

UDC 316.2

*L. Kirillova***SOVIET INTERNATIONALISM: CULTURAL DIPLOMACY IN LATIN AMERICA AND PEOPLES' FRIENDSHIP UNIVERSITY**

The article analyzes the cultural aspect of Soviet-Latin American relations during the Cold War years. In particular, it focuses on the policy of Soviet "cultural diplomacy" that aimed to spread the Soviet influence in Latin America by means of multicultural interactions between the regions. In particular, the article provides examples of Soviet broadcasts, travelers' accounts about Latin America and other print media propaganda, as well as examples of various friendship societies, study programs, and cultural events such as Soviet exhibitions of science, technology, and culture and creative performances of Soviet artists. The article also examines the case study of Peoples' Friendship University (PFU) that turned into the first institutionalized educational experiment of Soviet internationalism after the World War II. Latin American students, influenced by the Soviet rhetoric of cultural diplomacy, structural antiracism, and the idea of friendship among the peoples, eagerly applied to study at PFU on advantageous terms. The article provides firsthand comments of Latin American students and concludes that Soviet propaganda machine successfully created the image of the University and the country in general as a tolerant place to study and to live. Overall, the article expands the existing historiography on the multicultural relations between the Soviet Union and Latin America in the context of the Cold War.

Keywords: Soviet internationalism, cultural diplomacy, structural antiracism, Peoples' Friendship University, the Cold War, Latin America, student exchange, Soviet propaganda.

Introduction

Few scholarly studies have focused on the cultural relations between the Soviet Union and Latin America after World War II. This lack of attention by scholars ignores the influence of the Cold War cultural politics on the exchange of the artistic and scientific knowledge between these two parts of the globe. Traditionally, historians framed their studies of Cold War Latin America in the context of its relations with the United States [1]. My research, however, will address an understudied area of multicultural relations centered on the Soviet policy of "cultural diplomacy" in Latin America and student culture at Peoples' Friendship University (PFU) between the 1960s and 1970s. Becoming the "safe haven" for students of the Global South, PFU became the first official Soviet institution that implemented politics of Soviet internationalism after World War II. This article will examine the Soviet promotion of itself as a tolerant and progressive country for Latin American audience and argue that PFU became the direct product of Soviet "cultural diplomacy."

Before the success of the Cuban Revolution in 1959, Latin America was not a region of strategic interest for the Soviet Union. Since its foundation in 1922, the Soviet Union emphasized its support for local Communist parties around the world, however, it was not particularly interested in making Latin America "red." Soviet efforts to establish economic and political relations with larger countries such as Brazil and Argentina failed mainly because political elites in those countries distrusted Soviet support for Communist parties in light of some failed Communist revolutions in the region [2]. It was only during and immediately after the Second World War that the Soviet Union focused its diplomatic and economic interests in Latin America, however, this change in policy toward Latin America was soon lost as the Cold War escalated globally [3. P. xvi]. Many scholars have also argued that "geographic fatalism," or regional proximity to the U.S., led the Soviet Union to assume that Latin America was under a firm U.S. control [4].

The triumph of Cuban Revolution reinvigorated Soviet policies toward Latin America. By acquiring its first ally in the region, the Soviet Union began to strengthen and expand its diplomatic influence with other Latin American states. During the 1960s and 1970s, the Soviet Union broadened the scope of cooperation with the democratic governments of Colombia, Venezuela, and Costa Rica as well as the military-led regimes of Bolivia and Ecuador. The USSR also expanded its diplomatic and trading relations with Argentina and Brazil, and consolidated its ties with leftist governments in Chile, Cuba, and Peru [3].

Soviet Cultural Diplomacy in Latin America

Beyond its political and economic influence, the Soviet Union also expanded its "cultural diplomacy" in the region. "Cultural diplomacy" stands for "the manipulation of cultural matters and personnel for propa-

ganda purposes” [5. P. 336]. This strategy promoted an image of the USSR as a tolerant raceless country mainly through media outlets, such as news agencies and other broadcasting networks. By 1971, the daily output of Soviet official broadcasts for Latin America reached 17 hours. These broadcasts were conducted in Russian and other regional languages such as Spanish, Portuguese, Guarani, Aymara, and Creole. In addition to the number of official output, there were additional hundreds of weekly hours disseminated through clandestine communist transmitters [5. P. 355-368; 6. P. 3-39].

Radio Moscow played a particular role in this Soviet propaganda. There were many “Friends of Radio Moscow” clubs around Latin America, and Radio Moscow conducted various contests and games among its listeners, some of whom had been even invited to Moscow by the editorial office. Numerous prominent Soviet citizens participated in the broadcasts, such as cosmonauts Yuri Gagarin, Alexei Leonov, Valentina Tereshkova, and many outstanding Soviet athletes, artists, writers, and poets [7]. Certainly, these guests raised the prestige of Radio Moscow and created a positive image of the Soviet Union. In 1972, there were three radio programs that were broadcasted daily. The first program – “Radio Moscow Reports and Comments” – included a 15-minutes news report, radio host’s commentary on international or domestic issues, and observation of important events in Latin America. In the second program – the journal about Soviet life *Sobesednik* (Interlocutor) – the radio host explained the goals of socialist building by commenting on economic, cultural, and social events in the Soviet Union. The third program of Radio Moscow – “Round the World” – pays attention to international affairs [8. P. 140-146].

The program, “Listen, Chile!” was another important platform of foreign broadcasting of Radio Moscow. Its name was very attractive to many Chileans who, after the military coup of Augusto Pinochet in 1973, lived under conditions of severe censorship [9]. Many Chileans called Radio Moscow “the first Chilean radio station” as it scored a great success. The former President of Chile Eduardo Frei, who was the second president after Pinochet years, later admitted that he himself listened to this radio station for many years and that it “became a part of our [Chilean] history” [7].

To effectively circulate the communist cause and Soviet culture in Latin America, numerous periodicals, pamphlets, brochures, and books were published in foreign languages by Soviet government to be publicly distributed abroad [5. P. 369-375; 6. P.34-37]. In 1959, the Soviet Union published over 830 book titles with a circulation of 30 million in 26 foreign languages for dissemination to non-Communist countries. These books were either circulated for free or sold at low cost, mainly in Asia, Africa, and Latin America [10. P. 1-2]. Soviet poetry, for instance, ranked among the most widely read foreign literature in Cuba [11. P. 181]. Hence, Soviet pieces of propaganda were widely available and popular.

Various friendship societies, language clubs, and cultural events were too a prominent part of Soviet cultural diplomacy. The famous 1957 Moscow Youth Festival of Youth and Students, in particular, appeared as a crucial tool of spreading a peaceful image of the Soviet Union to the world [12]. For two weeks, the festival hosted around 34,000 people from 130 countries. Its famous slogan “For Peace and Friendship!” was appealing to younger generation of Soviet and non-Soviet citizens and resonated with their desire to learn more about each other. Especially notable is the letter about the Moscow Festival of 1957 from Dr. Rafael Estrada Villa, the President of the Peoples’ Youth of Mexico Association. In his letter, he stated that “during the Festival, every song, dance, photograph, concert, film, play, etc. became a show of solidarity to the struggle for independence along colonial and semi-colonial peoples; a contribution to the cause of peace and bright future of all humanity” [13. P. 6]. This example suggests the influence of friendship festivals on the non-Communist world and successful work of Soviet propaganda machine to cast the image of the Soviet Union as an internationalist country.

Cultural trips and exchange agreements among people of different professions also became a significant source of Soviet propaganda in Latin America [14. P. 362-401]. In 1956, famous Soviet violinist Igor Bezrodny and four pianists successfully toured eight countries of South and Central America for two and a half months [15. P. 28-31; 16. P. 5]. In 1960, the Bolshoi Theater ballet company toured Cuba, Venezuela, Columbia, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Jamaica, performing forty-two shows for an estimated 140,000 spectators [17]. This same year, another ballet company from Stanislavski and Nemirovich-Danchenko Moscow Academic Music Theater successfully toured the biggest cities in Brazil. After the show, one of the Brazilian spectators said, “These artists can dance here for a whole month, but the box office will always have a sign ‘sold out!’” [18. P. 52]. In the early 1970s, Soviet conductor Ruben Vartanian held the position of the leading conductor in the National symphony orchestra of Bolivia for five years, reviving the public interest in the orchestra and bringing back its national and international prestige [19. P. 163-168]. Latin American

public was exposed to the image of the Soviet Union as a cultural country that was willing to share its artistic heritage with the outer world by going to the concerts of Soviet performers.

Soviet exhibitions of science, technology, and culture, which were displayed in Latin America, were additional sites for disseminating information about the Soviet Union. In 1960, such exhibition was opened in both Mexico City and Havana. It underscored Soviet achievements in different areas, including literature, science, arts, and military equipment [20. P. 1-40; 21. P. 25-29]. A similar exposition was opened two years later in Brazil with major sections devoted to conventional hydroelectric and steam power plants, oil and steel industries, and Soviet aircraft [22. P. 11]. Considering the scale of these tours and exhibitions, it becomes clear that Soviet efforts to vastly invest resources to harvest influence in Latin American countries, were very high.

Intourist, a Soviet travel agency, also played an important role in diffusing Soviet propaganda to the external world. Founded in 1929 as a purely commercial agency that controlled traveling of Soviet citizens within the country, by 1955, *Intourist* turned into the organization that provided travel opportunities for Soviet citizens abroad. Starting from that same year, foreign tourism to the Soviet Union was also resumed [23]. *Intourist* took a direct part in organization of foreign guests' travel programs and their whole stay in the Soviet Union. The agency organized special orientation sessions for international tourists in which trained Soviet *Intourist* guides explained the rules of social behavior in Soviet society and Soviet social norms. Perhaps, half a million or more foreign tourists to the Soviet Union were exposed to this orientation each year, and were thus informed of many aspects of Soviet society [24]. In 1956 alone, there were about half a million visits to Russia by foreign citizens from 84 countries. Soviet tourists, in turn, visited 61 destinations of the world. In 1964, the number of foreign tourists exceeded one million people, and about 900,000 Soviet citizens went abroad [23]. Very quickly, *Intourist* turned into a cultural bridge between the outside world and the Soviet Union, disseminating a Soviet image of peace and prosperity.

Soviet travelers' accounts about Latin America also turned out to be a valuable component of Soviet-Latin American relations. These narratives allowed Soviet people to learn about Latin American countries and to imagine how the people and the cultures from that region looked like. Such works as *V Strane Inkov* (In the Incas' Country), *V Pogone za Meksikoi* (In Chase of Mexico), *Vozvrashchenie v Gavanu* (Return to Havana), and *Shagi po Chuzhoi Zemle* (Walking on the Foreign Land) became especially familiar to the Soviet readers [25]. Another popular source, where Soviet tourists published their accounts, was the academic journal *America Latina* founded in 1969 under the headship of the Institute of Latin America. Almost every issue of this journal included a column titled, "Travel Experience," designed to spread knowledge about this "exotic" region among the reading public [26]. These popular articles and books, with a wide readership, depicted Latin America as a "bustling" continent where national liberation movements developed affection for the USSR, thus raising Soviet curiosity and interest in this region.

In the context of Soviet internationalism, various study programs conceived specifically for foreign students became especially popular among Soviet legislators. In June of 1960, the Soviet Union announced an international summer school to be held on the southern coast of the Crimea. Over 100 students from various countries attended the courses. Top Soviet writers, scientists, and cultural leaders participated in the seminars [10. P. 1]. In the summer of 1975, the number of foreign students, who visited these International Summer Student Courses, increased to 200 [27. P. 156-160]. Soviet industrial training was additional popular study program aimed for foreigners. According to the Soviet State Committee for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, in 1958 alone, more than 200 international students underwent industrial training in the Soviet Union [10. P. 1]. These examples emphasize the increased interest of foreigners in Soviet education and the success of Soviet propaganda in specifically attracting students from the outside world [10. P. 1]. In general, the number of foreign students, who studied in the Soviet Union, dramatically increased over the year. Prior to the opening of PFU, in 1959, the Soviet Minister of Higher Education reported that more than 13,000 students from 40 countries were attending colleges in the Soviet Union. About 1,000 of these students came from "underdeveloped" Global South countries. A decade earlier, however, enrollment of foreign students was less than half the 1959 figures [10. P. 1]. This data suggests that the Soviet Union utilized increasingly its educational resources to reach and influence people from both the "underdeveloped" and "developing" nations of the world.

Soviet authorities considered Russian language courses in Latin America as another tool to exercise their influence in the region. According to the article "Latin Americans Are Learning Russian," the interest in the Russian language was very high among Latin American students [28. P. 147]. Professor Lapshina-

Medvedeva taught Peruvian students as well as local people for a period of two years in the city of Trujillo during the early 1970s. She claimed that Russian language was very popular there. “Russian,” the article stated “is a language of a great nation whose contribution to the world civilization won the love and respect from other people of the planet” [29. P. 172-176]. Similar appraisal of Russian language was included in another article, “Russian Language in Latin America”, which argued that, due to the Soviet successes in all areas of social life, Russian language gained authority and respect among millions of people [30. P. 166-172]. Spreading the influence of Russian language in the world and making it a symbol of a civilized society, the Soviet Union successfully utilized the cultural diplomacy as one of the tools of its propaganda machine.

Soviet Antiracism and Peoples’ Friendship University

An emphasis on Soviet structural antiracism was probably the most effective tool of cultural diplomacy and a way to appeal to other peoples of the world and propagate the image of Russia as a tolerant country. Structural racism defined as “a system in which public policies, institutional practices, cultural representations, and other norms work in various, often reinforcing ways to perpetuate racial group inequity” [31]. In other words, structural racism implies unspoken interaction between institutions, policies, and their practices that unavoidably strengthens barriers to opportunities and racial inequalities. It is a historical feature of the social, economic and political systems of a certain society that does not function by the will of the people or institutions. Therefore, by reinforcing the opposite – namely, the idea of structural antiracism, in addition to the absence of social classes and gender bias – the Soviet Union was able to ensure the promotion of its positive image to the outer world.

Starting from the 1920s, the Soviet Union developed the concept of a “New Soviet Man,” an archetype of a perfect person who was free from ethnic and religious affiliation, had no desire to pursue private property, and was always ready to sacrifice for the benefit of the socialist state [32]. More importantly, the new Soviet person had a race-less identity [33. P. 140-141]. The recognition that race did not matter in the Soviet Union created a highly favorable image of the country that was very attractive to the people who felt discriminated or economically disadvantaged. The race-blind vision of the Soviet Union especially appealed to nonwhite people who, inspired by the Soviet message of antiracism, traveled to this country for more opportunities [34].

It was in this context of Soviet internationalism and structural antiracism that the Soviet state opened the PFU in the fall of 1960. N.S. Khrushchev, First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, gave the first speech about the establishment of the PFU at the Gadjah Mada University (Indonesia) on February 21, 1960, during his Asian tour:

“Wishing as it does to aid countries in training their national technical and administrative personnel – engineers, agricultural experts, doctors, teachers, economists and experts in other spheres of learning – the Soviet government has decided to organize a Peoples’ Friendship University in Moscow. This decision has been taken because progressive public circles, and also private citizens in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have time and time again asked us to create greater facilities for training their own technical and administrative personnel in Soviet educational establishments” [35. P. 49].

Promoting Soviet racial equality, PFU became the first Soviet institution founded on Soviet structural antiracism. As one of the University booklets suggested, “Here you come across young people of all races, attired in bright turbans, snow white galabia, rainbow saris and kimonos, speaking many different languages. Youth, friendship and knowledge flourish under one roof, the Patrice Lumumba Friendship University” [36. P. 3]. This and many other similar messages idealized the University settings and stressed the commitment of PFU to Soviet antiracism.

The main objective, set by PFU, was to prepare highly skilled and educated national experts (especially from low-income families) from Asia, Africa, and Latin America in the environment of friendship between peoples. As the 1963 Soviet booklet stated, “The Soviet people have but one wish – that by persistent study these young people might acquire the maximum knowledge and practical experience in order to be useful to their countries and their people” [37. P. 5]. Another booklet of 1973 held similar idea, “This University was founded in Moscow for the sole purpose of aiding the developing nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America to resolve one of their most urgent problems – the training of highly qualified national personnel” [36. P. 3]. Therefore, Soviet authorities intentionally founded PFU to create an environment where students from Latin America, Asia, and Africa gained a real Soviet experience by being exposed to Soviet

society of so-called social equality and inclusivity. PFU became the first institutionalized product of Soviet cultural diplomacy that aimed to introduce foreigners to the Soviet society that, at least in theory, lived in the atmosphere of genuine collectivism, comradeship, solidarity, and friendship of all peoples.

Under the rhetoric of Soviet cultural diplomacy, students from all over the world expressed their enthusiasm about the opening of PFU. In an article titled "Friendship University of Three Continents" there were examples of several letters from Latin American, African, and Asian students, who conveyed their ideas about the opening of PFU. In one of those letters, a young woman Ielnia De La Victoria, from Panama, vigorously wrote that the "establishment of Friendship University [was] met with great enjoyment by young people, who [had] a desire to learn about [...] the Soviet Union. Wonderful! This will contribute to the cultural development of oppressed youth who does not have the opportunities to receive higher education" [38. P. 10]. In a similar manner, Lila Ramires, from Colombia, passionately stated that the Soviet Union had founded the first University of its kind in the world, where hundreds of ordinary young people from various countries were getting knowledge and training to achieve their goals in life, "to serve their country and [their] people" [39. P. 44]. These examples illustrate the students' enthusiasm about the opening of PFU and their desire to study in a country "where anyone can learn to be of better service to his [or her] nation" [40. P. 45].

Sergey V. Rumyantsev, the Soviet deputy minister of higher education since 1955, and a doctor of technological sciences became the first rector, or President, of the University. In an interview published in the Soviet Booklet on the Lumumba University in 1963, he stated that PFU was set up as a separate educational institution for foreign students so that "the multi-national make-up of the University [kept] with the internationalist principles of Soviet society." Most importantly, he stated that students of Friendship University "have formed a closely knit family which knows no racial or national prejudices, and that, of course, is of true humanistic significance" [37. P. 11]. He believed that the relations between the students were a model of the relations which should exist among all nations of the world in future. These statements underline the fact that the PFU was a crucial institute of Soviet cultural diplomacy that disseminated the image of that country as a tolerant race-less place. Most importantly, the university materialized the ideas of Soviet structural antiracism in practice.

Over the summer of 1960, Rumyantsev met with representatives of various countries to discuss the direction of the future activities of the University. In regards to Latin America, in particular, he met with the Peruvian, Colombian, and Chilean delegations in June of 1960 [41. P. 23-24]. President of Brazil Joao Goulart also visited the PFU that same year and welcomed the opening of the University, wishing it every success in the promotion of higher education. Notably, he left the following inscription in the Distinguished Visitors' Book, "My stay in the U.S.S.R. would have been far from complete had I not been given the opportunity to visit Friendship University" [37. P. 7]. This powerful statement suggests the level of excitement of foreign leaders about the opening of PFU and their realization of the high role of this influence in their own countries.

President Goulart was not the only famous politician from Latin America to comment on the foundation of the PFU. The President of the Republic of Cuba, Osvaldo Dorticos, stated that the establishment of the PFU was a "fine initiative" in the strengthening of friendship among the nations. He believed that institution was "destined to play a tremendous role" in disseminating the "achievements of world culture" and promoting a "better understanding of the basic cultural problems in the development of a new society" [42. P. 143-144]. The members of the delegation from Guatemala also expressed their deep satisfaction with the scientific, social and economic achievements of the University and voiced their hopes in "getting effective help for the solution of their [own] problems" [42. P. 151].

A call for the admission of prospective students to the PFU was published on March 24, 1960. As part of the direct recruitment and selection program of the new university, Soviet embassies and consulates in Asian, African, and Latin American countries circulated information detailing eligibility and study conditions in the University. Local Communist parties and organizations such as the International Union of Students and the World Federation of Democratic Youth, their affiliates in addition to newspaper advertisements helped inform prospective students of available scholarships and the rules of admission [10. P. 7; 43. P. 75-76].

Applications received in Moscow disproportionately outnumbered vacancies. By April of that year, the University had received 455 applications from 72 countries, including 14 from Latin American countries. That same summer, the number of applications exceeded fifty thousand [41. P. 24]. Radio Moscow, and other propaganda media, kept the Soviet public and countries abroad informed about great interest in the university. In October, Soviet broadcasts informed Latin America that the university had received 3,500 applications from that region including people of various backgrounds [10. P. 7].

The school officially opened on October 1, 1960. Speaking at the opening ceremony, Khrushchev said, "Your University is taking its first steps. The foreign students present here are but the first youth detachment of Friendship University from fifty-nine Asian, African and Latin American countries. May Friendship University progress and develop, establish good traditions and foster friendship among the peoples" [37. P. 8]. The first students were 539 men and women from 59 countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America (including 57 Soviet students), of which 169 young people arrived from 19 countries in Latin America, the largest number of students accepted by the region. The majority of Latin American students arrived from Cuba, Bolivia, Mexico, and Colombia [41. P. 24-25]. As of February 1, 1961, there were 191 students admitted from Latin American countries with men outnumbering women almost 6 to 1, the fact that suggests the existence of gender misbalance within the University settings [10. P. 7].

The University admission committee paid close attention to the level of general education of the applicants, letters of recommendation, and family income (preferences were given to the low-income families) in the selection process. The Soviet government assisted selected students with traveling expenses to Moscow and back home after graduation. In addition, education, accommodations, and medical services – were all free. The university cafeteria provided hot meals for students at very low cost. Finally, the students received a stipend of 90 rubles, an amount higher than the average Soviet salary at the time [44. P. 386]. On the average, Soviet students in other Soviet universities received from 25 to 75 rubles a month [10. P. 6]. This information suggests that University managed to spend extensive resources to satisfy foreign students' needs, thus gaining popularity and positive feedback from the students and their governments. Chaffik Salem Karadj, a student from Jordan, noted that, "The student need not worry about anything, he [or she] is provided with books, tutors and everything else required for his [or her] studies and he [or she] receives good medical care [...] It is not surprising in the least that after a year's stay in Moscow students are able to save up enough money to buy cameras, radio sets, movie cameras and much else" [37. P. 30]. This information suggests that PFU administration seriously invested in attracting students from the Global South regions, so they could reinforce the image of the University, and the whole country, as a progressive and comfortable place to study and live.

All entering students attended a Preparatory Faculty for at least one year, less qualified students remained there longer. In the Preparatory Faculty, Asian, African, and Latin American students spent most of their first year (890 hours) learning to understand, speak, and read the Russian language. Students of all specializations also enrolled in "Historical Geographic Survey," in which they learned about the Soviet view of world history and geography [37. P. 9].

One can assume that required survey courses included indoctrination in Communist ideology. The Soviet Booklet of 1963, however, stated the opposite. In an interview by the publishers, Panamanian student Nestor Muguel Rios asserted that never and nowhere have the students been trained as communist propagandists. "What is more, we can say for sure," he continued "that in no other place in the world will you find greater respect for traditions, political beliefs and religions than at Friendship University" [37. P. 26]. In the booklet of 1973, a student from Argentina, Daniel Calvo, stated the same, "The students have various political, philosophical and religious views and the teaching staff always seeks to create a friendly atmosphere and not to foist their views upon us, to have a free discussion without making anyone accept their viewpoint" [36. P. 33]. The fact that all PFU booklets include solely positive responses of the students suggests that, in the climate of the Cold War, the university purposely doctored its equal treatment of foreign students to make the world aware of its commitments to internationalism. These booklets were pieces of Soviet propaganda themselves and, thus, the positive feedbacks of the students must be questioned. Moreover, some of the Western newspapers highlighted examples of students complaining about "heavy-handed attempts at political indoctrination." And as one Soviet journalist put it, "We knew not every student would be happy here. But if two out of ten go away even mildly pro-Soviet then we've won our gamble" [45. P. 34]. These examples suggest that while there were students who whole-heartedly believed in the Soviet promises, PFU also encountered complaining students who could critically observe the Soviet reality.

About 40 % of the total number of students admitted to the PFU studied in the Department of Engineering, an additional 35% in the Departments of Agriculture and Medicine, and the rest studied in the Departments of Physics, Mathematics, and Natural Sciences, History and Philology, and Economics and Law [10. P. 9]. The graduation class of 1960 took place on June 29, 1965. Among the graduates there were 228 young professionals from 47 countries – 8 of them were from Latin America – received Soviet diplomas. At a ceremonial reception, in the State Kremlin Palace, a graduate from Venezuela, Raul Estevez Lapriel said, "We

must show the world that today, while the imperialists shoot and kill defenseless women and children in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and Congo, Peoples' Friendship University produces a large group of highly qualified specialists for these same countries" [41. P. 27]. Thus, under the influence of the Soviet lifestyle, many PFU students believed in a clear line between progressive communism and decaying imperialism.

In order to create an image of PFU as a progressive institution, in addition to carrying forward their regular program at the university, students could form their own clubs or associations either based on their country origin or by special field of interest, such as art, photography, and handcrafts. In 1973, there were eighty such groups, and each of them had its own structure and elected leadership [36. P. 11]. Chilean student Pedro Tamayo, for example, stated that students of different nationalities had their own student association. Thus, the Chileans also had their national association, with one student representing them on the University Council [46. P. 54]. PFU students also established connections with students in other universities and participated in sport competitions, fostered national theatrical performances, and/or aided their countrymen in their studies. Problems of individual students were presented to the administration of the university through these associations, which, in turn, were used to improve individual student's school performance or behavior [10. P. 9-10]. A student from Cyprus, Andreas Savvidis, for instance, admired students' initiative at PFU and praised the work of the Students' Council [47. P. 70].

Students of the university spent summer holidays in the Soviet Union taking trips specifically organized for them, unless they wished to go home at their own expense. Alternatively, they could undertake practical work in their fields of study in appropriate Soviet factories to gain experience in practical work and production training [10. P. 10]. PFU students often, willingly, joined international student construction brigades, traveling to construction sites in Siberia, Karelia or Kazakhstan [36. P. 13]. The period from 1964 to 1970 was known as a particular stage in the history of the international student construction brigades of PFU. The number of brigades grew significantly in all geographical areas of the USSR, and the percentage of foreign students in their composition reasonably increased [48. P. 16]. The booklet *The Patrice Lumumba Friendship University in Moscow* stated that "whenever the University students [spent] their vacation or [went] to work they [were] certain to be accorded the warmest hospitality" [36. P. 13]. Syrian student Zaid Majid El Hariri, for instance, shared his experience in working at the machine-building plant on the Neva River in Leningrad, he explained, "We were given a lot of attention at the plant right from the start. Every student had a consultant who could help him whenever necessary and explain anything that wasn't clear or help choose the right design" [36. P. 79].

PFU has turned into a very successful Soviet experiment that, under the policies of cultural diplomacy and Soviet internationalism, managed to make a contribution into the formation of an educated elite in the Global South. Some of the most distinguished graduates from Latin America were Bharrat Jagdeo (President of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana, 1999-2011), Bheri Sygmond Ramsaran (Minister of Health of Guyana, 2006-2011), and Oswaldo Lu Izar Obregon (Member of the Congress of the Republic of Peru). Many PFU graduates became notable diplomats, advisors, administrators, and international consultants [49].

Conclusion

From the middle of the 1950s, the Soviet Union increasingly spread its influence in the Global South, including Latin America. Soviet print media and broadcasts increased in numbers, and large exhibitions and artistic performances became appealing attractions in that region, enhancing Soviet prestige and power. Moreover, after the 1957 World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow and the Cuban Revolutions of 1959, the Soviet Union opened its doors to hundreds, and eventually to thousands, of international students, including those who came from the Latin American and the Caribbean region. In 1960, Moscow's Peoples' Friendship University, originally named after the Congolese independence leader Patrice Lumumba, was established by Soviet officials as part of efforts to establish diplomatic relations with the Global South. Cultural diplomacy of the Soviet Union and its rhetoric of structural antiracism created an image of the USSR as a friendly country for foreign visitors and offered the Latin American youth a comfortable framework within which they could obtain Soviet education and form global networks. This article expands the existing body of historiography on the relations between the two regions and contributes to the analysis of multicultural relations between the Soviet and Latin American youth in the context of the Cold War.

REFERENCES

1. For an overview, see Smith P.H. *Talons of the Eagle: Latin America, the United States, and the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. 438 p.; Coerver D.M., Hall L.B. *Tangled Destinies: Latin America and the United States*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1999. 303 p.; Schoultz L. *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy toward Latin America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998. 496 p.; Rabe S.G. *The Killing Zone: The United States Wages Cold War in Latin America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. 288 p.; McMahon R.J. *The Cold War in the Third World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 256 p.
2. For more information, see Mujal-Leon E. *The USSR and Latin America: A Developing Relationship*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, Inc., 1989. 416 p.; Clissold S. *Soviet Relations with Latin America, 1918-1968: A Documented Survey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970. 313 p.; Poppino R.E. *International Communism in Latin America: A History of the Movement, 1917-1963*. New York: The Free Press, 1964. 247 p.
3. Mujal-Leon E. *The USSR and Latin America: A Developing Relationship*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, Inc., 1989. 416 p.
4. Discussions on "geographic fatalism" can be found in Roy A.N. *The Third World in the Age of Globalisation: Requiem Or New Agenda?* Delhi: Madhyam Books, 1999. 160 p.; Bain M.J. *From Lenin to Castro, 1917-1959: Early Encounters between Moscow and Havana*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2013. 170 p.; Kolodziej E.A., Kanet R.E. *The Limits of Soviet Power in the Developing World*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989. 552 p.; Mujal-Leon E. *The USSR and Latin America: A Developing Relationship*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, Inc., 1989. 416 p.
5. Taborsky E. *Communist Penetration of the Third World*. New York: Rober Speller & Sons Publishers, Inc., 1973. 500 p.
6. Rupprecht T. *Soviet Internationalism after Stalin: Interaction and Exchange between the USSR and Latin America during the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. 346 p.
7. Istorija Mezhdunarodnogo Moskovskogo Radio. URL: http://www.travelradio.lv/history/golos_rossii.htm.
8. Novikov L.A. *Golos Mira // Amerika Latina*. 1972. N 3. P. 140-146.
9. For more information on life under Pinochet regime in Chile, see Politzer P. *Fear in Chile: Lives under Pinochet*. New York City: The New Press, 2001. 1111 p.; Munoz H. *The Dictator's Shadow: Life under Augusto Pinochet*. New York City: Basic Books, 2008. 376 p.; Nagy-Zekmi S. *Democracy in Chile: The Legacy of September 11, 1973*. Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2005. 226 p.
10. Rosen S.M. *The Peoples' Friendship University in the U.S.S.R*. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1962. 13 p.
11. Cherisian D. *Sovetskaia Poezia na Kube // America Latina*. 1977. N 5. P. 181.
12. For more information on the 1957 Moscow Youth Festival, see Koivunen P. *The 1957 Moscow Youth Festival: propagating a new, peaceful image of the Soviet Union / Soviet State and Society under Nikita Khrushchev*; ed. M. Ilic and J. Smith. London: Routledge, 2009. P. 46-65; Tsipursky G. *Socialist Fun: Youth, Consumption, and State-Sponsored Popular Culture in the Cold War Soviet Union, 1945-1970*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2016. 384 p.
13. Estrada R. *Moe Mnenie o VI Festivale // Moskva: Molodaia Gvardiia*. 1957. N 7. P. 6.
14. For more information on the origins of Soviet cultural exchange agreements, see Gilburd E. *The Revival of Soviet Internationalism in the Mid to Late 1950s / The Thaw: Soviet Society and Culture during the 1950s and 1960s*; ed. D. Kozlov and E. Gilburg. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013. P. 362-401.
15. Bezrodny I. *From Argentina to Cuba // New Times*. 1956. N 51. P. 28-31.
16. Bezrodny I. *Seventy-Five Days in Latin America // Moscow News*. 1956. N 94. P. 5.
17. Iochomirova I. *Sem'desjat dnei v Latinskoj Amerike // Muzykal'naja zizn'*. 1960. N 14. P. 13. In 1962, another Soviet ballet company performed in Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, and Argentina: Trunina L. *Sovetskij Balet v Latinskoj Amerike // Teatr*. 1962. P. 182.
18. Dorenski S. *Fotos des Verfassers // Kultur und Leben*. 1960. N 1. P. 52.
19. Kulikova N.V. *Piat' Let v Bolivii // America Latina*. 1978. N 2. P. 163-168.
20. *Lunes de Revolucion*. 1960. N 46. P. 1-40.
21. Pequeno A. *La Exposicion Sovietica en la Habana // INRA*. 1960. P. 25-29.
22. *Soviet Exhibition Opened in Brazil: Diversified Show Is Russia's Biggest in Latin America // The New York Times*. May 4, 1962. P. 11.
23. *Istoriia*. URL: <http://www.intourist.ru/about/history>.
24. For more information on Intourist program, see Barghoorn F.C. *The Soviet Cultural Offensive: The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960, 353 p. Several *Intourist* advertisement posters can be found in the following website. URL: <http://retours.eu/en/39-intourist-USSR-posters/>.
25. Rodionov N.N. *V strane Inkov. Alma-Ata: KGIHL*, 1963. 69 p.; Chichkov V. *V pogone za Meksikoi*. Moscow: Molodaia Gvardiia, 1968. 238 p.; Chichkov V. *Vozvrashchenie v Gavanu*. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1977; Chichkov V. *Shagi po chuzhoi zemle*. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1983. 397 p.
26. Some of these articles include Smirnov S.S. *Peruanskie zapiski // America Latina*. 1969. N 1. P. 155-171; Pohvalin V.I. *V Strane na ekvatore // America Latina*. 1970. N 1. P. 138-149; Nikolaev P.I. *V Strane kofe i izumrudov //*

- America Latina. 1970. N 3. P. 127-137; Volsky V.V. Pinos – ostrov yunosti // America Latina. 1970. N 4. P. 105-118; Volkov V.V. Anakonda // America Latina. 1970. N 5. P. 132-141; Laurinchukas A. Belie solnca i chernoje zoloto // America Latina. 1970. N 6. P. 84-95.
27. Bely E.L. Mezhdunarodnie letnie studencheskie kursy // America Latina. 1975. N 1. P. 156-160.
28. B.S. Latinoamerikancy izuchaiut russkii yazik // America Latina. 1972. N 3. P. 147.
29. Lapshina-Medvedeva. Dva Goda v Peru // America Latina. 1972. N 6. P. 172-176.
30. Grebnev A.L. Russkii yazik v Latinskoj Amerike // America Latina. 1977. N 5 P. 166-172.
31. Roundtable on Community Change. Glossary for Understanding the Dismantling Structural Racism/Promoting Racial Equity Analysis // The Aspen Institute. URL: <https://assets.aspeninstitute.org/content/uploads/files/content/docs/rcc/RCC-Structural-Racism-Glossary.pdf>.
32. For more information on the creation of the “New Soviet Man” and “New Soviet Woman”, see Attwood L. The New Soviet Man and Woman: Sex-Role Socialization in the USSR. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990. 263 p.
33. Law I. Red Racisms: Racism in Communist and Post-Communist Contexts (Mapping Global Racisms). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 183 p.
34. Some of the studies on black sojourners to the Soviet Union include Carew J.G. Blacks, Reds, and Russians: Sojourners in Search of the Soviet Promise. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 296 p.; Roman M.L. Opposing Jim Crow: African Americans and the Soviet Indictment of U.S. Racism, 1928-1937. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012. 320 p.; Baldwin K.A. Beyond the Color Line and the Iron Curtain: Reading Encounters between Black and Red, 1922-1963. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002. 360 p.; Margulies S.R. The Pilgrimage to Russia: The Soviet Union and the Treatment of Foreigners, 1924-1937. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1968. 290 p.
35. Khrushchev N.S. To Exclude War Once and Forever from the Life of Society / The Soviet Union – Faithful Friend of the Peoples Fighting for Independence: Speeches of N.S. Khrushchov during his Asian Tour, February-March, 1960. London: Soviet Booklet N 68, 1960. P. 49.
36. Fradkin A. The Patrice Lumumba Friendship University in Moscow. Moscow: Novosti Press Agency, 1973. 87 p.
37. Novosti Press Agency. Two Universities: An Account of the Life and Work of Lumumba Friendship University and Moscow State University. London: Soviet Booklets, 1963.
38. Viktorinov E. Universitet druzhby trekh kontinentov // Moskva. 1960. N 7. P. 10-11.
39. Ramires L. Children of the People / We Are From Friendship University. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965. P. 44.
40. Molina J. My Patriotic Duty / We Are From Friendship University. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965. P. 45.
41. Marchuk N.N., Volosiuk O.V. RUDN i Latinskaia Amerika: 50 let sotrudnichestva. Moscow: RUDN, 2009. 157 p.
42. People's Friendship University. We Are from Friendship University. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965. 157 p.
43. Samokhvalova T. Universitet druzhbi narodov gotovitsia... // Vestnik Vysshei Shkoly. 1960. N 9. P. 75-76.
44. New-Type University for the Developing Countries // The Times: Educational Supplement. September 30, 1960. P. 386.
45. The Old College Try // Newsweek. June 28, 1965. P. 33-34.
46. Tamayo. Our Daily Round / We Are from Friendship University. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965. P. 54.
47. Savvidis A. Students' Initiative / We Are from Friendship University. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965. P. 70.
48. Savin V.M. Internatsional'nye studencheskie stroitel'nye otryady RUDN: istoriya i sovremennost'. Kniga 1. Moscow: RUDN, 2015. 547 p.
49. The full list of distinguished graduated can be found at the University website. URL: <http://www.rudn.ru/?pagec=2920>.

Поступила в редакцию 10.06.17

Л.В. Кириллова

СОВЕТСКИЙ ИНТЕРНАЦИОНАЛИЗМ: КУЛЬТУРНАЯ ДИПЛОМАТИЯ В ЛАТИНСКОЙ АМЕРИКЕ И УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ДРУЖБЫ НАРОДОВ

В статье анализируется культурный аспект советско-латиноамериканских отношений в годы холодной войны. Основное внимание уделено политике «культурной дипломатии» Советского Союза, нацеленной на увеличение советского влияния в Латинской Америке благодаря развитию межкультурных отношений между регионами. В частности, в статье приводятся примеры советского влияния в регионе с помощью распространения советской прессы и радиовещательных передач. Более того, рассматриваются примеры учебных программ и культурных мероприятий, таких как советские выставки научных достижений и концерты советских деятелей искусств в странах Латинской Америки. В статье также проводится комплексный анализ деятельности Университета Дружбы Народов (УДН), ставшего первым образовательным учреждением, пропитанным идеологией интернационализма после второй мировой войны. Основанный в 1960 г. и названный в честь лидера конголезской независимости Патриса Лумумбы, УДН стремился установить сотрудничество со странами «третьего мира». Нахо-

дьясь под влиянием советской политики культурной дипломатии, структурного антирасизма и идеи дружбы между народами, студенты из Латинской Америки охотно приезжали учиться в УДН за получением уникального международного опыта (к тому же и на выгодных условиях). В статье приводятся комментарии латиноамериканских студентов и делается вывод о том, что советская пропагандистская машина успешно создала образ университета и страны в целом как толерантного места для учебы и жизни. В целом, статья значительно расширяет историографию о развитии межкультурных отношений между Советским Союзом и Латинской Америкой в контексте холодной войны.

Ключевые слова: советский интернационализм, культурная дипломатия, структурный антирасизм, Университет Дружбы Народов, Холодная война, Латинская Америка, обмен студентами, советская пропаганда.

Кириллова Ляна Викторовна,
аспирант, ассистент преподавателя
Университет Южного Иллинойса (г. Карбондейл)
1000 Faner Drive, Rm 3280
Carbondale, IL 62901, USA
E-mail: liana.kirillova@siu.edu

Kirillova Liana,
Ph.D. student, Teaching Assistant
Southern Illinois University (Carbondale)
1000 Faner Drive, Rm 3280
Carbondale, IL 62901, USA
E-mail: liana.kirillova@siu.edu