts in Nkrumah's Ghana: Decolonisation and Semipheriperial Postcoloniality in Socialist Hungary." *Mezosfera* 5 (2018), http://mezosfera.org/hungarian-experts-in-nkrumahs-ghana/, accessed 6.7.2021.

Gorsuch, Anne E. *Youth in Revolutionary Russia: Enthusiasts, Bohemians, Delinquents.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Gorsuch, Anne E., and Diane P. Koenker, eds. *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Gorsuch, Anne E. *All This is Your World: Soviet Tourism at Home and Abroad after Stalin.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Gorsuch, Anne E., and Diane P. Koenker, eds. *Socialist Sixties: Crossing Borders in the Second World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Gould-Davies, Nigel. "The Logic of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy." *Diplomatic History* 27, no.2 (2003): 193-214.

Gruttner, Michael. "Concluding Reflections: Universities and Dictatorships." In *Universities under Dictatorship*, edited by John Connelly and Michael Gruttner, 269-271. University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005.

Hasegawa, Tsuyoshi ed. *The Cold War in East Asia, 1945–1991.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Havranek, Jan. "Czech Universities under Communism." In *Universities under Dictatorship*, edited by John Connelly and Michael Gruttner, 163-180. University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005.

Haywood, Harry. *Black Bolshevik: Autobiography of an Afro-American Communist.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978.

Hessler, Julie. "Death of an African student in Moscow: Race, Politics, and the Cold War." *Cahiers du Monde Russe* 47, no. 1-2 (2006): 33-63.

Hirsch, Francine. *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1991*. London: Abacus, 1995.

Hodgkinson, Dan, and Luke Melchiorre. "Introduction: Student Activism in an Era of Decolonization." *Africa* 89, no. S1 (2019): S1-S14.

Hornsby, Robert. *Protest, Reform and Repression in Khrushchev's Soviet Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Hughes, Langston. *I Wonder as I Wander: An Autobiographical Journey*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1993.

Iandolo, Alessandro. "The rise and fall of the 'Soviet Model of Development' in West Africa, 1957–64." *Cold War History* 12, no. 4 (2012): 683–704.

Ilic, Melanie. *Life Stories of Soviet Women. The Interwar Generation*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Jersild, Austin. *The Sino-Soviet Alliance: An International History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Jessen, Ralph. "Between Control and Collaboration: The University in East Germany." In *Universities under Dictatorship*, edited by John Connelly and Michael Gruttner, 241-278. University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005.

Jian, Chen. "China, the Third World, and the Cold War." In *The Cold War in the Third World*, edited by Robert J. McMahon, 85-100. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Johnston, Gordon. "Revisiting the Cultural Cold War." *Social History* 35, No. 3 (2010): 290–307.

Joseph, G.M., and Daniela Spenser. *In from the Cold: Latin America's New Encounter with the Cold War*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

Josephson, Paul. "Stalinism and Science: Physics and Philosophical Disputes in the USSR, 1930-1955." In *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe,* edited by

Michael David-Fox and György Péteri, 105-140. Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000.

Kalinovsky, Artemy M., and Sergey Radchenko, eds. *The End of the Cold War and the Third World: New Perspectives on Regional Conflict.* London-New York: Routledge, 2011.

Kalinovsky, Artemy. "Not Some British Colony in Africa: The Politics of Decolonization and Modernization in Soviet Central Asia, 1955–1964." *Ab Imperio* no. 2 (2013): 191–222.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "L'union soviétique et les intellectuels africains: Internationalisme, panafricanisme et négritude pendant les années de décolonisation, 1954-1964." *Cahiers du monde russe* 47, no. 1-2 (2006): 15-32.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "Transferts Est-Sud. Échanges éducatifs et formation de cadres africains en Union soviétique pendant les années soixante." *Outre-mers* 94, no. 354-355 (2007): 80-103.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "Afrikanskie studenty v SSSR. Utcheba i politika vo vremia dekolonizatsii." *Ezhegodnik sotsial'noi istorii* (2008): 209-228.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "Soviet Lessons for Arab Modernization: Soviet Educational Aid to Arab Countries after 1956." *Journal of Modern European History* 8, no. 1 (2010): 85-105.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "The Soviet-South Encounter. Tensions in the Friendship with Afro-Asian Partners, 1945-1965." In *Cold War Crossings. International Travel and Exchange across the Soviet Bloc, 1940s-1960s*, edited by Patryk Babiracki and Kenyon Zimmer, 134-165. Arlington: Texas A&M University Press, 2014.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "Les étudiants des pays arabes formés en Union soviétique pendant la Guerre froid (1956-1991)." *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* 32, no. 2 (2016): 13-38.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "Burden or allies?: Third world students and internationalist duty through Soviet eyes." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 18, no. 3 (2017): 539-567.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "Creating a Socialist Intelligentsia: Soviet Educational Aid and Its Impact on Africa, 1960-1991." *Cahiers d'études africaines* 226, no.2 (2017): 259-286.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "Une superpuissance éducative: l'Union soviétique et la formation des élites du tiersmonde (1956-1991)." *Traverse: Zeitschrift für Geschichte = Revue d'histoire,* no.1 (2018): 108-121.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "The Lumumba University in Moscow: Higher education for a Soviet-Third World alliance, 1960-91." *Journal of Global History* 14, no.2 (2019): 281-300.

Katsakioris, Constantin. "Students from Portuguese Africa in the Soviet Union, 1960-1974: Anti-colonialism, Education, and the Socialist Alliance." *Journal of Contemporary History* (2020): 1-24.

Kirasirova, Masha. "'Sons of Muslims' in Moscow: Soviet Central Asian Mediators to the Foreign East, 1955-1962." *Ab Imperio* no. 4 (2011): 106-132.

Kirasirova, Masha. "The 'East' as a Category of Bolshevik Ideology and Comintern Administration: The Arab Section of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 18, no.1 (2017): 7-34.

Kirillova, Liana. "International Construction Brigades: Building the International Soviet man in the 1960s USSR." Conference paper presented in ASEEES convention 2018, Boston.

Koenker, Diane P. "Travel to Work, Travel to Play: On Russian Tourism, Travel, and Leisure." *Slavic Review* 62, no. 4 (2003): 657–665.

Koenker, Diane P. "Whose Right to Rest? Contesting the Family Vacation in the Postwar Soviet Union." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 2 (2009): 401-425.

Koenker, Diane P. *Club Red: Vacation Travel and the Soviet Dream.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.

Koivunen, Pia. "The 1957 Moscow Youth Festival. Propagating a New, Peaceful Image of the Soviet Union." In *Soviet State and Society Under Nikita Khrushchev*, edited by Melanie Ilic & Jeremy Smith, 46-65. London: Routledge, 2009.

Koivunen, Pia. *Performing Peace and Friendship: The World Youth Festival as a Tool of Soviet Cultural Diplomacy, 1947-1957.* PhD dissertation, University of Tampere, 2013.

Koivunen, Pia. *Rauhanuskovaiset.* Helsinki: SKS, 2020.

Koivunen, Pia, and Simo Mikkonen. "Kulttuuridiplomatian näkökulma kylmään sotaan." *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 120, no. 2 (2022): 133-140.

Kotkin, Stephen. *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization.* Oakland: University of California Press, 1995.

Kozlov, Denis. "Writing about the Thaw in Post-Soviet Russia.*" Russian Studies in History* 49, no. 4 (2011): 3–17.

Kozlov, Denis, and Eleonory Gilburd. "Thaw as an Event in Russian History." In *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960*, edited by Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd, 18-84. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Krechetnikov, Artiom. "Simbol druzhby ili 'ruka Moskvy'?" *BBC Moskva* 27.1.2010. https://www.bbc.com/russian/russia/2010/02/100127_russia_rudn_history, accessed 8.7.2021.

Krementsov, Nikolai. "Lysenkoism in Europe: Export-Import of the Soviet Model." In *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe,* edited by Michael David-Fox & György Péteri, 179-202. Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000.

Kret, Abigail Judge. "We Unite with Knowledge: The Peoples' Friendship University and Soviet Education for the Third World." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 239-256.

Kuznick, Peter, and James Gilbert, eds. *Rethinking Cold War Culture*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001.

LaPierre, Brian. *Hooligans in Khrushchev's Russia: Defining, Policing, and Producing Deviance during the Thaw*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2012.

Latham, Michael E. *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.

Loyd, Thom. "Dupes and Defectors: African Students as Cold War Propagandists." Presentation at University of Texas at Austin symposium "African-Soviet Encounters: New Histories of Russian Racism and Anti-Racism" 3.2.2021.

Luthi, Lorenz M. *The Sino-Soviet Split: Cold War in the Communist World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Magnúsdóttir, Rósa. "Mission Impossible? Selling Soviet Socialism to Americans, 1955–58." In *Searching for a Cultural Diplomacy*, edited by Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and M. C. Donfried, 50-72. New York: Berghahn, 2010.

Major, Patrick, and Rana Mitter. "East is East and West is West? Towards a Comparative Socio-Cultural History of the Cold War." In *Across the Blocs: Cold War Cultural and Social History*, edited by Rana Mitter and Patrick Major, 1-22. London: Frank Cass, 2004.

Mäkinen, Sirke. "In Search of the Status of an Educational Great Power? Analysis of Russia's Educational Diplomacy Discourse." *Problems of Post-Communism* 63, no.3 (2016): 183-196.

Mark, James, and Péter Apor. "Socialism Goes Global: Decolonization and the Making of a New Culture of Internationalism in Socialist Hungary, 1956–1989." *The Journal of Modern History* 87, no. 4 (2015): 852-891.

Mark, James, Péter Apor, Radina Vučetić, and Piotr Osęka. "'We Are with You, Vietnam': Transnational Solidarities in Socialist Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia." *Journal of Contemporary History* 50, no. 3 (2015): 439-464.

Mark, James, Artemy M. Kalinovsky, and Steffi Marung, eds. *Alternative globalizations: Eastern Europe and the Postcolonial World.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2020.

Marks, Steven G. *How Russia Shaped the Modern World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Martin, Terry. *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.

Marwick, Arthur. *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britain, France, Italy and the United States, c. 1958–c. 1974.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Matusevich, Maxim. "An Exotic Subversive: Africa, Africans and the Soviet Everyday." *Race&Class* 49, no.4 (2008): 57-81.

Matusevich, Maxim. "Journeys of Hope: African Diaspora and the Soviet Society." *African Diaspora* 1, no. 1-2 (2008): 53-85.

Matusevich, Maxim. "Black in the USSR: Africans, African Americans, and the Soviet society." *Transition* no. 100 (2009): 56-75.

Matusevich, Maxim. "Probing the Limits of Internationalism: African Students Confront Soviet Ritual." *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 27, no.2 (2009): 19-39.

Matusevich, Maxim. "Revisiting the Soviet Moment in Sub-Saharan Africa." *History Compass* 7 no. 5 (2009): 1259-1268.

Matusevich, Maxim. "Expanding the Boundaries of the Black Atlantic: African Students as Soviet Moderns." *Ab Imperio* no. 2 (2012): 325-350.

Mazov, Sergey. *A Distant Front in the Cold War: The USSR in West Africa and the Congo, 1956–1964.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

McClellan, Woodford. "Africans and Black Americans in Comintern Schools, 1925-1934." *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26, no.2 (1993): 371-390.

McClellan, Woodford. "Black Hajj to Red Mecca: Africans and Afro-Americans at KUTV, 1925-1938." In *Africa in Russia, Russia in Africa: Three Centuries of Encounters,* edited by Maxim Matusevich, 61-84. Trenton: Africa World Press, 2007.

McKay, Claude. *A Long Way from Home.* Boston: Mariner Books, 1970.

McMahon, Robert J., ed. *The Cold War in the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

McVety, Amanda Kay. *Enlightened Aid: U.S. Development as Foreign Aid Policy in Ethiopia.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Medvedev, Dmitrii. "Rossotrudnichestvo—sil'nyi, effektivnyi, gibkii instrument vneshnei politiki." https://interaffairs.ru/news/show/8738 accessed January 20, 2020.

Melissen, Jan, ed. *The New Public Diplomacy: Soft Power in International Relations.* New York: Palgrave McMillan, 2005.

Miethe, Ingrid and Jane Weiss. "Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South." In *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South,* edited by Ingrid Miethe and Jane Weiss, 7-28. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020.

Mikkonen, Simo. "To control the world's information flows: Soviet Cold War broadcasting." In *Airy Curtains in the European Ether: Broadcasting and the Cold War,* edited by Alexander Badenoch, Andreas Fickers, and Christian Henrich-Franke, 241-269. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2013.

Mikkonen, Simo, and Pia Koivunen, eds. *Beyond the Divide: Entangled Histories of Cold War Europe*. New York: Berghahn, 2015.

Mikkonen, Simo, Giles Scott-Smith, and Jari Parkkinen, eds. *Entangled East and West: Cultural Diplomacy and Artistic Interaction During the Cold War.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2018.

Muehlenbeck, Philip. *Czechoslovakia in Africa, 1945–1968.* Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2016.

Muehlenbeck, Philip, and Natalia Telepneva, eds. *Warsaw Pact Intervention in the Third World: Aid and Influence in the Cold War.* London: I.B. Tauris, 2018.

Murguia, Dayana. "Socialist Education and International Cooperation: An Introduction to the School Program on the Isla de la Juventud in Cuba." In *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, edited by Ingrid Miethe & Jane Weiss, 111-132. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020.

Nikitin, V.N. *Universitet Druzhby: Kratkii ocherk poluvekovoi istorii.* Moscow: RUDN, 2010.

Nye, Joseph S. *Soft Power. The Means to Success in World Politics.* New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

Onslow, Sue, ed. *Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Péteri, György. "Science Between Two Worlds: Foreign 'Models' and Hungary's Academia, 1945-1949." In *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe,* edited by Michael David-Fox and György Péteri, 203-224. Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000.

Péteri, György. "The Communist Idea of the University: An Essay Inspired by the Hungarian Experience." In *Universities under Dictatorship*, edited by John Connelly and Michael Gruttner, 161-187. University Park: Penn State University Press, 2005.

Péteri, György. "The Occident Within - or the Drive for Exceptionalism and Modernity." *Kritika*: *Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 9, no. 4 (2008): 929-937.

Péteri, György, ed. *Imagining the West in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union*. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 2010.

Phillou, Christine. "Introduction: USSR South: Postcolonial Worlds in the Soviet Imaginary." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa, and the Middle East* 33, no. 2 (2013): 197–200.

Pieper Mooney, Jadwiga E., and Fabio Lanza, eds. *De-centering Cold War History: Local and Global Change*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Pilkington, Hilary. *Russia's Youth and Its Culture: A Nation's Constructors and Constructed*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Pohl, Michaela. "From White Grave to Tselinograd to Astana: The Virgin Lands Opening, Khrushchev's Forgotten First Reform." In *The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960,* edited by Denis Kozlov and Eleonory Gilburd, 269-307. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013.

Prashad, Vijay. *The Darker Nations. A People's History of the Third World.* New York: The New Press, 2008.

Prasolov V., and V. Zolototrubov. "Ob ideologicheskoi diversii protiv SSSR na kanale mezhdunarodnogo studencheskogo obmena." *Sbornik statei ob agenturno-operativnoi i sledstvennoi rabote komiteta gosudarstvennoi besopasnosti SSSR* no. 93 (1982): 39-43.

Professora, doktora nauk i vidnye uchenie Rossiiskogo Universiteta Druzhby Narodov: Biograficheskii slovar. Moscow: RUDN, 2010.

Pugach, Sara. "African Students and the Politics of Race and Gender in the German Democratic Republic." In *Comrades of Color: East Germany in the Cold War World*, edited by Quinn Slobodan, 131-156. New York: Berghahn, 2015.

Pugach, Sara. "Eleven Nigerian Students in Cold War East Germany: Visions of Science, Modernity, and Decolonization." *Journal of Contemporary History* 54, no. 3 (2019): 551–572.

Pugach, Sara. "Agents of Dissent: African Student Organizations in the German Democratic Republic." *Africa* 89, no. S1 (2019), S90-S108.

Radchenko, Sergey. *Two Suns in the Heavens: The Sino-Soviet Struggle for Supremacy, 1962–1967.* Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2009.

Rakove, Robert B. *Kennedy, Johnson, and the Nonaligned World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Raleigh, Donald J. *Russia's Sputnik Generation: Soviet Baby Boomers Talk about Their Lives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Raleigh, Donald J. *Soviet Baby Boomers. An Oral History of Russia's Cold War Generation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Reid, Susan E. "Who Will Beat Whom? Soviet Popular Reception of the American National Exhibition in Moscow, 1959." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 9, no. 4 (2008): 855–904.

Ritchie, Donald A. *Doing Oral History: A Practical Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Richmond, Yale. *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain.* Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003.

Risch, William J. "Soviet 'Flower Children': Hippies and the Youth-Counter-culture in 1970s L'viv.*" Journal of Contemporary History* 40, no. 3 (2005): 565–584.

Robinson, Robert. *Black on Red: My 44 Years Inside the Soviet Union.* Washington DC: Acropolis Books, 1988.

Romero, Federico. "Cold War Historiography at the Crossroads." *Cold War History* 14, no.4 (2014): 685-703.

Roschin, Evgeny. "Friendship of the Enemies: Twentieth Century Treaties of the United Kingdom and the USSR." *International Politics* 48, no. 1 (2011): 71-91.

Rosen, Seymor M. *The Development of People's Friendship University*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973.

Roth-Ey, Kristin. *Moscow Prime Time: How the Soviet Union Built the Media Empire that Lost the Cultural Cold War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Rubinstein, Alvin. "Lumumba University: An Assessment." *Problems of Communism* 64 no. 20 (1971): 64-69.

RUDN: 2016 – the year that has changed the university brochure. Moscow: RUDN, 2016.

Rupprecht, Tobias. "Gestrandetes Flaggschiff. Die Moskauer Universität der Völkerfreundschaft." *Osteuropa* no.1 (2010): 95-114.

Rupprecht, Tobias. "Die Sowjetunion und die Welt im Kalten Krieg: Neue Forschungsperspektiven auf eine vermeintlich hermetisch abgeschlossene Gesellschaft." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 3 (2010): 381–399.

Rupprecht, Tobias. *Soviet Internationalism After Stalin. Interaction and Exchange between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Rutter, Nick. "Look Left, Drive Right: Internationalism at the 1968 World Youth Festival." In *Socialist Sixties. Crossing Borders in the Second World*, edited by Anne Gorsuch and Diane Koenker, 193-212. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Rutter, Nick. "The Western Wall. The Iron Curtain Recast in Midsummer 1951." In *Cold War Crossings. International Travel and Exchange across the Soviet Bloc, 1940s-1960s*, edited by Patryk Babiracki and Kenyon Zimmer, 78-106. Arlington: Texas A&M University Press, 2014.

Sahadeo, Jeff. "Soviet 'Blacks' and Place Making in Leningrad and Moscow." *Slavic Review* 71 no. 2 (2012): 331-358.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.

Savin, V.M. *Universitet Druzhby Narodov i Vsemirnoe Festivalnoe Dvizhenie Molodezhi i Studentov.* Moskva: RUDN, 2013.

Shen, Zhihua, and Danhui Li. *After Leaning to One Side: China and Its Allies in the Cold War*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Simpson, Bradley R. *Economists with Guns: Authoritarian Development and U.S.–Indonesian Relations, 1960–1968.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008.

Slobodian, Quinn. "What Does Democracy Look like (and Why Would Anyone Want to Buy It?): Third World Demands and West German Responses at the 1960s World Youth Festivals." In *Cold War Cultures. Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies*, edited by Anette Vowinkel, Marcus M. Payk and Thomas Lindenberger, 254-275. New York: Berghahn Books, 2012.

Slobodan, Quinn, ed. *Comrades of Colour: East Germany in the Cold War World*. New York: Berghahn, 2015.

Smirnov, Konstantin. "Delo Shakala: Poltora goda himii." *Kommersant Vlast* 23.12.1997, https://www.kommersant.ru/doc/14005, accessed 8.7.2021.

Smith, Homer. *Black Man in Red Russia: A Memoir.* Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 1964.

Smith, Jeremy and Melanie Ilic, eds. *Khrushchev in the Kremlin. Policy and Government in the Soviet Union, 1953–1964*. London: Routledge, 2011.

Smith, Steve. "Two Cheers for the 'Return of Ideology." *Revolutionary Russia* 17, no. 2 (2004): 119–135.

Smith, Steve. "The Russian Revolution, National Self-Determination, and Anti-Imperialism, 1919-1927." In *Left Transnationalism: The Communist International and*

the National, Colonial, and Racial Questions, edited by Oleksa Drachewych and Ian McKay, 73-98. Montreal: McGill University Press, 2019.

Speich, Daniel. "The Kenyan Style of 'African Socialism': Developmental Knowledge Claims and the Explanatory Limits of the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* 33, no. 3 (2009): 449–65.

Stoler, Ann Laura. "On the Uses and Abuses of the Past in Indonesia: Beyond the Mass Killings of 1965." *Asian Survey* 42, no. 4 (2002): 642-650.

Stronski, Paul. *Tashkent: Forging a Soviet City, 1930–1966*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.

Studer, Brigitte. *The Transnational World of the Cominternians*. London: Palgrave McMillan, 2015.

Suny, Ronald Grigor. "On Ideology, Subjectivity, and Modernity: Thoughts on Doing Soviet History." *Russian History/Histoire russe* 34, no. 1–4 (2007): 1-5.

Thom, Francoise. *La Langue de Bois*. Paris: Juilliard, 1987.

Tolz, Vera. "The Formation of the Soviet Academy of Sciences: Bolsheviks and Academicians in the 1920s and 1930s." In *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe,* edited by Michael David-Fox and György Péteri, 39-72. Santa Barbara: Praeger Publishing, 2000.

Trentin, Massimiliano. "Modernization as State-Building: The Two Germanies in Syria, 1962–1972." *Diplomatic History* 33, no. 3 (2009): 487–505.

Tromly, Benjamin. *Making the Soviet Intelligentsia: Universities and Intellectual Life under Stalin and Khrushchev.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Tromly, Benjamin. "Brother or Other? East European Students in Soviet Higher Education Establishments, 1948-1956." *European History Quarterly* 44, no.1 (2014): 80-102.

Tsvetkova, Natalia. "International Education During the Cold War: Soviet Social Transformation and American Social Reproduction." *Comparative Education Review* 52, no. 2 (2008): 199-217.

Unfried, Berthold. "Education as a Paradigm and as a Part of Institutionalized 'International Solidarity' of the German Democratic Republic." In *Socialist Educational Cooperation and the Global South*, edited by Ingrid Miethe and Jane Weiss, 69-90. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2020.

Varga-Harris, Christine. "Between National Tradition and Western Modernizations: Soviet Woman and Representations of Socialist Gender Equality as a 'Third Way' for Developing Countries, 1956-1964." *Slavic Review* 78, no. 3 (2019): 758-781.

"Voices from Russia's Cold War 'friendship' university." *BBC*, 6.2.2010. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/8498904.stm, accessed 8.7.2021.

Vowinckel, Annette, Marcus M. Payk and Thomas Lindenberg, eds. *Cold War Cultures. Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2012.

Vu, Tuong and Wasana Wongsurawat, eds. *Dynamics of the Cold War in Asia: Ideology, Identity, and Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Ward, Christopher J. *Brezhnev's Folly: The Building of BAM and the Late Soviet Socialism*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009.

Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Whitney, Craig R. "Lumumba U: Is it a Soviet Tool?" *The New York Times* 6.1.1980

Wright, Peter Q. "Between Market and Solidarity: Development Aid and the Political Economy of International Higher Education in Socialist Yugoslavia." *Nationalities Papers* (2020): 1-21.

Xie, Kankan. "Various Forms of Chineseness in the Origins of South East Asian Communism." In *Left Transnationalism: The Communist International and the National, Colonial, and Racial Questions*, edited by Oleksa Drachewych and Ian McKay, 286-314. Montreal: McGill University Press, 2019.

XX s''ezd Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza. Stenograficheskii otchet: Tom 1, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Politicheskoi Literatury, 1956.

XXII s''ezd Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza. Stenograficheskii otchet: Tom 3, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Politicheskoi Literatury, 1962.

Yurchak, Alexei. *Everything Was Forever until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Zhuk, Sergei. *Rock and Roll in the Rocket City: The West, Identity, and Ideology in Soviet Dniepropetrovsk, 1960–1985*. Washington DC.: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2010.

Zubok, Vladislav. *Zhivago's Children: The Last Russian Intelligentsia.* Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Appendix 1: Interview questionnaire in English, Russian and Spanish, with consent and release forms

Consent form

This interview is connected my PhD research project on Peoples' Friendship University as a case of Soviet cooperation with the developing world. The recordings will be used for scholarly purposes as determined by the project. The information may be published as part of my dissertation or other publications written by me. The information collected will be used anonymously (only mentioning your nationality). The interview recording and the transcripts will be stored in a secure way and will not be shared with third parties. Your approval indicates that the purposes of the project and the use of the recordings have been explained to you and that you have agreed to be interviewed. You may discontinue participation in the interview at any time without penalty.

From which country did you arrive to Moscow (what is your nationality)?

Which years did you spend in Moscow? How old were you when you arrived?

Did you return to your country of origin after graduation, stay in the Soviet Union or go to another country?

Arrival

Why did you decide to study in the USSR? Where did the first idea come from?

Where did you get information about the opportunities to study? (media, organizations, personal contacts etc.)

What kind of ideas or expectations did you have about the USSR before arrival? Did these expectations fulfill or fail? Did you experience any kind of cultural shock upon arrival?

Studies

What did you study in the USSR? (subject, specialization) Why did you choose this topic?

What kind of difficulties (if any) did you experience in your studies? (For example, with language?) Describe your studies at the preparatory faculty and afterwards, especially the challenges you faced or any other details you feel worth mentioning.

What kind of study schedule did you have? How did you experience the workload?

Did you study any ideological subjects, such as history of the communist party or political economics? Were these subjects compulsory or optional? What did you think about these subjects? (Were they interesting to you?)

Free time

What did you do on your free time? Did you mostly spend time with Soviet people, people from your own country, or foreigners (foreign students not from your own country)?

Did you have Soviet friends? (Where these friends from the university or from outside the university?) What did you do with your Soviet friends? Where the activities you did with your Soviet vs. non-Soviet friends different?

Did you take part in the activities of the compatriot associations (zemlyachestvo)/Komsomol/Dom Druzhby (Friendship House)/the embassy of your own country or other countries/other organizations? What kinds of activities did they organize? Where these activities interesting to you? Did you participate often in organized activities, or did you spend your free time in other ways (how)? Were there any events that you had to participate in? (First of May demonstrations etc.) What did you think about such events?

How did you spend your holidays? If you took part in the activities organized by the university (building projects, work camps, holidays at Makopse, trips and excursions around the Soviet Union) describe the program and contents of these activities: what was the daily program like? Who participated? What was the students' general attitude towards these activities like: was it interesting to spend one's holidays taking part in such activities?

Housing

How many roommates did you have, from which countries, and what did you think about the conditions in the dormitory in general? Did you like living in the dormitory?

What was everyday life in the dormitory like? (Describe the friendships, parties, difficulties, or any other things you think is worth mentioning about dormitory life.)

Were there any problems, such as drinking or theft in the dormitory? Who caused these problems?

Soviet society

What kind of attitude did the Soviet students at UDN/teachers/Soviet citizens outside the university have towards the foreign students? Were these attitudes different towards different groups of students? (Latin Americans, Africans, etc.) Did you make friends outside the university, either in Moscow or elsewhere?

Describe the things you experienced in Moscow and elsewhere in the USSR: where there any surprises concerning the everyday life in the USSR? Describe how and where did you buy things, how you spent time in the city, or any other details you find interesting or important. If you traveled outside Moscow, did you experience any surprises concerning life outside the capital?

Life after the studies

What kind of attitude did your country of origin have towards Soviet higher education? Was it easy to find employment with your degree?

Were there other people with Soviet degrees at your place of employment?

Did you find employment in your own field?

Release form

This interview was part of my PhD research project on Peoples' Friendship University as a case of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the developing world. Recordings and transcripts resulting from interviews conducted for the project will be deposited by the author in a secure way. Participation in the project is entirely voluntary. I, the undersigned, have understood the above and voluntarily donate to the project full use of the information contained in the recordings made on _____ (date), transcripts of the recordings, and other materials collected during the interview. I hereby assign legal title and all literary property rights, including copyright, in these recordings and transcripts to the project, which may copyright and publish said materials. The information may be used for scholarly purposes as determined by the project.

Согласие

Это интервью связано с моим докторским проектом по исследованию сотрудничества СССР с развивающимися странами на примере Университета дружбы народов. Записи будут использоваться в научных целях, в соответствии с планом проекта. Информация может быть опубликована как часть моей диссертации или использована в других публикациях моего авторства. Собранная информация будет использоваться анонимно (с указанием только вашей национальности). Запись интервью и стенограммы будут храниться в безопасном месте и не будут переданы третьим лицам. Ваше одобрение означает, что вам объяснили цели проекта и использование записей, и что вы согласились на интервью. Вы можете прекратить участие в интервью в любое время без санкций.

Из какой страны вы приехали в Москву (Кто вы по национальности)?

Какие годы вы провели в Москве? Сколько вам было лет, когда приехали?

После окончания учебы вы вернулись на родину, остались в Советском Союзе или уехали в другую страну?

Прибытие

Почему вы решили учиться именно в СССР? Как появилась идея об учебе там?

Откуда вы получили информацию о возможностях учебы? (СМИ, разные организации, личные контакты и т.д.)

Какие ожидании вы имели о СССР перед прибытием? Оправдались ли эти ожидания? Вы почувствовали культурный шок, когда приехали?

Учеба

На кого вы учились (профессия, специализация)? Почему вы выбрали именно эту специализацию?

Были ли у вас какие-то трудности с учебой? (Например, языковые сложности?) Опишите, пожалуйста, свою учебу на подготовительном факультете и далее, по специальности, особенно трудности, с которыми вы столкнулись, а также другие подробности, которые вы считаете важными или интересными.

Какое было расписание учебы? По-вашему, была ли учебная нагрузка чрезмерной?

Учили ли вы идеологические предметы, например, историю КПСС или политэкономию? Эти предметы были обязательными или дополнительными по вашей специальности? Что вы думали об этих предметах, было ли вам интересно?

Свободное время

Чем вы занимались в свободное время? С кем вы проводили большую часть свободного времени (с людьми из СССР, со своими земляками или с иностранными студентами из других стран)?

Были ли у вас друзья из СССР? (Если да, познакомились ли вы с ними в университете или вне него?) Чем вы занимались с ними? Отличалось ли ваше времяпрепровождение с друзьями из СССР от того, как вы проводили время с иностранными друзьями из других стран?

Принимали ли вы участие в разных мероприятиях своего землячества/Комсомола/Дома Дружбы/посольства своей страны или других стран/других организации? Какие мероприятии они организовали? Было ли вам интересно принимать участие в этих мероприятиях? Часто ли вы принимали участие в организованных мероприятиях или проводили свое свободное время по-другому (как)? Были ли там мероприятия, в которых было обязательно принимать участие? (Демонстрации на Первое Мая и т.д.) Что вы думали о таких мероприятиях?

Как вы проводили свои каникулы? Если вы принимали участие в программах, организованных университетом (строительные отряды, лагери в Молдавии и Крыму, отдых в Макопсе или поездки и экскурсии по СССР), опишите их дневную программу. Кто принимал участие? Каково было отношение студентов к этим программам: интересно ли им было проводить свои каникулы таким образом?

Быт

Сколько соседей было в вашей комнате, откуда они приехали, каковы были условия жизни в общежитии? Вам понравилось жить в общежитии?

Каковы были ваши будни в общежитии? (Опишите, пожалуйста, дружбу, тусовки, проблемы и другие особенности жизни в общежитии, которые вы считаете важными или интересными.)

Сталкивались ли вы с какие-то проблемами в общежитии, например, с пьянством, воровством и т.д.? Кто был виновником этих проблем?

Советское общество

Каково было отношение к иностранным студентам у советских студентов УДН/учителей/советских граждан вне университета? Отличалось ли отношение к разным группам студентов? (Например, к африканцам, латиноамериканцам и т.д.) Вам удалось подружиться с советскими гражданами вне университета в Москве или в других частях СССР?

Опишите, пожалуйста, свой опыт жизни в Москве и в других частях СССР: было ли там что-то неожиданное? Опишите, как и где вы покупали вещи, как проводили время в городе, расскажите другие интересные или важные

подробности о вашей жизни в СССР. Если вы путешествовали вне Москвы, заметили ли вы что-то необычное в жизни вне столицы?

Жизнь после учебы

Как люди относились к советскому высшему образованию на вашей родине? Вам было легко найти работу со своем дипломом?

Были ли на вашем месте работы другие сотрудники со советскими дипломами?

Вы нашли работу по своей специальности?

Форма выпуска

Это интервью было часть моего докторского проекта по исследованию сотрудничества СССР с развивающимися странами на примере Университета дружбы народов. Записи и стенограммы интервью, проведенных для проекта, будут храниться у автора в безопасном месте. Участие в проекте полностью добровольное. Я, нижеподписавшийся, ознакомился и согласен с вышеизложенным и добровольно передаю проекту в полном объеме информацию, содержащуюся в записях, сделанных _____ (дата), в записях стенограмм и других материалах, собранных во время интервью. Настоящим я передаю законное право собственности и все права на литературную собственность, включая авторские права, на эти записи и стенограммы проекту, который может защищать авторские права и публиковать указанные материалы. Информация может быть использована в научных целях, определяющихся проектом.

Formulario de consentimiento.

Esta entrevista forma parte de mi proyecto de doctorado, que investiga sobre la Universidad de la Amistad de los Pueblos como un caso de cooperación soviética con el mundo en desarrollo. Las grabaciones se utilizarán con fines académicos según lo determine el proyecto. La información recopilada puede ser publicada como parte de mi tesis u otras publicaciones escritas por mí. Asimismo, la información se utilizará de forma anónima (solo mencionando la nacionalidad). La grabación de la entrevista y las transcripciones se almacenarán de forma segura y no se compartirán con terceros. La aprobación de este formulario indica que se han explicado los propósitos del proyecto, se ha aclarado cuál será el uso de las grabaciones y que usted ha aceptado ser entrevistado. Puede dejar de participar en la entrevista en cualquier momento sin ningún problema.

¿De qué país llegó a Moscú (cuál es su nacionalidad)?

¿Qué años pasó en Moscú? ¿Qué edad tenía cuando llegó?

Después de graduarse: ¿Regresó a su país de origen, se quedó en la Unión Soviética o se fue a otro país?

La llegada

¿Por qué decidió estudiar en la URSS? ¿Cómo surgió esa idea?

¿De dónde obtuvo información sobre las oportunidades para estudiar? (medios, organizaciones, contactos personales, etc.)

¿Qué tipo de ideas o expectativas tuvo sobre la URSS antes de su llegada? ¿Se cumplieron o no estas expectativas? ¿Experimentó algún tipo de choque cultural al llegar?

Estudios

¿Qué estudió en la URSS? (tema, especialización) ¿Por qué eligió este tema?

¿Qué tipo de dificultades (si es que las tuvo) experimentó en sus estudios? (Por ejemplo con la lengua) Describa sus estudios en la facultad de preparación y después, especialmente los desafíos que enfrentó o cualquier otro detalle que sienta que valga la pena mencionar.

¿Qué tipo de programa de estudios cursó? ¿Cómo experimentó la carga de trabajo en sus estudios?

¿Estudió alguna asignatura ideológica, como la historia del partido comunista o la economía política? ¿Fueron estas asignaturas obligatorias u opcionales? ¿Qué pensó sobre estas asignaturas? (¿Fueron interesantes?)

Tiempo libre

¿Qué hizo en su tiempo libre? ¿Pasó la mayor parte del tiempo con gente soviética, compatriotas o extranjeros (estudiantes extranjeros no compatriotas)?

¿Tuvo amigos soviéticos? (¿Eran amigos de la universidad o de fuera de ella?) ¿Qué hizo con tus amigos soviéticos? ¿Fueron diferentes las actividades que hizo con tus amigos soviéticos y no soviéticos?

¿Participó en las actividades de las organizaciones de los compatriotas (zemlyachestvo) / Komsomol / Dom Druzhby (Casa de Amistad) / la embajada de su país u otros países / otras organizaciones? ¿Qué tipo de actividades organizaron? ¿Estaba interesado/a en estas actividades? ¿Participó a menudo en actividades organizadas o pasó su tiempo libre de otras maneras (cómo)? ¿Hubo alguna actividad en la que tuvo que participar? (Manifestaciones del Primero de Mayo, etc.) ¿Qué pensaron acerca de tales actividades?

¿Cómo pasó sus vacaciones? Si participó en las actividades organizadas por la universidad (proyectos de construcción, campos de trabajo, vacaciones en Makopse, viajes y excursiones alrededor de la Unión Soviética), describa el programa y los contenidos de estas actividades: ¿cómo fue el programa diario? ¿Quién participó? ¿Cuál fue la actitud general de los estudiantes hacia estas actividades? ¿Fue interesante pasar las vacaciones participando en tales actividades?

Alojamiento

¿Cuántos compañeros de cuarto tuvo, de qué países, y qué pensó acerca de las condiciones en el dormitorio en general? ¿Le gustó vivir en el dormitorio?

¿Cómo era la vida cotidiana en el dormitorio? (Describa las amistades, fiestas, dificultades o cualquier otra cosa que crea que valga la pena mencionar sobre la vida del dormitorio).

¿Hubo algún problema, como la embriaguez o el robo en el dormitorio? ¿Quién causó estos problemas?

Sociedad soviética

¿Qué tipo de actitud tenían los estudiantes soviéticos en UDN / profesores / ciudadanos soviéticos fuera de la universidad hacia los estudiantes extranjeros? ¿Fueron estas actitudes diferentes hacia diferentes grupos de estudiantes? (Latinoamericanos, africanos, etc.) ¿Hizo amigos fuera de la universidad, ya sea en Moscú o en otros lugares?

Describa las cosas que experimentó en Moscú y en otros lugares de la URSS: ¿Hubo algunas sorpresas en la vida cotidiana en la URSS? Describa cómo y dónde compró las cosas, cómo pasó su tiempo en la ciudad o cualquier otro detalle que le parezcan\ interesante o importante. Si viajó fuera de Moscú, ¿experimentó algunas sorpresas con respecto a la vida fuera de la capital?

La vida después de los estudios.

¿Qué tipo de política tuvo su país de origen hacia la educación soviética? ¿Fue fácil encontrar empleo con su título universitario?

¿Había otras personas con títulos universitarios soviéticos en su lugar de trabajo?

¿Encontró empleo en su propio campo de especialización?

Forma de liberación

Esta entrevista fue parte de mi proyecto de doctorado, que investiga sobre la Universidad de la Amistad de los Pueblos como un caso de cooperación entre la Unión Soviética y el mundo en desarrollo. Las grabaciones y transcripciones resultantes de las entrevistas realizadas serán depositadas por el autor de forma segura. La participación en el proyecto es totalmente voluntaria. Yo, el abajo firmante, he entendido lo anterior y por tanto doy voluntariamente al proyecto el uso completo de la información contenida en las grabaciones, realizadas el _____ (fecha), transcripciones de las grabaciones y otros materiales recopilados durante la entrevista. Por la presente cedo el título legal y todos los derechos de propiedad literaria de las grabaciones y transcripciones al proyecto, que por tanto tendrá los derechos de autor y de publicación de dichos materiales. La información se puede utilizar con fines académicos según lo determine el proyecto.

Appendix 2: Statement of Objection

Statement of Objection

Student's name: Riikkamari Johanna Muhonen

Program: PhD in comparative history

Dissertation title: "Good Friends" for the Soviet Union: The Peoples' Friendship University in Soviet Educational Cooperation with the Developing World, 1960-1980

Dissertation supervisor(s): Charles Shaw, Alfred Rieber

I wish to name individual/s whose presence in the Dissertation Committee I object to: (circle the appropriate answer) NO YES

If you marked YES, please name the individual/s:

_____

_____

Justification: (Please, note that the reasons should be well-grounded.)

Date: 25.1.2022

Signature of the student:_____ _____