

# Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia: Collapse or Perpetuation of the Soviet System? A Historical and Conceptual Study

Author: Alexey Kuraev

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/3799>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),  
Boston College University Libraries.

---

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2014

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

BOSTON COLLEGE  
Lynch School of Education

Department of Educational Leadership and Higher Education  
Higher Education

**INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN  
RUSSIA:  
COLLAPSE OR PERPETUATION OF THE SOVIET SYSTEM?  
A HISTORICAL AND CONCEPTUAL STUDY**

Dissertation  
by

ALEXEY KURAEV

Submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

May 2014

© Copyright by Alexey Kuraev

2014

Abstract

**Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia:**

**Collapse or Perpetuation of the Soviet System?**

**A Historical and Conceptual Study**

Alexey Kuraev - author

Philip Altbach - dissertation director

This study traces the policy and implementation of internationalization in the Russian higher education system from 1917 to the present. The analysis suggests that international academic policy has been applied by the Russian state continuously, though with radically differing emphasis and mechanisms, through the last hundred years.

Chapter One presents the research questions, design and methodology of the study. Chapter Two reviews scholarly literature related to academic internationalization and situates this definition within the context of Russian higher education.

Chapters 3-5 explore the role of international activities in Russian higher education during the seventy years of the Soviet era. Trends in Soviet academic international policy related to three major historical periods are discussed in this section: a) the initial Bolshevik program for global academic reform; b) Sovietization of higher education in the countries of Communist Bloc; and c) East-West international academic competition during the Cold War period.

Chapters 6-7 address the role of internationalization in the reformation of Russian higher education during the last two decades of Post-Soviet period. This section examines the extent and likely outcomes of these changes.

This research demonstrates that Russian higher education has had a continuous international aspect, though organized differently than Western structures. The analysis also suggests that key organizational components of the Soviet administrative system still exist in the current Russian higher education structure. The current implementation of internationalization presents Russian academics with an opportunity to enforce academic professionalism and promote their status as global academics. At the same time, however, state organization and governing administration principles of Russian higher education continue to reduce academics to functional executors of state directives and deliverers of vocational training. In this way, internationalization serves as a critical nexus for the collision of traditional administrative structures with the new aspirations of Russian academics.

## Acknowledgments

This project would not have been possible without the support of many people. Many thanks to my adviser, Dr. Philip G. Altbach, who had patience to wait for years my accomplishing the dissertation, keeping trust in my ability to finish the work despite delays; and who read my numerous revisions and helped make sense out of my writing. I would like to thank my committee members, Professor Ana M. Martinez Aleman and Professor Mark O'Connor for the readiness to share their knowledge and academic experience. Their kind support served me as a valuable impulse to enforce the efforts at the challenging moment of dissertation's completion. Special thanks to my friend and colleague at Colorado State University, Bridget Julian, who was so kind to commit personal time and effort, helping me in editing my writing. Special gratitude to Dr. Elisabeth Sparks, Dean of Graduate Studies at LGSE, who was so kind to provide me with needed extension of time enabling my completion of this thesis.

Thanks also to my family who supported me in ways too numerous to mention.

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>List of Abbreviations</i> . . . . .  | vi |
| <u>Chapter 1: Introduction to Research Question and Methodology</u> . . . . .                               | 1  |
| Research Questions. . . . .   | 4  |
| Internationalization and Russian Higher Education: Exceptional Realities and<br>Unique Challenges . . . . . | 6  |
| Research Design and Methodology . . . . .   | 20 |
| Plan of Dissertation – Organization of the Study. . . . .   | 23 |
| Conclusion: Academic Contribution of the Study and Implications for Practice. . . . .                       | 24 |
| <u>Chapter 2: Review of the Literature</u> . . . . .  | 29 |
| Principal Literature on Internationalization. . . . .   | 30 |
| Internationalization and Soviet Higher Education . . . . .  | 40 |
| Internationalization and Post-Soviet Higher Education . . . . .   | 55 |
| Conclusion . . . . .  | 65 |
| <u>Chapter 3: Academic Internationalism in Marxist Theory and in Bolshevik Strategy</u> . . . . .           | 67 |
| Marxism and Academia . . . . .  | 69 |
| Education as a Driving Force of Communist Society . . . . .   | 72 |
| Values of Global Educational Enlightenment in the Views of Russian Marxists . . . . .                       | 74 |
| Role of Academia in the Bolshevik Strategy for the Establishment of the<br>Communist Society . . . . .      | 76 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Academic Policy in the Bolshevik Party Program . . . . .                     | 79 |
| The Bolshevik Campaign for the Launch of World Revolution in Russia. . . . . | 85 |
| The Bolshevik Plan for Academic Reform in Russia . . . . .                   | 88 |
| Conclusion . . . . .   | 94 |

Part One: Internationalization in the History of Soviet Higher Education

Chapter 4: Formation of the Soviet Higher Education System and Emergence of Soviet

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <u>International Academic Policy, 1917-1930s</u> . . . . .   | 97  |
| Russian Higher Education prior to the 1917 Revolution . . . . .  | 99  |
| Academic Internationalism as the Reflection of the Bolsheviks’ Revolutionary<br>Idealism . . . . .   | 102 |
| The Establishment of International Partnerships: A Vital Task of Soviet<br>Academia in the 1920s . . . . .   | 109 |
| Encircled by Enemies: Militarization of Soviet Higher Education and<br>Centralization of International Academic Policy through the 1930s . . . . . | 116 |
| Spanish War: The First Practical International Experience for Soviet Academia . . . . .  | 127 |
| Conclusion . . . . .   | 130 |

Chapter 5: Sovietization – The Mainstreaming of International Academic Policy

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <u>During The Cold War</u> . . . . .  | 133 |
| Soviet Perception of the Role of Sovietization Policy in the Post-War World . . . . . | 136 |
| Specifics of Academic Sovietization in the “Liberated Countries” of Europe. . . . .   | 140 |



|   |            |
|---|------------|
| The Reformation of Higher Education in the Countries of South-East Asia . . . . .       | 144        |
| Academic Composition of the World System of Socialism and Educational                   |            |
| Patronage of the Third World (1960s-1980s) . . . . .                                    | 156        |
| Peoples' Friendship University: A Myth of International Academic Paradise in the        |            |
| USSR . . . . .  | 160        |
| Foreign Students in Russia During the Brezhnev Stagnation Period. . . . .               | 163        |
| Conclusion . . . . .  | 169        |
| <u>Part Two: Internationalization of Russian Higher Education in Post-Soviet Period</u> |            |
| <u>Chapter 6: Perestroika Reforms in Russian Academia . . . . .</u>                     | <u>171</u> |
| Perestroika in Russian Academia as a Response to the Demand for National                |            |
| Educational Reform . . . . .  | 172        |
| US-Soviet Academic Partnership - the Turning Point Toward an Open Doors Policy .        | 175        |
| Open Doors Policy: From Discovery of Global Academia to Integration . . . . .           | 179        |
| Interconnections: Pluralism in Domestic Policy and Open Doors in International          |            |
| Policy . . . . .  | 182        |
| Foreign Students in the USSR During Perestroika . . . . .                               | 184        |
| Democratization as the Driving Force and Goal of Academic Internationalization. . . .   | 186        |
| Role of Academic Internationalization in the New Russian Educational Concept . . . .    | 191        |
| Academic Internationalization as a Priority of the 1992 Educational Act. . . . .        | 196        |
| Prerogative of an Institutional Internationalization - A Turning Point for the Role of  |            |
| Internationalization in Russian Academia . . . . .                                      | 202        |
| Conclusion . . . . .  | 205        |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <u>Chapter 7: New Mission of Academic Internationalization in Market-Driven Russia</u> . . . | 209 |
| A New Academic Internationalization: the West Comes to Russia . . . . .                      | 209 |
| International Funding: “Magic Wand” or “Brain Drain”? . . . . .                              | 216 |
| Merger of Internationalization and Commercialization in Russian Academia . . . . .           | 222 |
| Higher Education for Foreigners: From Donation to Commodification . . . . .                  | 228 |
| The Tempus Program – Institutional Internationalization in Russian Academia . . . . .        | 237 |
| Joining Bologna: Completion or Beginning of Integration with Western Academia . . .          | 240 |
| Differentiation - an Emerging Institutional Objective of Internationalization . . . . .      | 242 |
| Conclusion . . . . .   | 246 |
| <u>Chapter 8: Conclusion</u> . . . . .   | 247 |
| <u>Internationalization in Russian Higher Education – A Hundred Years of History</u> . . . . | 247 |
| Academic Internationalization During the Soviet Period . . . . .                             | 248 |
| Academic Internationalization During the Post-Soviet Period . . . . .                        | 252 |
| Future Prospects for Academic Internationalization in Russia . . . . .                       | 258 |
| Closure Summary . . . . .  | 268 |
| References . . . . .   | 269 |

## List of Abbreviations

BC - The British Council

COMECON - Council for Mutual Economic Assistance of Eastern Bloc countries (1949-1991)

COMINFORM - Communist Information Bureau (1947-1956).

COMINTERN – Communist International (1919-1943)

CONAHEC - Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration

CPSU - Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1952-1991)

DAAD - German Academic Exchange Service

DANIDA - Danish International Development Agency

EAIE - European Association for International Education

EU - European Union

GATS - General Agreement on Trade in Services

GK – State Committee in Soviet administrative structure (1918-1991)

Goskomobr – State Committee for Education, (1988 – 1991)

IAU - International Association of Universities

IAUP - International Association of University Presidents

KNK – Krupskaya, N.K., Collected Works, published in 1957

LGU – Leningrad State University

LPPS – Lenin, V.I. Complete Collection of Works, Fifth Edition. Moscow: Politizdat.

MBA - Master of Business Administration

MECW - Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels Collected Works, Second Edition. Moscow:

GIPL.

MGU – Moscow State University

Minobr – Ministry of Education of Russian Federation (1991-2004)

Minvuz – Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR (1946-1988)

Narkom – People’s Commissar, title of a Department Head in the Soviet Government

Narkomat – a Department in the Soviet Government (1917-1946)

Narkompros – Department of Enlightenment in the Soviet Government (1917-1946)

NEP – New Economic Policy (1921-1927)

NIS – Newly Independent States (former republics of the USSR after 1991)

NKID – Department of International Affairs in the Soviet Government (1923-1946)

NKO – Department of Defense in the Soviet Government (1934-1946)

NKVD – Department of Internal Affairs in the Soviet Government (1934-1946)

NUFFIC - Netherlands Organizations for International Cooperation in Higher Education

OECD - Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

PRC - People's Republic of China

PRM - People's Republic of Mongolia

RCP (b) – Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), 1918-1925

RF – Russian Federation (1991-current)

RKKA – Red Army of Workers and Peasants (1918-1946)

RSDRP – Russian Social Democratic Workers' Party (1898-1917)

RSFSR – Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic

RUDN – Russian University of People's Friendship (1960-current)

SA – Soviet Army (1946-1991)

SIDA - Swedish International Development Agency

SNK or Sovnarkom - Council of People's Commissars, Soviet Government (1917-1946)

Sovmin – Council of Ministers (Formal title of Soviet Government, 1946-1991)

SPGU – St-Petersburg State University

TASS - Information Telegraph Agency of Russia (1925-1992)

TCIK – Central Executive Committee (1918-1922)

TCK – Central Committee

UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

USAID - United States Agency for International Development

USSR – Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 1922-1991

VKP(b) - All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), 1925-1952

VLKSM – All-Union Leninist Young Communist League or Comsomol (1918-1992)

VSNH – All-Union Council for National Economy (1922-1932).

VTCIK – All-Union Central Executive Committee (1922-1946)

VUZ – Higher School (Higher Educational Institution in the USSR and in RF)

WTO – World Trade Organization

WWI – World War One

WWII – World War Two

## **Chapter 1: Introduction to Research Question and Methodology**

Internationalization is a critical issue in modern higher education (Altbach, 2007b; De Greve, 2010; Knight, 2003). At the same time this phenomenon still generates a lot of question marks, especially with regard to its progression outside Western culture (Heyneman, 1997; Muhle, 1994; Sadlak, 1993). As the successor to the former Soviet Union, the Russian Federation proclaimed in 1992 internationalization to be an essential element of the reformation of its national higher education system (Yeltsin, 1992). The international component in Russian academia has grown rapidly through the last two decades to the point of Russia's integration into the European academic network via the Bologna process (Kislitsyn, 2010; Lebedeva, 2006; Smirnov, 2004). The expansion of the international dimension in the Russian higher education calls for an analysis of its evolution.

This dissertation provides an examination of the status of internationalization in Russian higher education through the prism of its historical progression. The purpose of the dissertation is to present the development of the Russian academic model and its international activities from Soviet to post-Soviet times in the chronological context. The objectives of the research are to analyze the evolution of Russian international educational policy through the Soviet period (1917-1991) and to determine the current international mission of Russian academia, introduced after the adoption of the new federal legislation for Russian higher education (1992-2007). The central goal of the dissertation is to determine what international activities constituted an integral division of Russian academia during its historical progression, and verify that a definite international academic policy of the Russian state existed during the Soviet period, explaining its core

and different angles. The study also explores the essence of internationalization for modern Russian higher education at the national and institutional levels. This research is intended to become a practical guide for understanding the complexities of the internationalization progress in Russian academia.

Firstly, it is important to determine the status of Russian higher education at the time of the arrival of the Bolshevik revolution and establishment of Soviet power. Clear identification of the Bolsheviks plans for the future of Russian academia provides the basis for the analysis of the Soviet period in the history of the Russian university system. It is imperative to recognize the stages of the development of the Soviet academic policy and its international dimension in order to both: a) define the content of «Soviet academia» internally and externally; b) determine which changes in Russian higher education happened with the arrival of post-Soviet times.

The dissolution of the Soviet Union and its huge Empire became history in 1991. For the last twenty years hundreds of books have been published all over the world about this momentous event. Many authors of these publications are often critical and doubtful about the level of progress achieved by the new political successor-regimes in the former Soviet Commonwealth (Sakwa, 2008). Some Western authors deride the image of the new Russian leaders (Kets de Vries, Florent-Treacy, Korotov, Shekshnia, 2004), and some warn about the possible dangers of current developments in the political or economic spheres in Russia and the Newly Independent States (Lucas, 2009), however, nobody seems to doubt that the Soviet administrative structure is gone. Russian politicians, academics and publicists firmly support this statement: whatever should be



the name of the government organization of the modern Russian state, it is not "Soviet" any more (Arutjunyan, 2010; Gilmundinov, 2011; Martiyanov, 2005).

Throughout my study, I contend that leading principles of the Soviet administrative system have survived and still exist in current Russian higher education, greatly influencing on its international policy. To demonstrate this, I compare the administrative structure of Russian academia during the Soviet period to the modern organizational construction of Russian higher education. While the USSR was disintegrating in the late 1980s-early 1990s, many educators of the former Soviet Union supported the establishment of a new pro-Western academic model in Russia, glorifying the arrival of the post-Soviet era (Dezhina, 2005). Governments of all republics of the former USSR and now Newly Independent States rushed to request funds and guidance from the EU countries and the USA in order to change the former Soviet academic system into a new, modern one. This was widely understood as the arrival of internationalization into Russian higher education for the purpose of its progressive reformation (Popov, 2011). The direction of the academic conversion in Russia has been anticipated as the formation of a new, post-Soviet model of the national higher education, becoming a genuine part of the global academic network (Alshanov, 2010). My research suggests, however, that internationalization didn't appear suddenly at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, as an alien phenomenon in Russian academia. Rather, this research demonstrates that an international element was a consistent part of the Russian higher education during the Soviet period. This dissertation provides the historical framework to better understand issues and conflicts of the modern Russian university system as a part of the global academia. It is important to interpret the nature of recent radical departure of Russian

national education from the Soviet past and recognize the origin of the post-Soviet changes in the national higher education.

This study examines the problems of engagement of Russian higher education into the modern process of internationalization from the perspective of the tension it creates between the historic dependency of Russian academia on the political goals and monetary provision of the national government, and the simultaneous growing request of Russian universities for institutional autonomy, promoted by their involvement in the global process of commercialization in higher education. Particular analysis is given to the repeated claim of Russian scholars that the modern post-Soviet higher education system is fundamentally different from the old Soviet one, and is more comparable to the European academic organization (Bodrova, Nikitina, 2009; Soboleva, 2009).

### Research Questions

The initial task of the dissertation is to define what constitutes the process of internationalization for the Russian higher education system in the historical perspective from the Soviet to the modern times, 1917-2007. The following research questions are addressed in the dissertation:

- 1) What was the state of Russian academic system by 1917, the starting year for Soviet power?
- 2) Being the ideology of the Soviet era, does Marxism have any specific reference to the role of academia in a new, communist society, and does it suggest application of any particular international academic policy for a communist government?
- 3) What specific plans, if any, did Bolsheviks have for academic reform in Russia, and did they see any place for international division in the new, Soviet higher education?

4) What constituted Soviet higher education system as an administrative and academic organism in the time of its creation during the period of so-called “construction of the Socialist Society” in the USSR in 1920-30s? What were the major parameters of the newly formed Soviet academia, and what was the place for international activities in it?

5) Was there a continuous international academic policy during the Soviet period? What were typical international activities of the Russian academia during the post-WWII period when higher education all over the world became integrated with industries and technological revolution progressed in world economy? Can these activities be defined as internationalization?

6) What is the international policy of Russian higher education in the post-Soviet times? Could the 1990s reforms in Russian academia be qualified as adoption of the modern internationalization concept? Why?

7) What are international implications of recent structural changes in the Russian higher education? Does the international experience of Russian academics influence the organization and function of the national university system?

8) What type of organizational management constitutes the core of relations between federal, regional and institutional authorities within the Russian higher education system today?

Considering the ongoing reformation process in Russian higher education, these are not purely scholastic questions for the national academia, but rather urgent practical issues.

*Internationalization and Russian Higher Education: Exceptional Realities and Unique Challenges*

Most Western higher educational institutions worldwide are rooted in the original European medieval paradigm of Autonomos Liberum Universitas. Protection of academic freedoms through the institutional *Autonomy*; promotion of critical thinking via *Liberal* knowledge; dissemination of intellectual diversity *Universally*: these were the cornerstones of the University mission for centuries. The traditional concept of free academia expects that a higher educational institution of any organizational format - private, communal or state, - will have an institutional policy, an institutional mission and thus an institutional independence. At the same time a university bears an important public purpose of responding to the social demand of citizens seeking academic excellence and professional knowledge. Moreover, the European university model disseminated globally and now prevails as the world's most adopted academic paradigm (Altbach, 2004a). There are very few other examples of an academic structure known through the history of mankind to compare with the European university. The only academic construction that managed to not only survive for almost a thousand years, but to function continuously and successfully, expand globally and flourish, is the European university organization.

Russian higher education has a very different historical trajectory. Firstly, academia in Russia emerged by the autocratic decision of the national monarch, not because of the natural progress of the Russian society. From the very beginning, a university was a foreign establishment for the Russian public. Secondly, the very appearance of a university in Russia was a result of international policy of the Russian

government having an ambition to match leading European countries. For a hundred years, all Russian rulers, starting from Emperor Peter I and up to Emperor Alexander I were trying to beat the European sovereigns and have a greater army or a larger treasure, finer theater or fancier royal palace. Any political, cultural or economic feature that could underline the superiority of the Russian royals and their realm counted. University was one of the elements on the list of required establishments allowing Russian royalty to compete with Europe. It was a very difficult task considering that universities in Europe started to spread in the 12<sup>th</sup> century; by the early 1700s, there were 105 universities all over Europe (Porter, 2003). These institutions were vital participants in the beginning of the Enlightenment era (Schechtman, 2003). At the same time, Russia had no higher educational institutions or academic establishments of any type at all. Having no local scholars or professionals in applied sciences, Peter I and Russian monarchs after him were inviting foreigners to form Russian academia. First academic establishment in Russia was the Russian Academy of Sciences (1724) and all of its initial members were foreigners invited by the Russian emperor to work for the Russian monarch as state servants, being provided by the Russian state (Kopelevitch, 1977). The first Russian university was established as part of the Academy and was expected to provide all scientific and technical services, needed to the government (Osipov, 1999). The head of the Academy was its President, who was appointed by the Russian Emperor personally. Foreign scholars, who agreed to come to Russia and serve to its government as members of the Russian Academy, were usually coming with their own students (Grigoriev, 1870). The initial composition of Russian academic faculty and students was entirely foreign. We may say then, that Russian universities were established as the result of certain

international policies of the national royal elite, and internationalization was indeed the driving force of the very formation of the Russian academia.

Establishment of a Russian national system of higher education available to the general population of the country, and development of the similar processes to the ones progressing in Europe and America, - massification of higher education and its integration with the industries, - happened during the Soviet times, beginning it earnest in the 1930s. As a national system aimed to educate its citizenry, Russian higher education is less than a hundred years old. In order to fulfill the given political task and match Western academic systems that had advanced for centuries, Soviet academia needed to develop with improbable speed and required extraordinary efforts from the nation. Identification of the core of the Soviet higher education system as an administrative and academic organism in the period of so-called «construction of the Socialist Society» in the USSR in 1920-40s, with distinct definition of the place for international activities in it, is vital for this study. Was Soviet academia an active participant of cross-national collaboration, advancing in the world academic network during the 20<sup>th</sup> century, did it have the focus on the research and applied studies as the universities of the industrialized Western countries, or it had some different target of development, specifically related to its national realities and policies?

WWII resulted in many unprecedented global realities, one of which was «Sovietization» of higher education in the countries of so-called Eastern (or Soviet) Bloc. Eight countries of Eastern and Central Europe became Soviet not only in terms of their politics or government organization but also in the format and function of their national academic systems. The same process was progressing in Asia by the end of 1940s. In

1950s, Soviet organization of higher education have been installed in the vast territory between Eastern Germany and Korea, and while Western politicians were concerned about creation of the «Red Belt» from Europe into Russia and China, - almost half of world's population was taught in the educational institutions of the Soviet kind (Elutin, 1980). Can this process be defined as the “internationalization” of Russian academia? Famous technological revolution came in late 1950s, and the world rapidly became involved in several decades of industrial and military technological competition between the super-powers and their allies. Using the facts of their creation of the first nuclear power station, the launch of the first satellite and, later, the first man in space, the USSR claimed victory in its competition with Western civilization (Hanin, 2002; Lahtin, 1990). The West agreed to this at that time, producing government reports and dozens of publications saying that Soviet higher education and science were advanced, well organized, and a challenge to European and US educational systems (Rickover, 1959; Roosevelt, 1957). Had Soviet higher education indeed achieved superiority in global academia by early 1960s, or it was a merely political speculation?

Modern Russian higher education emerged from the Soviet university paradigm that was unique in its organization and function. It was autocratic in its organizational core, which was expected from a Soviet establishment, and well known to the academics worldwide (Glowka, 1987). Although named a university system, Soviet higher education was neither Autonomous nor Liberal. The humanitarian values of academia and its individual sense were obliterated and completely replaced in the Soviet higher education model with the pragmatism of immediate state needs and, related to them, the vocational training of human resources. Russian people were supposed to receive higher

education **only** in order to become practical experts in particular areas of industry or social services, to be then directed, organized, administered and sustained by the state. Communal needs, represented by the state, were dictated to individuals in the form of government orders defining precisely where and in what capacity a trained graduate should work. The Soviet university system reflected to task with its united federal mission and unified organizational structure. Soviet higher education also had a unique international perspective as it was supposed to develop into the leading and eventually the only existing academic model in the world (Avrus, 2001).

Today, internationalization is defined as the key “delivery-tool” of globalization in higher education and refers to the specific policies and initiatives of countries and individual academic institutions dealing with global trends (Altbach, Teichler, 2001). It includes policies relating to recruitment of foreign students, collaboration with academic institutions or systems in other countries, and establishment of branch campuses abroad. It would be reasonable to consider that internationalization not only conveys global changes into national higher education structures but also serves as the most important indicator for the advancement of those changes in practice (Altbach, Knight, 2007). Previously, inter-university networks operated between national systems, never touching the structural basics, specifics and traditions of each university model involved (Scott, 2000a). This type of international cooperation did not change the basis of national university systems. It was just a good addition, a kind of “topping”, for the academic activities of a national university. Academics had a level of international activities including international committees, conferences, research projects and scholarly teams. Students had their niche, with academic exchanges and practical training in different



countries, language courses and summer camps. University administrators and federal officials had inter-government agreements and statements declaring new international arrangements for better communication between national academic systems, and provision of state funds for internationalization purposes. But whatever the status of dissemination or integration, national systems of higher education were still unchanged and organizational structures, funding procedures, credit and evaluation mechanisms were still national. International educational policies reflected a world-order dominated by nation states (Scott, 1998).

As globalization has progressed during the last few decades, the situation in world higher education had changed dramatically (Carnoy, 2005; Olds, 2011; Robertson, 2012). First of all, by definition globalization means not the relationship of national educational systems, but the introduction of multinational, or if we may say – “above-national” - academic relations (King, Marginson, Naidoo, 2011). Secondly, globalization is a much more volatile and turbulent phenomenon that has had a great impact on many institutions of human activity, breaking national boundaries, conservative economic structures and cultural traditions. The forces of globalization are challenging the authority of the national state, being a radical process agnostic to nation states and addressing global agendas (Scott, 1998). A good example of such above-national status of modern globalization are the existing multilateral institutions of global economic surveillance, especially the G7, IMF, World Bank and WTO, which largely function to nurture this nascent “global market civilization” (Held, McGrew, 2003). The most important educational change in the era of globalization is likely the structural change of national academic systems, with great impact on the academic profession and curriculum

(Magrath, 2000). Finally, globalization compels internationalization to become the basis of educational policies and academic practices worldwide (Tzeng, Worton, Homma, 2008). This dissertation aims to provide reasons for and more clearly ramifications of tensions and challenges that Russian higher education faces due to these pressures.

In the face of a global economy and worldwide job market, internationalization becomes the only solution to cope with the global academic environment. The motivations for internationalization include commercial advantage, knowledge and language acquisition, enhancing the curriculum with international content, and many others. Specific initiatives such as branch campuses, cross-border collaborative arrangements, programs for international students, and establishing English-medium programs and degrees have been put into place as well (Altbach, Knight, 2007). The foremost example of success in the beneficial application of internationalization is the formation of the Bologna declaration of the EU countries (Lorenz, 2006). Mass academic mobility and unprecedented international integration between higher education institutions have promoted the internationalization of curricula and the dominance of English language in academic instruction and communication (Nehrt, 1987; Trueit, Doll, Wang, Pinar, 2000). International circulation of instructional materials, textbooks, and syllabi has become a routine reality of global academia, stimulating the development of compatible training programs in different countries and university systems (Knight, 2008). The most famous example of one course pattern being adopted worldwide is the case of the American-style MBA program that became dominant globally in the last decade (Altbach, 2007a). With the common use of Internet-based study materials, databases and the expanding influence of multinational publishers, course curriculum that

originate mainly in the large academic centers of the North spread over the world in the matter of days (Altbach, 2004b). Most of the scholarly publications, academic meetings and even common personal communication are carried out in English today. English has become the Latin of the 21st century. In many countries, it is the required second language, and it is the second language of choice almost without exception (Altbach, 2007a). The growth of international academic mobility and the global integration of curricula, teaching methods and research encourage national academic systems to become more similar and academic degrees to be more widely accepted internationally. The continuous adjustments of national educational policies reflect the modern needs of global academic organizations as the practical stimulus of internationalization (McGinn, 2007).

The situation is much more complex for the higher education of the Russian Federation, the case of my dissertation research. The progress of globalization and the related expansion of international activities coincided in Russia with the extensive internal changes known as “Perestroika” that transformed Soviet society into its current the post-Soviet status. The very socio-political construction of the USSR collapsed, forming a new position for Russia in international political and economic networks. Powerful economic, social, political processes changed life dramatically in the former Soviet realm. National academia was involved deeply into the transformation changes (Soboleva, 2009). In the 1990s, when the forces of globalization introduced the need for a modern policy of internationalization to the Russian higher education, the country was in a period of “multi-layered” reforms. The unavoidable involvement of Russian academia in the process of globalization brought an inevitable need for deep structural change in

national higher education. It is still considered an ongoing process, named by the Russian Federal authorities as a “continuous educational reform” (Fursenko, 2011). In order to be able to face the challenges of globalization, Russian higher education has to be converted from the Soviet model that was secured from the influence of outer world for decades into a new academic system that is fully integrated into the global academic network. It is a difficult process, involving a deep political debate with those in Russia who believe that the Soviet academic system was a progressive one, the best in the world, - and there are still a good number of people in the country who think that way (Lahtin, 1990). Their logic is simple but solid: Soviet academia kept the lead in the world in the fields of nuclear studies, space exploration, mathematics, cybernetics, computer science and many other scientific areas (Avrus, 2001). Graduates of Soviet higher education stood behind some of the greatest achievements in recent global science and engineering, such as the generation of a thermonuclear process, discovery of the principles of the synchrotron, production of the first nuclear icebreaker, the erection of the Aswan Dam, creating the world’s largest artificial fresh-water reservoir, the creation of the first lunar rover “Lunohod” and many more. In Soviet times, thousands of foreigners were willing to come and study in the USSR, while now so-called “foreign students” come mostly from the under-developed territories of the former Soviet Union to seek a good education for minimal expense (Rodonova, 2002; Arefiev, 2012).

The structural change of Russian national academia became a natural component of “Perestroika” political reforms. It was demanded by internal “reformation forces” and it was a condition for Russia’s integration into the European academic network. Such change was a vital necessity for every former member of the Soviet Commonwealth as

part of a grandiose political reunion of East and West, and the economic integration of the “Soviet Bloc” countries with the developed world of Europe and Americas. “Russia does not have any alternative to becoming a natural part of the global academic community, and I, as the President, together with the Prime-Minister and the government of the country make all needed efforts, for the Russian higher education to enforce its position in the European unified educational space as an equal and valuable, respected member” (Medvedev, 2012). The impetuous process of this transformation has been observed by the educators of the world during the last two decades (Dobbins, Knill, 2009; Sadlak, 2000; Teichler, 2004). Globalization for higher education in the former Eastern Bloc consists primarily of the dramatic transition of the Soviet in its core national university structure into a new organizational type – a Western-like research university model (Frolov, 2011; Ivanovsky, 2006). In the new political and economic realities of an open society, Russian higher education faces new demands in every field of its activities, including international aspects, where new policies for the internationalization of Russian academia have to be worked out at all levels: national, local, and institutional (Petrovich, 2010; Yampolskaya, 2004).

How it is possible to make internationalization a positive and a beneficial process for Russian academia, considering the complex current issues faced by the country? This is a very arduous question, requesting thorough academic research and a lot of exertion from the Russian government. Traditionally, Russian higher educational institutions emphasized teacher training. In Soviet educational practice, a teacher was the major vehicle and master of the study process, and was also an executor of the state demand for training professional personnel for the needs of the national economy; a student was a

trainee, like a “soldier” following orders, rules, regulations and requirements. A Soviet student was not expected to acquire expansive knowledge and creative thinking, or to make subsequent personal decisions about future professional careers after graduation. An applicant to a Soviet higher educational institution had to choose a future occupation before entering a university. Once there he obtained specific training, skills and experience to become a capable worker in a specific vocation. Graduates of Soviet higher education were not getting degrees in broad academic areas, like arts or sciences, but were graduating with a diploma of a specialist in a particular profession, like “engineer in bridge-constructing” or “teacher of history”. The state performed the task of distributing graduates to places of employment. Work at the appointed job location and in the specified job position was mandatory under the threat of annulment of the awarded diploma.

The governing principle of the current Russian university system remains the same, as the Soviet academia used to have: preparation of professional personnel for different divisions of the national economy (Putin, 2011). However, at a time when modern internationalization penetrates traditional boundaries of national educational systems and provokes rapid academic mobility worldwide, such policy in Russian higher education may lead to severe negative effects. Prior to the mid-1990s, international student exchange and academic mobility East-West was relatively small. An international experience was not part of the usual academic practice, but rather an exotic activity for most of the students and faculty of the university communities of the Soviet Bloc countries. Only six percent of all Russian universities had any students and faculty traveling in abroad for research or study purposes before 1993 (Vyssee obrazovanie v

SSSR, 1990). Starting from 1990s Russian higher education became an addition to the conventional division of academic mobility from “Third World” countries to “First World” or industrialized countries (Naumova, 1996; Oganov, 2009). Continuous brain-drain, especially of young talents in the last two decades, is a serious indicator of a troubled situation in Russian academia. Many Russian graduates and scholars use research or study abroad as an actual job search (Ledeneva, 2002). The diversion of students from the universities of the former Soviet Union to the West beginning in the 1990s has grown to over ten thousands each year (Agamova, Allahverdyan, 2007). Most of these students have pursued graduate degrees and over 70% of them have not returned to their countries of origin (Zayonchikovskaya, 2003). Over a hundred thousand scientists from the former Soviet realm emigrated to Western Europe and North America during the first ten years after the fall of the USSR (Kalabekov, 2007). The most significant “pull” factors for academic migration include better salaries and working conditions in developed countries, the opportunity to be at the centers of world research, and university culture grounded in academic freedoms and democratic values (Altbach, 2004a). This tendency of South-North, or according to the Russian educators “East-West” intellectual flow, creates many problems as not only it helps to preserve a traditional intellectual and economical dependency on industrialized countries but also promotes disparities in global higher education. According to estimates, the money spent abroad by students from some developing countries more than equals incoming foreign aid (Altbach, 2004a; Dezhina, 2002). The number of Russians studying in European and American higher educational institutions has equaled over thirty thousand students annually in the last several years (Ledeneva, 2007). These students spend an estimated hundred million dollars annually,

which equals the annual budget of the Federal Program for Innovation Development in Russian Higher Education launched five years ago (O gosudarstvennoi podderzhke razvitiya innovatsionnoi infrastruktury v vuzah. Postanovlenie Pravitelstva RF, 2010). The key issue about the migration of academic talent in the current globalized environment, however, is not about the search for the way to stop it, as some Russian politicians suggest (Putin, 2013), but in the need for closer international cooperation between academic institutions and governments in order to reflect better the realities of globalization (Altbach, Reisberg, Rumbley, 2009).

Current progress of internationalization shook the very foundation of the Soviet academic system creating an imperative need for structural changes. Data from Tempus-Phare international academic programs launched in early 1990s and aimed to establish inter-university collaboration between EU countries and the countries of the former Soviet Bloc, demonstrate that during the last two decades academic systems of Eastern Europe and former USSR republics abolished Soviet curriculum organization and management policies (Kalinauckas, 1998). Now they are rapidly installing Western models of higher education, and merging into the EU higher education integral system (Balmforth, 2011; Gwyn, Slavova, 1997). At the same time, deep inequalities undergird many of the current trends in internationalization in higher education, and they too need to be understood. A few countries prevail in global scientific systems. New technologies are owned primarily by multinational corporations, or academic institutions in the major Western industrialized nations, and the domination of English creates advantages for the countries that use English as the medium of instruction and research (Altbach, 2010). For the Russian academia this means the increase of dependency upon the major academic



superpowers in the last decades as well, with the growing need of responding to such reality with the adequate international academic policy.

Global process of commodification arrived to Russian higher education during the last decades. Seeking for well-paid jobs in the new, market-oriented economy, Russian students rapidly transformed into requestors of applicable knowledge, while domestic and global industries became demanding clients for the graduates. Market relations more and more rule the university policies in Russia and state universities have to compete with the emerging private sector in Russian higher education (Kisilev, 2010; Dovejko, 2011). Therefore, internationalization in Russia converted from being part of a political reformation into becoming a vital component of the market transformation of the national economy. Internationalization became a crucial force for the establishment of a new state educational system aimed at different social goals and rooted into different community values. Internationalization suggests not just new opportunities in cross-national communication and collaborations, or new types of learning establishments with new forms of study environment, but introduces a new organizational model into Russian national higher education. Many Russian educators and politicians name this process as “Westernization” and associate this positively with a change toward association with the industrialized, developed world (Ivanova, 2005). Others, use the same term in a negative sense, meaning the conversion from a solid, well organized, and scientifically productive Soviet higher education to the unknown, market-oriented and in this sense “anti-scholarly” Western academic system (Fionova, 2006; Kara-Murza, 2008). The main-road in Russian academia is after those who are willing for it to become an essential part of the world academic network and integrate with the European university space

(Filippov, Chistohvalov, 2003; Morozova, 2006; Pavlenko, 2006). Yet, it is still an ongoing and difficult process of transformation and Russian academia represents part of the modern Russian changing society. These important, though specific, features of internationalization in Russian higher education should be considered in the evaluation of its progress. It has to be a multifaceted study that includes the analysis of the historical heritage of the Russian higher education, and at the same time accounts the components of the ongoing transformation in the Russian society, influencing on the developments in legislation and administration practice of the national higher education.

This dissertation aims to provide such research, by presenting specifics in the development of Soviet-Russian higher education within the historical progression, and analyzing the place and the format of internationalization within modern Russian academia, while at the same time providing a comparative study of differences in development of internationalization in the West and in Russia. The resources discussed in my dissertation are intended as a map to navigate the trends of international higher education of the Russian state and the modern complex of relations between academe and society, both nationally and globally.

#### *Research Design and Methodology*

This dissertation study is intend to answer the research questions above using comparative analysis to examine data from 20<sup>th</sup> century Russian and Soviet legal, state and statistical sources. Documents and materials related to academic management that have been produced at the institutional, local and federal levels in the last decade will be examined to establish modern course of development of Russian academia. A historical portion, consisting of Chapters 3-5, is devoted to the analysis of the epistolary heritage of

Marx and Engels, works of Russian and European Marxists, and leaders of the Bolshevik Party that form theoretical basis of the Soviet concept of higher education; and an examination of the documents, constituting legal foundation and daily performance of Soviet higher education system and its international academic practices during the period of 1917-1991. Formerly classified records from Russian archives that were recently revealed to public access, broadly used in the current study. Data from the following sources has been collected and analyzed: political statements, speeches of the political leaders, statesmen, educators of the Soviet Union; official directives and instructions of the federal and local administrative establishments of the USSR Communist Party; Soviet federal and local legislation about national academia; formal documentation of the Soviet state administrative bodies that governed higher educational institutions; collections of statistical materials; and scholarly publications on the subject, produced in the USSR and worldwide. Historical method, built mostly on the critical and comparative analysis of the historical documents, is the basic research approach in this part of the study. This historical analysis is mainly aimed to situate the current issue of internationalization of Russian higher education into a broader historical and international policy context.

Examination of the post-Soviet stage of Russian higher education, presented in Chapters 6-7, is based partially on a critical analysis of the federal and local documents governing Russian academia and its international policy, and partially on the quantitative study of statistics and other numeric data. Quantitative research method is applied in work with data from different sources, including digitally presented in the Internet collections of materials of the Ministry of Education of Russian Federation. It allows measuring valuable parameters of the current Russian higher education and its

international activities. Materials related to the inter-government, international and inter-university programs involving Russian federal educational authorities or Russian higher education institutions are also used. This data is collected mostly from the published or electronic sources of United Nations (UN), EU DG XXII Committee, European Training Foundation (ETF), UNESCO, British Council (BC), DAAD, World Bank, Soros, Ford, USIA and other international foundations and organizations. The research objective of this segment of the study is to present the results of the ongoing structural reorganization of Russian higher education and reformation of its international academic policy comparative to the Soviet educational doctrine. This should help to determine the essence and specifics of modern internationalization progress in the Russian academia.

The final part of the thesis incorporates analysis of the response of Russian academia to the increased implementation of internationalization into the national higher education at the institutional level. Analysis of data received from modern studies produced in Russia in the last decade present possible prospects of internationalization at the institutional level. I present a current interpretation of internationalization and evaluate the influence of Bologna process on the progress of internationalization in Russian higher education. Therefore, this dissertation study may help to illustrate the current expectations of Russian academia regarding the progress of internationalization at the individual and institutional levels.

At its core, this dissertation research asks “how” and “why” questions about international academic policy formation in Russia during its Soviet and post-Soviet periods, and integrates the responses of Russian academia to the progress of internationalization on federal and institutional levels.

Plan of Dissertation - Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized to present an overview of internationalization policies and their impacts on the national academia during different periods of Russian higher education in a historical context. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study, describing the research questions and methodology of the research. Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature regarding higher education and internationalization, and classifies publications devoted to the international educational policies of Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia. This chapter provides background information that establishes the context for subsequent chapters. Chapter 3 explores theoretical foundation of Communist Academia as proposed in the Marxist thesis of a harmonious proletarian society. This theory formed an important basis of Lenin's perception of World Revolution, and underpins the conceptual framework of Soviet academia. The remainder of the study is divided into two sections, as follows:

The first section (Chapters 4-5) presents the essence of the Soviet higher education paradigm, its key organizational principles, and differences from the Western university model. It explains the role of international activities for Russian higher education during the seventy years of the Soviet era. The study determines types of international practices a Russian university could experience prior to Perestroika reforms of the 1990s. The research defines the international trends in Russian academia through the Soviet period and presents the starting conditions for internationalization progress in Russian higher education.

The second section (Chapters 6-7) is dedicated to the analysis of the essence and specifics of the international policy of Russian academia during the post-Soviet period of

1992-2007. It addresses the role of internationalization in the reformation of the Russian higher education system that has progressed rapidly in the last two decades. The emergence of private higher education, elimination of government bias toward engineering specialties, diversification of financial sources instead of a sole reliance on state financing, and introduction of dozens of new degree programs and courses - these and many other innovations are the direct result of internationalization escalating nowadays in Russian higher education. Using data from modern academic studies produced in Russia, I explore the impact of internationalization on the current reformation process ongoing in Russian academia, and assess the effects of internationalization on Russian universities. This analysis illustrates the essence and intensity of internationalization in Russian academe today as compared to the international practices of Soviet higher education. In conclusion, I outline the primary reasons that Russian educators participate in international activities on national, institutional and individual levels. Examination of the role of the Western promotion of internationalization into the Russian university system allows me to evaluate the efficiency of West-East collaboration in the field, and to envision prospects of Russian higher education in the global academic community.

*Conclusion: Academic Contribution of the Study and Implications for Practice*

Internationalization is a very real, yet highly understudied phenomenon in Russian higher education. Considering modern development of internationalization being a practical manifestation of cross-national trends in higher education in the era of globalization, it is essential to determine if this universal progression has any specific characteristics for the Russian academe. The internationalization of higher education in

Russia is closely integrated with profound political transition in the country, following the dramatic collapse of the Soviet Union and disintegration of the "Communist Bloc" in the 1990s. Russian national academia found itself in the turmoil of rapidly changing society, facing new political and economic agendas. Academics and administrators, students and faculty, university and state - all the players in Russian higher education suddenly faced the unprecedented reality of an "Open Society". These important though specific features of academic life in modern Russia seriously influenced the nature of internationalization progress in national higher education.

This research provides a comprehensive examination of the internationalization issue for Russian higher education today and in its historical progression, its implications for the higher education industry in Russia, and the preparedness of the Russian higher education to respond to significant change in its status quo. Assessing legislation and organizational structure of Soviet and Post-Soviet academia side-by-side reveals both the conflicts and the alignments between structure and policy for Russian higher education. Throughout this study, I have tried to link historical materials and current data into a cohesive examination of the development of internationalization in Russian academia and its impact on the national higher education structure and policy. Using secondary research sources in addition to literature published by higher education government authorities regarding internationalization policies and activities involving Russian academia provided significant and valuable data. Through this data and via creating distinctive research findings, I was able both to synthesize the collective issues surrounding internationalization policies concerning Russian higher education and to shed some light on organizational and institutional problems that may, in fact, be

something of a broader, even national, concern for the Russian academia. The data may serve as a basis for shaping an understanding of Russian higher education as it is impacted by international policies and responses to practices of internationalization.

Internationalization is promoting a dramatic reformation of the Russian university structure, one of the major - if not the most principal - changes in the history of Russian academia. For researchers of higher education, policy makers and the international university community, it is certainly vital to have a precise picture of how internationalization is progressing in the leading state of the former Communist Bloc. Russia entered 21<sup>st</sup> century as a transformed society, albeit still the largest country in the world and a key member of the global community. Therefore, study of internationalization progress in Russian academia has international value, although in English there is almost no discussion at all on this topic. Scholars all over the world repeatedly emphasize that hardly any research has been done to examine the phenomenon of internationalization in Russian higher education, underlining the importance of such a study (Zhivotovskaya, 2001; Sadlak, 2000; Slepukhin, 2004). The Russian higher education system emerged from the Soviet university paradigm, which probably was the most state-controlled and the least liberal academic structure in the history of higher education. Today the Russian university system keeps the Soviet tradition of uniformity, top-down command administration, and declares the preparation of a professional cadre for national industry as its major objective (Fursenko, 2006a). At the same time, Russian and Western scholars often agree that starting in the 1990s Russian academe has entered a completely new, post-Soviet phase in its progress (Baidenko, 1999b; Scott, 1998). Internationalization is usually named as an imperative component of this transformation,



which made Russian higher education an organic part of academic globalization process (Zaretskaya, 2001a; Sadlak, 2000). The parameters of the conversion of the Russian academia to its "post-Soviet" status however, remain unclear. Neither Russian nor Western scholarly literature defines distinctly the difference between the international practices of Soviet higher education and the internationalization of modern Russian academia. It is crucial to understand the place of internationalization in the recent reforms of the Russian academic system in order to determine the social mission and the global position of Russian higher education today. The Russian Education Act of 1992 allowed international academic activities to be initiated, performed and managed at the institutional level. Since then for almost two decades Russian universities have been trying to establish direct contacts with the foreign academic institutions and develop academic exchanges, collaborative research, develop joint degree programs and promote participation of their students and faculty in international grant programs. Internationalization progressed in Russia nationwide indeed, being now not only the policy of the federal government, but of the university authorities as well.

New international trends happening in Russian academia and their aftereffects call for the scholarly analysis. Much more research is needed in a broad spectrum of areas related to internationalization of Russian higher education, including an examination of institutional leadership and how it affects decision-making around internationalization; faculty research and institutional and departmental support for areas of studies; the increase of foreign student populations at Russian universities, growth of the number of Russians studying in abroad; pursuit of the Russian government and Russian academia towards nostrification of Russian academic degrees and diplomas in the Western

countries; expansion of campus programs to include greater exposure to international issues and studies, and much more. This research will provide a focused look at a specific issue of status and development of the international dimension in the Russian higher education as it evolves in the era of globalization. The study of internationalization strategies and outcomes of the Russian academia will provide data and analysis, allowing institutions and leaders of modern Russian higher education to embrace the potential of globalization, while pushing back against any negative ramifications.

## **Chapter 2: Review of the Literature**

This chapter seeks to establish a core understanding of the literature that intersects both research of internationalization and research of Russian higher education. This is a complicated task, because these academic areas are incredibly broad, and they have been studied mostly apart from one another. When the historical progression of Russian academia and development of internationalization in higher education are examined in conjunction, many aspects of current Russian educational policy and its applications become clear, including promotion of organizational reformation, curricula innovations, and commodification.

Internationalization now is at the center of attention of the specialists in higher education worldwide (Currie, 2003; Enders, 2004; Salmi, 2009; Streitwieser, 2013). Numerous publications on the subject were produced through the last two decades where authors unanimously depict internationalization being a universal trend of modern global academe. In fact, all educators talk about the beginning of a new era - higher education with no cultural boundaries or national borders (Knight, 2006; Green, Marmolejo, Egron-Polak, 2010; Qiang, 2003; Varghese, 2009). With all the multifaceted and complex nature of changes introduced by internationalization to the higher education systems of the West, the magnitude of transformations taking place in the former Soviet realm and its birthplace, - Russia - is much larger (Arzhanova, 2010; Froumin, 2011; Sadlak, 1995; Scott, 2002).

How do scholars define the origin of internationalization, progressing now in Russian academia? Do publications on the subject consider that internationalization provides a modern international dimension to the traditional Russian academic system,

without deconstructing the Soviet nature of its organization? Or should the promotion of internationalization be interpreted as a complete transformation of the original Soviet university paradigm into a new higher educational system, international in its academic context? It is most imperative to understand the academic interpretation of global internationalization process by scholars worldwide. The first part of this chapter is aimed at analyzing primary literature about the phenomenon of internationalization and its connotations. The next section of the chapter presents opinions of Western and Russian scholars about Russian higher education in its historical progression from the Soviet to post-Soviet times and international activities of the Russian academe in different periods of history.

*Principal Literature on Internationalization*

There are quite a number of publications analyzing the phenomenon of internationalization in higher education worldwide. The following authors could be defined as major beacons in the field, presenting internationalization in global academia from different aspects: Peter Scott (2000a, 2009, 2010) gives an overall perspective for the current progress of internationalization globally; Philip Altbach (2002a, 2004a, 2006, 2013) provides a thorough examination of the integration process between higher education systems of the industrialized North and of the developing South; Jane Knight (2003, 2006, 2010) introduces the “circle of internationalization activities” on institutional and national levels; Peter Magrath (2000, 2003, 2010) shares his vision on the future of the US university system in the era of internationalization and predicts that the extension network of the American state universities should become international, considering that only internationalized universities will form the core of American

academe in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Hans de Wit (2000, 2002, 2011) presents a comparative analysis of internationalization progress in Europe and in the USA in a historical and social perspective; Ulrich Tischler (1999, 2003, 2009) studies internationalization imperatives within the university community of European Union; Marijk van der Wende (2007, 2009) examines European responses to global competitiveness in higher education. Two key topics are the focus of the prominent scholars in the field: the essence of internationalization and the current application of internationalization. The profound study of the subject has been primarily done in the USA and in Europe. This seems very logical because the international dimension of higher education has become a traditional part of university policy and academic improvement in the Western world.

There is a great debate about the precise meaning of the term “internationalization” in the field of higher education. Prior to 1980s, *international education* was the favored term describing the international aspects in academia (Knight, 1994; De Wit, 1999). Later, a swarm of new terms, like, *comparative education*, *global education*, and *multicultural education* came into intensive use and discussion centered on differentiating the term *international education* from all the rest (Aigner, Nelson, Stimpfl, 1992; Davies, 1992; Harari, 1989). At the same time, in late 1980s, *internationalization* became the most popular term used in academic literature. By the mid-1990s internationalization was commonly defined at the institutional level as the “process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight, 1994, p.7). However, right from the beginning and all through the nineties internationalization often carried very different meaning for different researchers. Some scholars defined it with a series of international activities such as academic

mobility for students and teachers (Ebuchi, 1989; Mauch, Spaulding, 1992; Laureys, 1992); as international linkages, partnerships, and projects (Klasek, 1992; Weifang, 1999); or as new, international academic programs and research initiatives (Burn, Smuckler, 1995); and, even as the multiple activities, programs and services that fall within international studies, international educational exchange and technical cooperation (Arum, Van de Water, 1992). For other researchers internationalization meant the delivery of education to other countries through new types of arrangements such as branch campuses or franchises using a variety of face-to-face and distance teaching techniques (Davis, 2000; Sedgwick, 2002). To many scholars, internationalization stands for the inclusion of an international, intercultural, and/or global dimension into the curriculum and teaching learning process (Bond, 2006; Knight, 2003; Tubbeh, Williams, 2010). With the introduction of *globalization* as a new definition describing international developments progressing in higher education worldwide, the situation with terminology became even more complex. Despite extensive research available on the topic even academic coryphaei admit that it is difficult to distinguish the difference between globalization and internationalization (Altbach, 2004a).

Jane Knight (1994) was the pioneer among scholars to consolidate key organizational models of internationalization strategies and rationales practiced globally, and to suggest them in some logical format. The result of her vast efforts was presented in the “Internationalization Circle” concept explained in the publication “Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints” (1994) and further developed in the subsequent works of the author (Knight, 1999, 2003, 2004). Internationalization Circle is a continuous sequence of awareness, commitment, planning, operationalizing, review,

and reinforcement promoted by an academic institution (Knight, 1994, p.12). Knight's cycle notion extends beyond a linear configuration to the level of a complex paradigm, which bonds supportive culture of an institution integrating internationalization with the broader national and inter global framework, extending the traditional parameters of a higher education setting (Knight, 1994). Presenting the Cycle model, Knight (2004) speaks of two levels of internationalization: institutional and national/sector. She suggests using both, a bottom-up (institutional) and a top-down (national/sector) approach to examine the dynamic relationship between these two levels and to study internationalization progress in its complexity (Knight, 2004, p.6-7). Jane Knight (2004) provides the most detailed analysis of the development of the definition "internationalization" in higher education literature during the last two decades. The difference between internationalization and globalization according to Knight (2004, 2008) is that internationalization is changing the world of higher education, while globalization is changing the world of internationalization (Knight, 2004, p.4). She recommends the following working definition: Internationalization is the process of integration of an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education at the national/sector, and institutional levels (Knight, 2003, p. 2).

Philip Altbach (2002a), states that internationalization, while being a major trend in higher education and a worldwide phenomenon, is widely misunderstood (p.17). He suggests considering "globalization" as a term referring to the fundamental developments in higher education that have cross-national implications, such as mass higher education, a global marketplace for students and scholars, and the global reach of the new Internet-

based technologies (Altbach, 2002a). “Internationalization” is defined by Altbach (2002b) as a variation of practical initiatives of countries and individual academic institutions or systems to deal with those global trends. Examples of internationalization include policies relating to recruitment of foreign students, collaboration with academic institutions or systems in other countries, establishment of branch campuses in abroad (Altbach, 2002b). In this paradigm internationalization is positioned as a practical implication of globalization on the national or institutional levels (Altbach 2002a, p. 219-224). Philip Altbach (2004) does not consider modern internationalization in higher education as a unique and unusual phenomenon. He believes that today’s global processes in academe have long standing precedents. Since the Middle Ages academia has interacted beyond campuses and across national borders (Altbach, 2004). Besides, the European university model was disseminated globally and now prevails as the world’s most adopted academic paradigm (Altbach, 2004a, p.5).

Altbach (2006) concentrates on the study of the traditional direction of global flows of scholars and students from the “Third World” or South to industrialized world or North. Altbach (2004a) comes to the vastly substantiated deduction that modern internationalization is adding a new dimension to existing disparities in higher education, making it highly inequitable (p.24). He cautions about the growing gap between research universities-centers of the developed countries and mass higher education of the peripheries (Altbach, Reisberg, Rumbley, 2009). The key implication of the author is in the importance of promotion of equal academic relationships to ensure that globalization does not turn into the academic neocolonialism of the 21st century (Altbach, 2004a, p.25).



At the same time, Peter Scott (1999, 2002) suggests another format of defining the difference between internationalization and globalization. Scott (1999) considers internationalization as the preceding stage to globalization in the development of higher education (p.3-4). Globalization is explained by Scott (2002) as a new phenomenon that brings cardinal changes into modern higher education, shaking and sometimes breaking national boundaries. He regards globalization as “the most fundamental challenge faced by the University in its long history” (Scott, 1999, p.5). In his major publications “The Globalization of Higher Education” (1998) and “Higher Education Re-formed” (2000a), Peter Scott provides comparative global perspectives in international education. Scott (1998) believes, that rooted in the original idea of liberal knowledge, higher education institutions are naturally integrated worldwide by the pursuit of the same communal purpose of intellectual progress and humanism. He argues that universities and academic systems all over the world seek ways of making themselves attractive to overseas students and to build links with universities in other countries to enhance their global reach (Scott, 2000a). According to Scott (1999) internationalization is the result of modern global economy and the internationalization trends worldwide are driven by the market imperatives.

Hans de Wit (2000) provides an insightful and thought-provoking analysis of the historical and conceptual context of internationalization in modern academia. In his principal study “Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States and Europe” (2002), De Wit argues that even though there have always been international elements in higher education, dating back to the medieval roots of the university, internationalization was not the primary goal of academe until after WWII (p.2-4).

Following Altbach's concept of defining internationalization as the practical manifestation of global processes in higher education, De Wit (2002) suggests that internationalization is tightly connected to world politics through modern history. De Wit (2002) concludes that with all the diversity of related terms and debates on the difference between "internationalization and international education," this phenomenon should be definitely understood as an essential part of modern globalization (p.1). Hans de Wit (2002) suggests that even within the Western higher education paradigm, internationalization had varied motivations and different conceptual contexts over time (p.2-4). In Europe, the most significant outcome of internationalization according to De Wit (2002) is in the creation of "the sole educational space" in Europe, which is the basic step toward the establishment of the Knowledge Society (p. 108-111). H. de Wit (2009) argues that internationalization is the driving force for most of the changes happening currently in European academia.

According to Peter Magrath (2010), a university that is not international today is not a university. Magrath believes that the most important challenge of global academia in the era of internationalization is the impact onto academic profession and curriculum (Magrath 2010). Extensive structural changes considerably transform the traditional position of scholars worldwide. Scholars are being converted from the representatives of national educational systems into universal academics, and now are usually identified not with the country of residence but with a research field or an academic subject. Administration of every university worldwide follows global rules and international regulations nowadays as well, being actually funded, operated, marketed and accredited internationally (Magrath, 2000).

In analyzing the challenge of internationalization for higher education in Europe in the 1990s, Ulrich Teichler (1999) distinguishes three substantial qualitative changes “...ongoing in internationalization of higher education in European societies: - from a predominantly “vertical” pattern of cooperation and mobility, towards dominance of international relationship on equal terms; - from casuistic action towards systematic policies of internationalization; - from a disconnection of specific international activities...towards an integrated internationalization of higher education.” According to Teichler (2000), practical steps taken in the direction of academic internationalization in European Union and consolidated in the Bologna Declaration devalue former rules of relationship between national university systems and lead to a neutral and united “sole educational space.” European educators often refer to it as the Global Society of Knowledge. Teichler (2003) trusts in the glorious future of the Knowledge Society concept and considers internationalization as the major practical tool for its establishment globally.

The list of prominent scholars addressing issues of academic internationalization and studying various aspects of its progression could be endless. It would certainly have to include Marginson (2000), studying trajectories in a networked global educational environment; Carnoy (1999) and Enders (2004), analyzing changing modes of governance in higher education and future of the academic profession in the Knowledge Society; Newman and Couturier (2002), scrutinizing marketization in higher education; Jan Currie (1998, 2003), presenting institutional policy responses and criticizing growing managerialism of the scholarly community. The voices discussing internationalization are largely Western. It is quite conspicuous that not only the research around issues of

internationalization in higher education emanates largely from North American, European and Australian sources, but also its data is drawn principally from those areas of the world. Few research publications represent the other parts of academia; examples of such important work include Powar (2001), Strydom (2002), and Huang (2003), who present modern trends of internationalisation in the university systems of India, South Africa and China respectively. They provide in-depth case studies of the challenges and opportunities developing countries face as they pursue internationalization. Focused on India, Powar's book offers a valuable perspective on how developing countries think about internationalization issues through the prism of long-standing concern about "brain drain" (Powar, 2001). Implementation of the strategy for the transition to a knowledge-based economy in Korea is based on the notion of internationalization as presented in the interesting study conducted by Dahlman and Andersson (2000) in the framework of a World Bank project. In the study of EU policies promoting academic internationalization Kalvermark and van de Wende (1997) note that some real progress has been made in injecting an international dimension into the decision-making about national higher education in some of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Ultimately, although some researchers like Taylor (2004) assert that the emergence of internationalization in higher education is well documented, it is difficult to disagree with De Wit (2005) that internationalization as a field of research is still at a decidedly "territorial" stage of analysis. Many excellent single studies are being conducted, however no consensus exists on the size and shape of the field of enquiry, nor any consistent conceptual framework, taxonomy, terminology or methodology (De Wit, Callan, 1995, p.68). A number of scholars use internationalization to refer to some

practical form of academic management and new form of international higher education institution that arrives instead of the old national organizational format (Waterhouse, 2005; Cunningham, Ryan, Stedman, Tapsall, Bagdon, Flew, Coaldrake, 2000; Soderqvist, 2007). Some authors note that modern internationalization is perceived by many academics of the Developing World as a negative notion of “Westernization” or “Americanization” of global higher education (Sadlak, 2000). Others claim that internationalization promotes the growth of inequality between academic systems worldwide, while at the same time delivers uniformity or “McDonaldization” in global academia (Hayes, Wynyard, 2002). With all the variety of opinions from presenting “internationalization” and “globalization” as interchangeable terms (Lim, 1995) to being “unconnected trends” (Teichler, 1999), academics unanimously perceive internationalization as one of the key challenges for modern higher education.

Given the myriad of factors that are affecting internationalization both within and external to the education sector plus the accelerated pace of change, it is no wonder that *internationalization* is being used in a variety of ways and for different purposes. The description of internationalization as a practical policy of academic institutions or national academic systems reflecting global changes, introduced by Altbach (1998, 2002c) and shared by de Wit (2002), Knight (2003) and other professionals in the field, seems to be the most explicit and logical interpretation of the modern trends in global academia.

Internationalization of higher education is in its zenith globally and comprehensive polygonal research efforts of the scholarly community are needed. Clear understanding of the term “internationalization,” and explanation of theoretical basis of this phenomenon

provided in the major academic publications discussed above, helps greatly in an analysis of the international dimension of the Russian international higher education. Definition of internationalization as a practical policy of higher educational institutions and national academic systems suggests a logical framework for research on international trends in Russian higher education during its historical progression.

*Internationalization and Soviet Higher Education*

The historiography of Soviet education describing its philosophy, methodology and major phases of its practical development is quite substantial. Thousands of publications have been issued through the last ninety years in the West and in Russia describing Lenin's theory of creation of a "New Man," Bolshevik practice of "Cultural Revolution," academic reforms and scientific achievements of the USSR after WWII. At the same time, it is hardly possible to find a single book devoted specifically to the analysis of the international trends in Soviet higher education system in its historical and conceptual context.

Scholarly literature on the internationalization of Soviet academia is virtually non-existent. Almost all publications issued worldwide on the subject of Soviet higher education are conducted by historians and carry on the tradition of analysis focused on the political issues in the USSR and around it at a particular moment of history presenting facts and events in a chronological order. This review follows a similar pattern and sequence. There is a sharp differentiation between scholarly publications about Soviet higher education produced in the West and in Russia. Soviets wrote massively about national higher education, praising its progress through the "decades of glorious construction of Communism in the best educated country of the world" (Butyagin,

Saltanov, 1957). However, in the ocean of numerous publications written in the USSR about “...outstanding achievements of Soviet academia, indisputably acknowledged globally” (Egorov, 1968, p.27) there could hardly be named a single book that would meet the definition of scientific research. Outside loquacious veneration of the role of the Communist Party and extensive citation of Marx, Lenin and Stalin, most Russian books provide only a chronology of events that happened on different levels of Soviet higher education, including institutional, regional, and federal. International aspects of national academia were hardly mentioned by Soviet authors. Except for a few recent articles, all Russian publications about Soviet academia have an obvious political focus. Soviet literature on the subject could be classified into the several categories. The largest portion would occupy history books depicting grandiose achievements of the Soviet academia through the hardships of the years of “Socialism construction” in 1920-30s (Galkin, 1958; Medynskiy, 1947), heroic post-war reconstruction in 1940-50s (Kravec, 1967; Nuzhin, 1975) and the glorious period of building the Communism edifice in 1960-70s (Chanbarisov, 1988; Ladyzhetc, 1992). Most usually these publications were prepared by designated academics in the frame of a “scholarly production plan,” which was mandatory for each university and was directed straight from the Communist Party Central Committee (Chutkerashvili, 1968; Katuntseva, 1977; Safrazyan, 1977). Another category of publications is presented by the “jubilee collections” issued at various anniversary dates, and often published in several languages (Socialisticheskoe Obrazovanie, 1937; Obrazovanie i Nauka, 1957; Elutin, 1967). Books of this type didn’t contain explanatory or analytical portions. Their goal was to demonstrate grandiose achievements of the Soviet education system and present its global superiority. Finally,

there is a set of several huge volumes that summarize “the magnificent march of Soviet education to a vanguard position in global academia” (Nesmeyanov, 1970; Prokofiev, 1967; Konstantinov, Medynskiy, Shabaev, 1982). Such publications, however, didn’t contain comparative analysis of Soviet higher education with other academic systems. The authors didn’t have a need to justify their conclusions, as the major one was quite obvious to the readers – Soviet higher education is the best in the world, because it is Soviet. The same numeric data is used by the authors repeatedly, not to provide proof of their statements, but to illustrate the expected conclusion. Almost all these books were edited by leaders of Soviet education, who officially governed the Ministry of Education of the USSR at one time or another (Lunacharskiy, 1927; Bubnov, 1931; Elutin, 1959; Stoletov, 1975; Filippov, 1993). Few of those books touch in passing the subject of my interest and describe “the outstanding role of Soviet scientists and educators in training international specialists for the friendly countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America” (Filippov, 1993). One exception is the book of Elutin (1980), who served as the head of Federal Department of Higher Education of the USSR for more than thirty years between 1954 and 1985. Describing international activities of Soviet higher education, Elutin (1980) presents extensive data about the “training of foreign specialists in Soviet higher institutions; international dissemination of progressive Soviet experience in teaching methodology; participation of the Soviet academics in the activities of international organizations devoted to culture, science, and education; development of creative international communication among students” (p.121-122). The author concludes proudly that these activities helped to improve higher education in the USSR and to further the intellectual and socioeconomic progress of mankind (Elutin, 1980, p.158). Elaborating



about the importance of “constructive possibilities of international cooperation in modern academia” and providing interesting statistics about post-WWII foreign students’ mobility to the USSR, Elutin (1980) suggests no valuable reasoning or analysis of international trends in Soviet academia.

Despite their huge numbers, Soviet publications on higher education are primarily collections of data, assortments of materials, and compilations of historical chronicles. They present a total lack of scholarly research, academic analysis and author’s personal positions or conclusions. Russians didn’t produce qualified experts to research the field because “university administration” or “higher education management” didn’t exist at all in the Soviet directory of professions. University educators were considered as pedagogy specialists in the USSR, and were supposed to study teaching methods, curriculum development and learning means. The whole bundle of Russian literature about Soviet higher education published before the 1990s should be placed into the “Data Sources” section where it really belongs.

By the beginning of Perestroika, Soviet higher education was much more “terra incognita” to the Russians than to the outside world. Publications that appeared in Russia in the last two decades prove that statement. Most of them are concentrated on the criticism of the discovered state policy of “residual principle of funding” of Soviet academia in 1970-80s (Dyatlov, 1995; Shlenov, 2001; Vladimirov, 1997); and revelation of the mass purges in Academy of Sciences during the Stalin rule (Arefieva, 1995; Dgakipova, 1991; Levin, 1988). Almost every author writing at the time mentions in the introduction that Soviet higher education has hardly ever been seriously researched,

especially in the international context, being “the blank spot of Soviet history” (Davydov, 1997; Zhukov, 2001).

Two books published recently in Russia deserve special attention. One is the study of Chanbarisov (1988), who is the first Russian scholar to make an attempt to research the process of establishment and organizational formation of the Soviet university system before WWII. The author does not have a special section devoted to the analysis of the international activities of the Soviet academia, but provides detailed description of new types of higher institutions – Institutes of Red Professors where foreigners studied as well (Chanbarisov, 1988, p.42-48). Sverdlov Communist Academy is portrayed in the book as the “first in the world truly international educational establishment” where Russian future commissars studied together with their comrades from Germany, Hungary, Mongolia and China (Chanbarisov, 1988, p.46). The author concludes that the Soviet higher education system is the most progressive organizational pattern for academe, where the “old-fashioned concept of liberal education is replaced by the efficiency of polytechnic vocational training, transforming university from the bourgeois establishment for the elite classes into the blacksmith of professional cadre for the practical needs of the Soviet peoples” (Chanbarisov, 1988, p. 64).

The other book is the research of Anatoly Avrus “History of Russian Universities” (2001). The author tries to provide the complete chronology of Russian university system from the 18<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, as well as present socio-political status of Russian academia and its internal problems in different periods of national history. Avrus (2001) considers himself a pioneer in the analytical study of the field (p.5). Avrus (2001) suggests that Russia has a unique university system of its own, and it

occupies an exclusive niche in global academia (p.4). He believes that despite of all the organizational experiments of Soviet period, Russian national higher education kept the major values of the classical university paradigm and had positive improvements (Avrus, 2001, p.82). A special section of the book is devoted to the development of international trends in Soviet academia after WWII. In just a few pages the author presents the activities of the Moscow University of People's Friendship and explains the burst of foreign student mobility to Russia in 1960s as the result of Khrushchev's "political thaw" (Avrus, 2001, p.56-58). Avrus (2001) believes that due to well-known achievements in space exploration, application of nuclear energy, cybernetics and so on, Soviet academia had become globally recognized as one of the world leaders in higher education at that time. However, not much data is provided to prove the statement. He hopes that modern progress of Russian higher education will bring national university back to the level of prestige that Soviet academia used to have worldwide (Avrus, 2001, p.83).

Outside Russia Soviet higher education has been studied quite intensively. There were several major waves of interest to Soviet higher education during last century. I'll try to follow these phases in a chronological order, indicating the most significant publications for the subject of this review. Firstly, there were publications related to the Bolshevik plan of construction of the Soviet educational system and its implementation through the period of Cultural Revolution. The first works on this subject appeared in the 1920s (Pinkevich, 1929; Harper, 1929; Woody, 1932) and research of the subject continues nowadays (David-Fox, 1997; Tolz, 1997). The process of reformation of the Russian academic system done by the Bolshevik regime seems to be well analyzed. However, the angle of analysis was always very political. Western educators and

historians have an underlying consensus that the changes were focused on the introduction of the Communist ideology as a mandatory part of the university curriculum, complete state governance of the educational institutions, and social transformation of academic population into the “educated proletariat” (Avis, 1990; David-Fox, Peteri, 2000; Hechinger, 1967). Yet, there is still quite a mixture of positions about the very definition of “Soviet Higher Education.” Two approaches dominate in the literature: political and ideological.

The classical apologist of the political rationalization of the paradigm of Soviet higher education M. Shore (1947) presents it as an essential part of Lenin’s plan for global Communist conquest. The introduction of Marxist ideology and polytechnic principles into the national university system, the proletarianization of academia, and other efforts of Bolsheviks are considered by the author as definitive proof of the political mission of Soviet Education (Shore, 1947). Shore (1947) comes to the conclusion that Soviet leadership struggles hard to spread the “Sovietism in education” globally, as part of the ambition of the Russian Communists for World Revolution (p.143).

One of the promoters of the theoretical conceptualization of the Soviet higher education is George Avis (1983, 1987), who devoted several publications to the subject. The author investigates the philosophical foundation of Soviet education and its ultimate goals. Avis (1987) presents the usual notion of the Soviet academia following Lenin’s directive to imbue youth with communist ideals. Every school or university had the strict task of molding the "builders of communism" to place the communal interests of society before their own individual ones (Avis, 1987). At the same time, Avis (1987) argues that the essence of Soviet educational paradigm was not in the political agenda, but in the dual

concept of rearing and educating. Avis (1987) considers Soviet academic system as an educational paradigm that aimed to provide the nation's economy with a qualified and highly skilled labor force. The major focus on polytechnic education in Soviet universities is presented as a reasonable, even progressive integration of formal knowledge and practical training.

The other topic of scholarly discussion in the Western historiography of Soviet higher education relates to the historical and international status of Soviet higher education system in the period of its establishment. Some authors present the emergence of the Soviet higher education as a catastrophic deconstruction of the classical pan-European university system that existed in Russia since the 18<sup>th</sup> century (McClelland 1971; Kassow, 1989). A very interesting interpretation of the international standing of Soviet academia is presented by Besancon (1974). Analyzing mostly pre-Soviet Russian higher education, the author gives an interesting comparative analysis of the classical university education in Tsarist Russia and in the USSR. Besancon (1974) believes that the Soviet regime interrupted the connection of Russian academia with the outer world. The author claims that since 1917 and till the mid-1970s, when the book was published, Soviet higher education was in total isolation, and didn't have any international context (Besancon, 1974, p. 107-116). S. Fitzpatrick (1970) to the contrary, suggests that Soviet academia tried to integrate its national specifics with international educational trends. Communists had to keep communication between Soviet scholars and their European colleagues open, forcing Russian academics to define their position in the interplay of several powers: native political autocracy, the international scientific community and the emerging Soviet society (Fitzpatrick, 1970). No publications, however, were produced in

the West where international practices of Soviet higher education would have been presented and analyzed specifically.

The next Soviet higher education topic that was traditionally well studied in the West is related to the sadly famous Stalin times. Publications devoted to this period are associated mostly with the formation of Soviet intelligentsia and purges it suffered. The conventional position of Western scholars is well presented by Bailes (1978). Two aspects dominate in depiction of the status of Soviet academia in 1930-40s. Firstly, using vast statistics about numbers of new students and study programs, taken from the Soviet official sources, the author demonstrates the strategic turn of Soviet higher education toward the polytechnic direction, which “changed the backward country into the industrial superpower” (Bailes, 1978, p.70-85). Secondly, he presents the horrors of the mass purges in Soviet academia. Analyzing this dark page in the history of Soviet higher schools, the author expresses his admiration for Soviet academia (Bailes, 1978). Despite the years of Stalin terror and total isolation from the outer world behind the Iron Curtain, Soviet science maintained a high class of research and kept progressing forward (Bailes, 1978). Not all Western scholars share this perspective on Soviet academia during the Stalin regime. Kline (1957) gives the analysis of the student life in Soviet universities in the 1920-50s, and mentions the existence of international students from “friendly countries and parties”. The author doesn’t elaborate on the matter, but provides enough data to imply that Soviet higher education had some body of international students who integrated academically and socially with Russian students. Konechny (1999) also mentions “friendly comrades” from abroad studying in Russia in the first decades of the Soviet period. He doesn’t provide actual research about the presence of international

students in Russia, but makes it very clear that Soviet academia was not totally isolated from the outer world, as was claimed by the most of the Western researchers.

An attempt to analyze in depth the origin and construction progress of the Soviet university paradigm was made by Michael David-Fox (1997). The author aims to determine why the near extinction of the universities in Soviet Russia turned into the establishment of the new system of higher education during the years of Stalin's Great Break (David-Fox, 1997). He argues that Soviet academia emerged due to the Cultural Revolution of the 1930s (David-Fox, 1997, p.74-75). The years of Stalin's Great Break were a period of particular upheaval and the time when the Bolshevized Academy of Sciences began to transform into a dominant "empire of knowledge" in advanced research (David-Fox, 1997, p.79). At the same time, classical Russian universities were pressed into a subordinated and vocational Soviet mold (David-Fox, 1997, p.86). David-Fox (1997) doesn't research the international context of Soviet academia, but mentions in passing "foreign comrades...who studied in Russia the successful experience of making a revolution." (p. 123).

The major burst of interest in Soviet academia happened in the West in the 1950-60s. After to the famous launch of Sputnik by the Soviets, - boom in publications about Soviet higher education was the major manifestation of "Sputnik-shock" in the USA and Western Europe. Dozens of special academic programs were launched only in the United States, aimed at examining the organization of higher education and science in the USSR. Western research centers and government education agencies were focused on the key question: what educational systems of the West missing or doing inadequate to allow the Soviets to become the vanguard of global academia? Politicians were up in arms, - the

Russians are winning the technological race! (Rickover, 1959). The largest portion of publications issued through this period is concentrated around the study process in Soviet universities. The academic structure of Soviet higher education, including different types of higher schools in the USSR, degree programs and university curricula were thoroughly examined for the first time (Froese, Haas, Anweiler, 1961; Shumilin, 1962; Rosen, 1963). The most detailed study of this kind has been produced by Nicholas DeWitt. In his first book, focused on Soviet professional manpower and vocational training, DeWitt (1955) gives the classical statement that would be repeated in the dozens of books: the Russians have purposefully created “technical intelligentsia” - a special social class of those highly educated in technology, an applied sciences workforce (p.367). In the next volume, DeWitt (1961) addresses some new issues, including the international activities of Soviet higher institutions. He presents the new program of Soviet higher education launched on the order of the Communist Party to supply the national economies of the Soviet satellites with the qualified manpower, primarily technically educated specialists. The author again doesn't give much scholarly analysis of the presented facts. DeWitt (1961) just states that the Soviet policy of training foreign students from friendly communist regimes influenced the professionalism of the manpower in the economies of its satellites (p.230). He considers excellent vocational training of the foreign students to be the key impact of the USSR on the progressive economic development of their home countries. In DeWitt's opinion, the US government should consider the new reality of the Soviets moving fast to the academic domination globally and respond with an adequate national program in the international higher education (DeWitt, 1961).



Soviet science and technology had become the major focus of research for quite a group of the Western authors, reflecting on the famous question of the time: “why the Soviets are outstripping us in education” (Smoot, 1962). Those scholars (Ashby, 1947; Korol, 1957; Graham, 1975) were finding the answer in the structure and function of the Soviet Academy of Science. Using various data material, and producing research in different years Western scholars were yet coming to the same conclusion, - that the Soviets had created a very efficient academic system integrated with the applied research facilities (Korol, 1957; Graham, 1987). The most recent work from this category belongs to L. Graham (1993) and is devoted to the search of reasons for the paradoxical achievements of science in Soviet Union in the conditions of political dictatorship, dogmatic ideology and international isolation.

Complimentary publications about Soviet science have much in common with the cascade of publications about Soviet teachers issued in the West after the Khrushchev education reforms in the 1960s (Redl, 1964; Matthews, 1982). “We have a lot to learn from the Soviets who have science and math at the center of the national educational doctrine...” (Pennar, Bakalo, Bereday, 1971). Redl (1964) praises Soviets, who “launched the most progressive education reforms...” (p.6-7). Matthews (1982) crowns these panegyrics to the Soviet academia, stating that “the development of higher education in the USSR since the death of Stalin is very much a success story of the global magnitude...” (p. 97). Not all Western scholars found the development of Soviet higher education that positive and progressive for mankind. Counts (1957) suggested an unusual research by showing six forces of Soviet education, like revolutionary enthusiasm, Marxism, and populism, are derived the conclusion that the goal of Soviet academia was

purely political. He presents the shocking technological successes of the Russians as part of the master plan of Communists to reach global domination via a “peaceful academic revolution” (Counts, 1957, p.179). The most dazzling comparative analysis of the international standing of the Soviet higher education was suggested by K. Meyer and O. Anweiler (1961), who compared the Soviet academic system to the Nazi system. The authors point to the analogous ideology of global expansion, as an essential part of the academic doctrines of both regimes. Meyer and Anweiler (1961) support their statement with data about the Sovietization of higher education in Eastern Germany.

The other authors who addressed the international aspects of post-WWII Soviet higher education didn't come to equally extreme conclusions, but also considered political interests as the major reasons for the activities of Soviet academia in abroad (Korol, 1957; Edding, 1958; Shumilin, 1962). Attracting foreign students with profound study programs in math and applied sciences, the Russians were serving as trainers of students not only in the friendly Communist Bloc countries but also pushing for mass expansion of Soviet academia globally, spreading it in Asia, and then into Africa (Korol, 1957). Shumilin (1962) and Edding (1958) follow the same pattern of depicting the growing presence of Soviet academia in the Third World using no other data or materials than the official USSR statistics, and providing no examination of the inner characteristics of Soviet higher education. Only after the collapse of Soviet authority in the Eastern Europe did scholars have a chance to study documents and freely discuss the influence of Soviet higher education on the development of academia in countries of the Communist Block through the post-WWII period. Modern researchers (Peteri, 2000; Connelly, 2000) come to a common verdict about Soviet academic system being

instituted by force all over the European domain of the USSR instead of the national university structures.

The last wave of interest to the Soviet higher education is related to the political transformations of Perestroika. Most of the publications issued on the matter in the West are very complimentary to the reforms, signifying the end of the orthodox autocracy in the Russian academia (Jones, 1994; Holmes, Read, Voskresenskaya, 1995). Deriving from the major thesis of the Western historiography on the topic about academic freedoms as a burning issue for the Soviet higher education (Eklof, Holmes, Kaplan, 2005; English, 2000), these publications are mostly concentrated on welcoming the academic liberalization introduced during the Gorbachev era. The authors either present the description of new progressive realities of Russian academia (Brown, 2001) or imply that “it’s impossible to comprehend at this time the real impact Perestroika and Glasnost have had on Soviet education” (Sweeney, 1994, p.748). There are very few analytical works on the subject and practically no publications about international trends in Russian higher education during the 1980s (Tomiak, 1986). An unconventional perspective on Soviet higher education in its final stage is presented by Glowka (1987). The author argues that Soviet education could not be really named as a system, because it was never accomplished as planned, but had to be adjusted to immediate political changes and industrial needs. Glowka (1987) considers Soviet academia as an unfinished educational paradigm, which still has hope for the right development. The author believes that reformation of the Soviet education system has been proceeding permanently since mid-1950s and was in fact a progressive development. “Fundamental processes of change are at work all the time in Soviet academia ...being by the international standards both: a

magnificent educational experiment and a tremendous experiment in educational policy making... thus making the reform of Soviet academia being a matter of global magnitude” (Glowka, 1987, p.28-29).

The only kind of publications describing international trends of Soviet higher education in the times of Perestroika are collections of data or educational guides issued by the Russian government. These publications are centered on descriptions of different types of Soviet academic institutions, and they mention specialized establishments of higher education aimed to train foreigners, like the famous Moscow People’s Friendship University (Levin-Stankevich, Popovich, 1992). Yet, along with naming a few Soviet universities well-known in the world and listing their degree programs and curricula, these books do not provide any scholarly analysis of international policy in Russian higher education. One book should be named especially. This is the most recent and the most complete multilingual annotated bibliography on Russian and Soviet Higher Education, which includes even dissertations presented on the subject all over the world (Brickman, Zepper, 1992). Examination of this rich collection brings the researcher to the conclusion that the least researched subject is the internationalization of Soviet higher education. In the list of over fifteen hundred publications examined by Brickman and Zepper (1992) there is not a single one with “internationalization” or “international” in its title. All books listed in the bibliography of Brickman and Zepper (1992) are written by historians. Not a single publication mentioned in this collection is prepared by a specialist in higher education or academic management.

International trends of Soviet higher education present one of the least-studied subject matters in global higher education and educational policy. It keeps a lot of

interesting discoveries and potential enlightenment about the path of progress of the modern Russian academia.

*Internationalization and Post-Soviet Higher Education*

The collapse of the Soviet Union and principal changes happening in the Russian society through the 1990s provoked a waterfall of publications. Hundreds of articles, conference presentations and research manuscripts were devoted to the reforms in Russian academia as well. Quite a number of publications refer to international matters of national higher education and even mention internationalization (Jones, 1994; Balzer, Gilbert, 2011). The major topic of discussion among Russian educators during the 1990s was about the lack of state funding and the problems that causes for Russian universities. Many researchers believed that universities of Russia started to seek international activities and foreign students at the time largely for the financial reasons (Filippov, 2001; Myasnikov, 2002; Trushin, 1999). Some authors went further and justified this association as the most appropriate one in the current at the time realities of Russian academia, which was busy with the practical surviving (Kokarev, Birukova, 1999; Sheregi, Dmitriev, Arefiev, 2002; Zajda, 2003). But these authors do not suggest any academic analysis of reasons and outcomes of the international activities of the Russian universities. One of the active supporters of the thesis of survival of Russian academia in 1990s via the international exchanges is Nikolay Dmitriev (2003a). He served as the Head of the Department for International Cooperation of the Russian Ministry of Education in 1990s, and thus, obviously is an expert on the matter. According to Dmitriev (2003a), by the beginning of new millennium Russian universities tried to enroll the largest possible number of foreign students in order to receive the maximum

financial benefit in hard currency. The author suggests that exploiting the international connections to countries of the Third World, established by Russian academia during the Soviet period, was not only beneficial financially for the national higher education, but was also a progressive variation of the global process of academic internationalization in Russia (Dmitriev, 2003a). The author perceives the positive result of such version of internationalization for the Russian academia in regaining the lawful position among the world leaders in export of education (Dmitriev, 2003a). Many Russian educators share this opinion (Galushkina, 2004; Latypov, 2004; Milner, 1999).

Some authors believe that the emergence of outside funding for Russian academia is the direct result of internationalization, and, thus, internationalization saved fundamental research and national science from complete bankruptcy in the 1990s (Danilov, Senikov, 2002; Kuznetsov, Idlis, 2000; Naumchenko, 1998). These scholars usually portray internationalization as the key promoter of the Western university model in Russian higher education in the most positive way. Internationalization of Russian higher education is depicted by them as Westernization, being the only method to revive the high standards of Soviet academia, which has been the ultimate leader of the global science since the late 1950s (Lurye, 2002; Rubin, 2004; Timoshenko, Zinovieva, 2003). One of the supporters of this idea, Gokhberg (1997), suggests the most complete study of the status of research in Russian higher education through the 1990s and the impact of international academic trends on it. According to Gokhberg (1997), by 1990 the USSR was the greatest world power in research, having over a million scholars and a “research intensive” economy. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, the national research potential of Russia suffered a real catastrophe, - greater than that of the

worldwide depression of the 1930s (Gokhberg, 1997, p.37). Adoption of the US university model by the Russian academia and a thrust for internationalization are the key means of restoring the glory of the Soviet science in modern Russia, concludes Gokhberg (1997).

A lot of debate was going on in the 1990s in the Russian press around the issue of tuition. Most academic publications support the common association of the Russian public between “for pay” higher education and the notion of a Western university (Zaretskaya, 2001b; Kruhmaleva, 2001; Shenderova, 2011a). Some Russian academics consider the introduction of tuition and the appearance of non-state higher institutions as the direct result of internationalization, and the negative influence of the West on the Russian national academic system (Chistohvalov, 2004; Shepkina, 2002; Sumarokova, 2002). Quite a number of publications, however, see tuition fees as an imperative source of budgeting for national higher education, and name tuition “a civilized way of academic funding” (Matvienko, 2003; Okorokova, Klikunov, 2002). According to Suspitsina (2001), all scholars studying reforms in Russian higher education unanimously agree that the application of Western curriculum and orientation towards non-governmental sources of funding are major components of success for a modern university framework in Russia.

In the last decade, the emphasis of publications shifted to organizational issues in Russian higher education and the focus of discussions were more on the matters of global recognition of Russian academia, advantages of academic freedoms and institutional independence. Major international trends in modern academia, like “commodification” of higher education and globalization of the job market for graduates, were used as key

arguments in favor of the selective policy of state support to the higher educational institutions in Russia. Priorities, mainly in the name of tuition privileges and research funding, were suggested to universities that could promote Russian national academia internationally. Tight collaboration of universities with industries, significance of applied research, and the market orientation of Russian higher education were discussed as dominant principles for the conversion of Russian academia into a vital and important member of the global economy (Elkina, 2008; Soboleva, 2009).

A large cluster of recent publications about national higher education represent Russian scholars discussing the advantages of modern Internet-based distance forms of higher education (Danilov, Senikov, 2002; Kondakov, 2001; Tsarev, 2000). Dmitriev (2003a) names additional education and distance learning as the most positive examples of Westernization of Russian higher education (p.28). Being able to suggest degree programs for much less cost than Western universities, Russian higher schools generate outstanding financial sources to sustain progressive reforms in national academia (Dmitriev, 2003, p.21). According to Dmitriev (2003), this makes internationalization a promoter of the financial well-being of Russian higher education (p. 25).

Many authors consider international academic mobility as the key factor of modern developments in Russian higher education and science (Arefiev, 2003; Zharenova, Ketchil, Pakhomov, 2002; Astakhova, 2011). In fact, quite a number of scholars identify international academic exchange with the internationalization of higher education (Malinskiy, 2004; Noskova, 2003; Zornikov, 2002). Russian authors, representing government agencies, actively publicize the following reasons for the progress of international activities at Russian universities: international students come to



Russia following the positive pattern of the previous generations who studied in Soviet universities and entered into successful careers back at home (Kouptsov, Tatur, 2001); foreigners are impressed with the level of professional training offered in Russia (Baidenko, 1999a); compared to Western universities, Russian higher education institutions ask considerably less payment for the same, if not higher, level of instruction (Sheregi, Dmitriev, Arefiev, 2002). At the same time, there are no publications presenting the opinion of the international students themselves to prove or contradict these statements. Some authors present international student mobility from Russia as a “get out” division of bright Russian youngsters in search of better-paying jobs in the West (Bainev, 2002; Dezhina, 2002; Ushkalov, Malaha, 2011). Most interesting is the key notion of such publications about Russian students getting good educations in the home-country, while looking for receiving the valid educational certificate abroad. Thus, East-West academic exchange is presented as just another version of “brain drain” (Ledneva, 2002; Karlov, 1999).

Many Russian authors relate the growth of institutional self-governance in national higher education directly to the influence of internationalization (Arzhenovskiy, 2002; Makarycheva, 2002; Sletkov, 2002). Knyazev and Kluev (2008) imply that internationalization plays a crucial role in the current organizational transformation of the Russian university system. They present strategic management and marketing at the institutional level as the definitive principles of modern academic administration. According to the authors, studying higher education management of the West and introducing it in Russian academia is the key for success (Knyazev, Kluev, 2008). Quite a number of Russian authors support the notion of national higher education reform being

successful in turning the old national university system into a modern, democratic structure reflecting the principles of the global academia (Filippov, 2000; Melnikova, 2003; Sadovnichiy, 2003; Bondarenko, Vetrov, 2001). Three features of “modernity” of Russian academic life are repeatedly mentioned in the Russian academic press: implementation of Western democratic principles into the national higher education; transition from authoritarian to cooperative academic management; and creation of humanist environment that contributes to free development of students, encouraging critical thinking and decision-making (Barkan, Shuvalov, Dompalm, 2001; Kisilev, 2003; Shestoperova, 1995). At the same time, the notion of modernity in Russian higher education does not correlate with any particular international policy of the Russian state in these publications. Russian authors, intensively writing about the democratization of national higher education during the last two decades, conclude in the most generic way that Russian academia today is much like the Western one in its organization and management.

Publications about post-Soviet Russian higher education in the Western press also concentrate on issues of democratization, but they have a much stronger emphasis on the connection between the advancement of political reforms in Russia and the progress of internationalization in national higher education. It is very peculiar that the “Western voice” in the academic literature discussing modern Russian university system is often presented by the former Russian scholars who now reside and work abroad. Sutyurin (2003) suggests that improvements in Russian academia rely upon its involvement in internationalization. The author states very sharply that in order to succeed, “Russian

university not just can but rather must internationalize actively...no rational alternative really exists” (Sutyurin, 2003, p.110). He sees a vital need for urgent formation of the “purposeful, well thought-out state policy” on the internationalization of higher education in Russia (Sutyurin, 2003). Bain (2003) depicts autonomy as the leading feature of organizational reform in Russian academia. The author suggests that decentralization of power and transition to a market economy created dramatic transformation in Russian society, paving the way to the introduction of the Western-style university model with the traditional tripartite function – teaching, research and service (Bain, 2003).

Not all authors support such positive description of the on-going reforms in Russian academia. Husband (1991) provides a critical analysis of Russian education before and after Perestroika, highlighting the main changes in curriculum and in academic freedoms during the 1990s. Husband (1991) concludes that the Russian professorate appeals more to the stability and social guarantees of the Soviet past, than embraces prospects of the new, pro-Western academic paradigm. One of the critics of the Russian higher education policy, Deaver (2001) doesn't see the reformation of the Russian academic system as an attempt to democratize at all. He believes that educational reform neither empowered legally nor provided financially the Russian academics (Deaver, 2001). The criticism of the reformation process in the Russian higher education is also supported by a few scholars who study the academic profession in Russia (Vasenina, Sorokina, 1999; Pirogova, 2008; Panfilova, 2011). Analyzing the latest trends in the development of the academic profession in Russia and the challenges it faces in the era of globalization, Smolentseva (2002) states that the future of the academic profession in Russia is quite ambiguous. Other Russian scholars support this thesis, pointing out the

rapid loss of humanitarian purpose in the priorities of the national academia and its growing dependency on the instantaneous requests of the labor market (Lukashenko, 2003; Pichugin, 2002; Pryadko, 2013). Internationalization, however, is depicted most usually as a positive tendency in that context, as it is supposed to provide Russian universities with an attractive opportunity to expand their “sales market” globally (Filippov, 2001; Onkoi, 2004).

Quite a number of Russian publications associate the success of internationalization in the national higher education with the cross-national recognition of Russian academic certificates (Baidenko, 2004; Galaktionov, 2004; Senashenko, Tkach, 2003; Trushin, 1999). Convinced that current Russian higher education is modern and democratic, the vast majority of Russian authors discuss emotionally the issue of the nostrification of Russian degrees globally as a sign that Russian academia is recognized as an equal to Western higher education (Bespalko, 1996; Kozlova, Puffer, 1994; Arseniev, 2003). Kouptsov and Tatur (2001) claim to produce the first research providing a comparative analysis of modern quality assurance approaches in the West and in Russia. Using vast statistical materials from federal, local and institutional sources, the authors present a detailed overview of the historical progress and modern status of quality evaluation in the Russian academe. The findings of the study are quite complimentary to Russian higher education, presenting its quality assurance system as in full correspondence with the “International Standards” (Kouptsov, Tartur, 2001). Russian educators actively depict national higher education as an essential part of the European university community (Chernomorova, 2001; Pokrovskiy, 2000; Zaretskaya, 2001a). Russia is playing an increasing part in international university organizations and

contributes to the construction of the “common European educational framework” (Galagan, 2000). Russian President Putin (2012a) crowns this assumption by pronouncing democratic reforms in the Russian higher education being part of an academic reformation progressing all over the world (p.2).

Some Russian authors support the notion of global humanitarian and civil issues being in the middle of Russian academic development (Artamonova, Blinova, Demchuk, 2011; Liferov, 2002). According to these scholars, Comparative and International Education should become the imperative part of curriculum for any academic institution in Russia. The emergence of citizenry, embracing democratic norms is the direct result of internationalization and the key-indicator of success of continuing reform of the Russian academia (Shirobokov, 2012). However, little scholarly data or academic analysis is provided to sustain such conclusions that look rather like appropriate political slogans reflecting the expectations of the Russian political elite. Integration into the European education framework through joining the Bologna Process is presented in many recent publications as the main course to ultimate internationalization of the Russian academia (Kulikova, 2012b; Ryabov, 2004; Savvin, 2012). This is probably the only issue in Russian higher education which is discussed with an equal interest in the West and in Russia. But the logic and conclusions of European and Russian educators studying the problem often diverge. Russian authors (Lavrova, 2004; Melvil, 2005; Tokmovtseva, 2001) have a remarkable unity in the vision of the national educational certificates nostrification being the key matter dividing Russian and European higher education systems. Internationalization of national university system is associated for many Russian educators with complete integration into the European academic framework and with the

consolidation of labor market from Atlantic to Urals (Zhivotovskaya, 2001; Larionova, 2012; Smirnov, 2003). Some Western authors support the notion of post-Soviet Russia being a part of the academic reforms in modern Europe (Aalto, 2011; Emerson, 2005; Kontiainen, Tight, 2002). Peter Scott (2000b) considers internationalization of higher education in Russia being part of the strategic process of collapse of Communism as a political system and an essential element of democratization in academia that took place all over Eastern-Central Europe and former USSR in the last two decades. But despite confirmation of the qualitative changes happening in Russian higher education today, most of the European scholars consider the need for deeper reformation of the Russian academia before it can be fully integrated with the European university system (Stastna, 2005; Tomusk, 2000; Uvalic-Trumbic, 2002). Introduction of academic freedoms and civil society norms into the organizational core of the Russian higher education is the most anticipated outcome of the modern transformations in Russia (Barblan, 2002; Johnson, 1998; Nyborg, 2004). Quite notable is the fact, that the issues of correlation between democratization of Russian higher education and the progress of internationalization are mostly discussed by either the Western scholars or the Russian educators in the publications, issued in the Western press.

The first attempt to provide a detailed examination of the international position of the Russian academia from the perspective of progressing globalization is given in the recent book of Alexander Slepukhin (2004). According to Slepukhin (2004), the major example of developing globalization in academia is the implementation of the Bologna Declaration by European Union. Russia is considered an essential participant of that

process, while Russian higher education is presented as an academic system that deeply integrated in the “pan-European academic network” (Slepukhin, 2004, p.10-13).

Conclusion

With all the massive number of publications issued through the last decade in the West and in Russia about Perestroika reforms and social changes in modern Russia, there is still no study available suggesting analytical comparison of Soviet and the modern Russian university systems. The differences between the objectives of the Soviet international policy in the field of higher education and the modern concept of Russian government about the internationalization of national higher education are neither pronounced nor analyzed in the scholarly press. Virtually no publications provide a logical and consistent description of the internationalization process in Russian higher education in its historical progression, or clearly explain the impact of that process on the organization and practice of Russian academia. In hundreds of publications describing pros and cons of the modern status of Russian academia, “internationalization” is mentioned most often as the essential part of its current reality, but only a few authors make an attempt to explain the meaning of this phenomenon for the Russian university system or specify any distinctive peculiarities in its progress. The changing paradigm of Russian higher education calls for the analysis of its historical progress through the prism of internationalization.

Throughout the following chapters, the literature on internationalization and international educational policy of Russian academia is presented in conjunction with the collected data and findings, which detail the potential benefits and threats of internationalization progress in the national academia. The chapters that follow also detail

the history of Russian higher education in an international policy context, the response of the traditional sector of Russian higher education to the potential reality of higher education's being included in the global academic network, and the current trend within global academia toward supporting policies that remove the trade barriers that currently regulate international higher education investments and endeavors.



**Chapter 3: Academic Internationalism in Marxist Theory and in the Bolshevik**

**Strategy**

Contrary to the assumptions of many Western and Soviet scholars describing Soviet academia as a system “sealed from the world by the Iron Curtain,” the present study reveals that an international component was a natural part of Soviet higher education. Built on the principles of Marxism, the Bolshevik Party plan aimed for the establishment of the Communist state in the former Russian Empire, followed by the immediate further dissemination of the “Communist Order” worldwide (Lenin, 1916a). According to the essence of Marxist theory, every act of reformation promoted by the Bolshevik government in Russia was considered an organic part of a globally expanding Proletariat Revolution (Lenin, 1917a). The creation of Soviet academia for the proletariats and consisting of the proletariats was considered by Russian Bolsheviks to be an essential part of the establishment of the “global kingdom of liberated working class” (Trotsky, 1918). Titled “proletariat internationalism,” a distinct international policy of the Soviet state was present in every political, social and economic change brought to Russia by the October Revolution of 1917. Higher education was not an exception to this pattern of Soviet notion and practice. Marxist theory had particular ideas for education in the future revolutionary transformation of the global society. What was the role of education in the Marxist forecast for the inevitable arrival of the Communist Society as the climax of humanity’s development? How Marxism depicted the organizational construction of the communist academic system in the “harmonious society of mankind”? Was there any special connotation for “international academic policy” of the global proletariat state? The important issue to be clarified in the chapter is about the perspectives of Russian

Marxists regarding the place of higher education in the practice of socialist transformation. The Bolshevik leadership consisted of sincere followers of Marxism, and it is imperative to recognize what role they have seen for academia in the Communist Society that they were planning to build. The emphasis of the following discussion will concentrate on specific practical reformations in higher education that Russian Marxists expected to perform in the frame of the world proletariat revolution accomplishment.

Before analyzing the actual events that happened in Russian academia during the Soviet period, I am trying to provide insight on the theoretical framework, used by the Bolsheviks for the formation of their educational program and international academic policy. The terminology, used by Russian Marxists and the specific meanings embedded into the political vocabulary used to define their program for world revolution are specifically analyzed. The construction of Soviet higher education and development of its international policy took a number of years, and many changes occurred during this time. The theoretical basics of the original perception of Soviet academia are the subject of analysis of this chapter. It should provide an understanding of the conceptual background of the Russian Marxists on the role of academia in Russia and worldwide, and explain the origin and the international context of the educational policy that the Bolsheviks promoted immediately after the victory of the October 1917 revolution. As will be presented, internationalization in its current definition as a national or institutional international academic policy was always in the revolutionary plans of the Bolsheviks, reflecting their understanding of the Marxist theory.

Marxism and Academia

The theory of Marxism was developed in mid-19th century Europe by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Although Marx and Engels did not write extensively about education, and wrote almost nothing about higher education specifically, they developed theoretical perspectives of the future, proletariat society, and its social functions (Baudrillard, 1981; Kellner, 2000). The classical Marxist paradigm is rooted in the materialist doctrine that men are products of their circumstances and upbringing (Marx, 1845). Marxism suggests studying human history using the method of historical materialism, considering historical progress of mankind as the consistent change of particular social orders, rooted into different modes of production – “socio-economic formations” (Marx, 1859). In the logic of Marxism, each stage of human development is based on a certain type of productive forces associated with the particular means of production and related to the specific kind of ownership on these means (Marx, 1859). Marxism advocates that humanity passed through four social orders related to four “modes of production” in its social development: prehistoric (tribal), classical antiquity, feudal, capitalistic. Advancement of productive forces directly depended upon the level of knowledge and abilities of humans, according to Marx (Marx, 1859). Thus, education occupies position of the driving force for social history, in the Marxist theory. Capitalism, being the last accomplished stage of social development, promotes growth of working-class population to the point of proletariat becoming the hegemon part of world population, and endorses massification of education, - creating by this a critical social moment of possible conversion to the next social order of human social organization – Communism (Marx, Engels, 1848). In this paradigm, not only Marxism suggests that

Communist Society will become the next global social order, but education will become the leading social service for the working masses and the guarantor of the human progress. Public access to knowledge and its application for the common good sustain the Marxist concept of Communism as the future and the most harmonious social order of mankind (Marx, Engels, 1848). The changing material conditions of life and changing the educational process become imperative factors for changing the human society. Out of this concept, Marx and Engels perceived that without education, the working class is condemned to lives of drudgery and death, but with education common people have a chance to win globally through the World Proletariat Revolution and create a better life in a new Communist society (Engels, 1880). However, in the realities of the mid-19th century, when hardly any worker in any European country had even an elementary level of education, a discussion of the role of university education in the future proletariat state seemed rather premature.

In the Marxist vision, class nature of human society was historically based on several principal disparities, including inequalities in education. This pattern was expected to end with the victory of world proletariat revolution. The period of transformation from the class construction of the capitalist society to the global communist society having no class division, and thus, no political and economic antagonisms, was usually named by Marxists as “Socialism” (Marx, 1875). Socialism should be a social order aiming at the full development of individual human beings with education playing a crucial role in this process. In the future socialist state access to education for all citizens would be broadened to include the university level of education (Marx, 1847). Education without boundaries and borders would help create a global,

cooperative, and harmonious society, and unleash human creativity in all of its forms (Marx, Engels, 1848). For Marxists the right for mass access of working class people to all levels of education including the university was an immediate priority after the fall of capitalist society (Cole, 2007). The proletariat revolution should bring the political hegemony to the proletariat, and “the class which is the dominant material force of the society, is at the same time its dominant intellectual force” (Marx, Engels, 1846). Marxists believed that the ideological hegemony of the ruling class is exercised through educational structure of a society, such as a national university system (Gramsci, 2011). According to Marx, a socialist education system has the same objective as a socialist revolution – freedom. “Freedom for each one to develop his own methods of thought and his own initiative” (Engels, 1847). The goal of socialism is the creation of “...an association of all people of the world wherein the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all” (Marx, Engels, 1848). Only as the workers have knowledge and intelligence can they solve the problem of their own political and industrial freedom (Marx, 1875). Serving the masses of working class, the new academic system would reflect the needs of the majority of the world’s population. Marx and Engels’ standpoint of the new society was as one of social humanity...where free and educated people work for society and run the society...and where the role of education was expected to lift high, until becoming the most important social service (Marx, 1845). Marx and Engels suggested that a change of social circumstances is required to establish a proper system of education, on the other hand, a proper system of education is required to bring about a change of social circumstances (Marx, Engels, 1848). Education and communism, as well as education and revolution were presented in this logic as naturally

inter-connected. “Knowledge is power...and proper education of youth worldwide must be one of the chief tasks of the new worldwide socialist society” (Marx, 1845).

Marx and Engels were expecting a proletariat revolution to happen and to be successful all over the world at one and the same time (Engels, 1847). Progressive social results of a world proletariat revolution should be experienced by all common people of the world. New system of education would become international essentially, as the result of the new proletariat state converting into a global society. Academics throughout the world would serve the interests of the working people and the education system will be not only global, but also proletarian in its social and political core (Engels, 1878). With the expectation that the proletariat revolution would be nothing less than a World Revolution and Communism would become a world-wide and a universal society, - the education system of the new society, including higher education had to be internationalized also quite innately (Marx, Engels, 1850).

*Education as a Driving Force of Communist Society*

It is possible to distinguish the following features of prospective public academia that the founders of Marxism considered to be the important basics for the civil organization of the future proletariat society:

1) Education in a socialist society, like other vital social services, has to be **funded and administered by state**. The proletariat state should have complete control over education. No room was given for any form of non-state education. Private educational institutions were hardly considered at all. Public education of the proletariat state should be managed and provided by state with everything needed for the teaching-learning process, including teaching materials and teachers. The US educational system was

presented by Marx and Engels as the most progressive at the time, and the closest to a socialist academic organization. It was seriously criticized, however, for its relation to both religion and capital, for the existence of tuition policies and for the practice of private educational institutions (Marx, Engels, 1848);

2) Higher education, as true of any other level of education in a socialist society, should be **free of charge** for the citizens, and all needs of academic institutions have to be funded by the state;

3) All citizens should have an **unconditional access** to all levels of education without any exceptions.

4) The classical Marxist paradigm envisions education functioning within the hegemonic social system of the proletariat state, which is organized by and serves the interests of the working people. This logic inevitably implies the need of **political supervision** of all educational institutions by the leading political power of a proletariat state – the communist party. Thus all educational institutions, including universities, were expected to follow the political objectives of proletariat.

5) National higher education systems would be united into **one global academia**. Traditional cultural boundaries and national borders would be naturally abandoned during the construction of a global socialist state. International origin of proletariat revolution will produce the major change in human society by formation of the first global community of all peoples of the world.

These basic principles were widely used by the followers of Marx and Engels who sought to implement Marxist theory into the social practice of constructing a communist society. Famous Marxist slogan “Workers of the World Unite” literally meant creation of

worldwide political, economic and social public structures. “The socialistic system of education will be universal and will attain highest results comparing to all stages of intellectual development of the human society through the history of mankind” (Marx, 1869). Marxist theory granted to education an important role of the vital driving force for the major social change in human history - establishment of the Communist Society. Proletarianization of masses in conjunction with massification of education were predicted as the key-factors of success for the World Revolution. Internationalism was the core principle of Marxism, while the essential issue of Marxists worldwide was to educate working class people over the globe, delivering them Communist ideology as enlightenment and action program. “Knowledge is the only force able to bring about the progressive social change” (Marx, 1835), – these words of Marx, became the motto of Russian Marxists for practical application of the academic internationalism.

*Values of Global Educational Enlightenment in the Views of Russian Marxists*

Russian Socialists actively supported the Marxist postulate about special role of education for the establishment of the global communist society. Early Marxist groups in Russia originated from so-called “Narodniki” (People’s Educators), who were firm believers into the crucial role of education for common masses, and promoted the idea of public progress via social revolution even before becoming followers of Marxism (Plehanov, 1940). Russian Marxists were sincere enthusiasts of immediate practical action, understanding education as a vital part of revolutionary work. In realities of Russian political life, where public civil activities were prohibited since early 19<sup>th</sup> century after the first open protest of Russian opposition against the Tsarist regime, call for education of masses was considered as a criminal political act of disobedience,



punishable by years of hard labor exile to Siberia. Enlightenment was a synonym of revolution for the Russian authorities, while an intellectual was an alternative term to Italian Carbonari or French Jacobins (Tokin, 1932). Despite of such traditional government persecution, Russian Marxists observed themselves as the Russian version of “the French philosophes” referring often to the ideas of Voltaire and Diderot, Montesquieu and D'Alembert (Kropotkin, 1979). Considering enlightenment as a pragmatic revolutionary accomplishment, they focused efforts on delivery of Marxist education to the working class of Russia. Admiring ideals of French revolution and following revolutionary practices of Robespierre and Marat, the Bolsheviks started from publishing of their own newspaper “Iskra” (Spark), which became the actual beginning of Marxism dissemination in Russia (Volin, 1964). Each issue of “Iskra” had the same epigraph: “The flame will grow from a spark when enlightened peoples will gather under the sacred red banner of revolution”, reflecting to the sincere belief of Russian Marxists in the power of political education (Stepanov, 1968). Values of Western Enlightenment, praising intellectual individual and logical reasoning, over the Russian social tradition of the Tsar’s sacred authority was the most important revolutionary notion for Russian Marxists. Enlightenment of common Russians justified the possibility for the backward Russia to become an equal and active partner of civilized Europe in the construction of the harmonious and progressive Communist Society under the motto of “Liberté, égalité, fraternité” (Polevoi, 1959; Zhuikov, 1962). First gathering of Russian Marxists as a new political party RSDRP was organized under the famous slogan of the Enlightenment Age: Sapere Aude! Russians Marxists understood it as the pursuit of the theoretical postulates of Marxism, applying them in the politically proper paradigm of action (Plekhanov,

1948). Discussing academic system of the communist society, Russian Marxists arrived to the conclusion that the practice of its creation should be done through the enlightenment of the common population (Lenin, 1904). The policy of enlightenment was considered by them as the necessary precondition for the successful establishment of Communism. The major task of the first proletariat government was observed as the further enlightenment of the population up to creation of a generation of communist minded, well-educated, and thus fully enlightened people, – able and willing to establish the Communist Society. Bolsheviks observed values of public enlightenment as the foundation of communism, while educated intellectuals were expected to become leading revolutionaries and the carriers of communist ideology (Lenin, 1897). Being the vehicle of global educational enlightenment, academia received a premium eminence in the strategy of Russian Marxists.

*Role of Academia in the Bolshevik Strategy for the Establishment of Communist Society*

Bolshevik understanding of the importance of education and academia in the anticipated communist society was grounded in classical Marxist principles. At the same time, discussing mostly the practice of transformation to the future social global order, Bolsheviks were concentrated on the formulation of concrete steps that may introduce the new educational system during the period of Socialism. Russian Marxists actively searched for the existing academic patterns that could be used as the basis for the construction of the future Communist academia. Works of Plekhanov and Bebel, discussing positive examples of existing national higher educational systems, made the most influence on the Bolshevik's perception of progressive and suitable for socialism academic model. German Social-Democrat August Bebel furthered ideas of Marx and

Engels about the US public education being the closest approximation to a socialist academic system of the future proletariat state. He wrote that in the United States, society is not burdened with old European prejudices and antiquated institutions, and is therefore much more inclined to adopt new institutions and ideas if they hold promise of advantage (Bebel, 1910). By the beginning of WWI America's working class population was not yet directly concerned about obtaining admission to the higher institutions of learning and to the practice of learned professions since, for the time being, these studies and the resulting positions were closed to them (Bebel, 1910). "Nevertheless, in the first place, it is a matter of principle to have the access to the higher education, since it affects the general position of proletariats; in the second place, it is destined to show what workers can accomplish even at present, under conditions that are highly unfavorable to their development" (Bebel, 1910). US public (land-grant) university system was presented by Bebel as a good organizational pattern for the creation of the communist academia (Bebel, 1910). Following this logic of analysis, Russian Marxists studied the US academic system believing it to be the most progressive educational organization at that time (Krupskaya, 1913; Trotsky, 1910). Two characteristics of the US public higher education have been especially discussed as good examples of progressive academic organization, and thus, the possible foundation for building the communist academia: a) governance of higher educational institutions by local communities, and their provision from the budgets of states; and b) tight connection between academic mission of state universities and the practical needs of local communities, manifested in the development of applied sciences and promotion of vocational training reflecting needs of local population. Russian Marxists also studied works of American educational theorists,

considering John Dewey as the scholar closest to the socialist academic paradigm in his academic conception. Bolshevik leadership found Bebel's concept quite appropriate for the practical implementation and considered the use of major organizational features of the US system of public schools and universities as useful and adequate prototype to build upon the socialist model of education (Krupskaya, 1915). Dewey's formula: "education should be a process of living not a preparation for future living" (Dewey, 1897), has been taken later by the Bolsheviks as the slogan for the educational reform during the Socialist Revolution of 1917.

The founder of the first group of Russian Marxists, George Plekhanov, associated the global lead in industrial development that, he thought, the United States and Germany achieved by the early XX century with technical education opportunities introduced in these countries (Plekhanov, 1922). He believed that Russia followed the leaders in industrial development but lagged in terms of the development of the national academic system. Plekhanov presented many common parallels in German and Russian political movements of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, while specifically underlined that industrial modernity could only be achieved through the introduction of technical education, comparable with the German system of polytechnic schools (Realschule) (Plekhanov, 1905). Using theoretical platform of Marxism in combination with the practical suggestions of Bebel, Plekhanov, and other socialists-theoreticians, Bolsheviks decided to concentrate on the following social demands in the field of education as part of their revolutionary practice, preparing the establishment of the socialist education: gender, ethnical, cultural, and social equality in higher education admissions, state funded education of working class representatives in the universities, and practical application of

gained knowledge through the provision of intellectual jobs in industries and other spheres to the graduates who possessed a common social heritage (Lenin, 1910). Bolsheviks supported conviction of Russian socialists that “until the social discrimination in education exists, humanity will always suffer from the iniquity of being divided into a mass of slaves and a tiny number of rulers” (Bakunin, 1992). Developing their reformation strategy, Bolsheviks planned to apply most forcefully the demand of Marxism to terminate disparity in education between classes as one of the basic social vices. Establishment of free and equal access to higher education for all people, public administration of universities and their focus on the vocational needs of local communities, international sense of academia and constant supervision of the communist party having progressive and global educational policy were considered by the Bolsheviks as the key turning points for the conversion of the old academic system that served to the ruling classes for centuries, into a new global university system, serving to all people of the world. Russian Marxists were certain that only education may help each individual to develop most fully, when educational opportunities are equally favorable to all (Plekhanov, 1898). Marxists of Russia were in complete agreement with their European comrades about necessity of creation of “...the three whales, carrying the construction of the socialist academia - freedom, equality and **internationalism**” (Martov, 2004; Zetkin, 1933).

*Academic Policy in the Bolshevik Party Program*

Being the group of radical practitioners among Russian Marxists, the Bolsheviks went further than other Marxists and created the plan of practical reformation of the world education into the unified and proletarian global system of public enlightenment

and academic advancement (Lunacharskiy, 1917). Bolshevik party based its plans for the practical execution of the proletariat revolution on the Marxist concept of World Revolution. According to Vladimir Lenin, the life-long leader of Bolsheviks, world revolution was the final political goal of the Bolsheviks, bringing the global victory of the proletariat, ending human history of class struggle, and establishing internationally an eternal communist society (Lenin, 1913). Being true advocates of the worldwide perception of proletariat revolution, the first and the most important vision point, the Bolsheviks had and tried to implement into social practice, was the international sense of revolution. They had no doubts that once it starts, "...the flame of proletariat revolution, will expand immediately all over Europe and then worldwide" (Lenin, 1915a). In this context social changes associated with proletariat revolution were expected to disseminate all over the world quite naturally. Education was always underlined by the Bolsheviks as the key social service of a new, to be built, "communist society" (Protocoly 6th RSDRP konferenciya, 1912). The place of academia in the proletariat revolution had to be international by definition, and its role after the global victory of the revolution has been logically considered as a global one as well. Marxism sets internationalism as an organic and leading component for the new academic system of the new world order (Lenin, 1917b).

Bolsheviks were creating practical plans for revolutionary reforms following Lenin's concept of imperialism as the prelude to World Revolution (Lenin, 1916c). In his major work, explaining soon collapse of capitalism worldwide "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism," Lenin (1916c) suggested that world had entered the imperialistic stage of development of the capitalist society (p.174-175). "Imperialism is the highest

and the final phase of capitalism progression... Empowerment of imperialism is a modern global process; it creates political and economic prerequisites for the world socialist revolution” (Lenin, 1916c). Bolsheviks believed that through developing global economic network, based on internationally incorporated industry, and at the same time promoting vocational education of the working class in order to have massive, while well-trained labor-force, governments of leading imperialistic powers “produce their own gravedigger” by creating consolidated, politically active and educated proletariat (Trotsky, 1991). The particular emphasis was given to the need for the proletariat becoming educated both professionally and politically in order to stand as a successful victor in the future revolution. “Knowledge is the foundation of Marxist ideology...it is imperative for every worker to be educated, and...that is why we suggest to the working class of the world this very simple, while the most practical slogan: study, study, and study!” (Lenin, 1899) Lenin considered beginning of World War I as the proof of this theory. He observed the war as “pre-death beastly grin” of the leading imperialistic countries that are dividing world into their spheres of economic and political influence (Lenin, 1915d). Without using “globalization” as a term, Lenin actually defined its arrival in the early 20th century as a new worldwide process. At the same time, the global context of a new war was understood by the Bolsheviks as a prelude to the world revolution (Lenin, 1916d). World war brought sufferings and poverty to the working masses of the European countries pushing them towards the revolution. “Unleashing the global massacre, imperialists are preparing the global demise of the capitalist society because the world war acts as the catalyst for the world revolution...which would become the inevitable outcome of the war...and could be expected any time now” (Lenin,

1916e). After the beginning of WWI, the Bolsheviks and other radical Marxists of Europe started practical preparations for the world revolution, discussing intensely where it would start and how long would it proceed. Debates around these issues led Bolsheviks to the formulation of the major postulates of the practical realization of the World revolution. Firstly, at the center of the discussion was suggested by Marx definition of “permanent revolution.” Bolsheviks were rather unanimous in understanding that proletariat revolution would start in Europe and may take years to come to a victorious accomplishment all over the world (Lenin, 1915b). They usually named Germany as the launching point of revolutionary activities (Lenin, 1915c). Bolsheviks agreed, that Germany had needed precondition to serve as the pioneering grounds for proletariat revolution: a) developed industry and thus massive, organized and well established proletariat; b) long-standing revolutionary traditions and a well-developed sense of socialist ideas in a national communal mentality, and in the national political movement; c) Germany was the birth-ground of Marxism and the Marxist party was strong in Germany while well connected internationally. For decades Germany hosted Marxists and socialists from all over the world. Considering Germany as the starting place for the world revolution, the Bolsheviks specifically underlined that the German working class was well-educated comparing to other European countries, especially after introduction of the Humboldt academic system with its focus on polytechnic knowledge (Lenin, 1915a). “Broad access to vocational training in conjunction with the massive Marxist propaganda gradually create needed advancement and awareness in German proletariat...making it the leader of the world working class” (Trotsky, 1927). After being successful in Germany, proletariat revolution was predicted to spread into France



and further involve the rest of Europe (Trotsky, 1927). At the same time, “the revolutionary flame” was expected to advance into Russia and grow further East into Persia and Indo-China colonies of the imperialistic countries, disseminating the worldwide context of the revolution and establishing the global proletariat state. Education was understood as an important component of progress of the permanent revolution, and a vital condition of success for the world dissemination of the revolutionary transformations. Academic enlightenment and political awareness of the working masses were envisioned by the Bolsheviks as guardians of triumph and promoters of essence of the proletariat revolution (Lenin, 1915b).

Another topic of debates among the Bolsheviks was the result of the long-lasting while worldwide advancing revolution. What should be expected as the outcome of the revolution? Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders agreed that when accomplished, proletariat revolution should become the starting point for “socialism.” Socialism was understood as an interjacent step from capitalism to communism (Konferencia zagranichnyh sekcii RSDRP, 1954). It was understood as the first stage towards the future Communist Society, being already not capitalism, but not yet communism. Socialism is the time-period of the construction of the communist social institutions and creation of a “new man” (Lenin, 1917c). Victorious proletariat should firstly establish a new social order based on communist ideology, and collective labor for public good. Socialist regime has to be set on the civic principles, following proficient examples of proletariat self-governance demonstrated by Paris Communards in 1871, and by Moscow Soviet of Workers in 1905. This will become the organizational backbone of the Communist Society (Lenin, 1908). Though communism becomes reality only after the vital task of

upbringing of new men is achieved. To get to such a culmination, Bolsheviks saw great need in the immediate and international educational reform (Lenin, 1917c). Common people should first accumulate the academic knowledge of previous generations, and become an enlightened and civilized community of “new people” during the socialism stage, then they will become capable of building a global and a harmonic society – communism (Lenin, 1917c). Bolsheviks understanding of the Marxist theory of improvement of the human society was based on the necessity of formation of a new social class of the future citizen of the Communism Society, who should have proletariat mentality, proletariat political ideology and proletariat morality (Lenin, 1917c). Education was in the center of this logic, being “...the practical instrument of building of a “Communist Man” (Lunacharsky, 1917).

Russian Marxists didn't use “globalization” and “internationalization” as part of their political terminology. However, the way they were explaining political, economic and social realities of the world at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century fit into the modern definition of globalization. Lenin and other Russian Marxists had a very strong conviction that worldwide integration of national economies and construction of above-national or global financial, industrial and communication corporations have happened by the WWI. Not only they have referred to the global economy as a reality, but considered it as a driving force in changing the politics from being inter-national to becoming a global one as well. Bolsheviks understood the very fact of the beginning of World War I as the major outcome and the key-evidence of the arrival of a global change for mankind (Lenin, 1915a). Bolsheviks (or Leninists) broadly emphasized that WWI carries a number of significant socio-economic meanings. It is the climax of capitalism bringing it to the

zenith of economic development in the format of its final stage – imperialism. Imperialism stands actually as a synonym of globalization in the political language of Bolsheviks. At the same time, being the highest stage of capitalism, imperialism creates the reality of global integration of national economies and national policies, while lacking adequate social developments towards equal rights, opportunities and services available to all people worldwide; - it forms the basis for World Revolution. The very concept of world revolution is based on the notion of globalization in the social life of mankind. It is expected to lead to the new kind of society – communal and global. The meaning of world revolution is a synonym to “global revolution” or “proper globalization” in the social organization of humanity.

Any social change, resulting from the progress of world revolution, including reform of education system was assumed as a global reform by definition. Moreover, it is a reform purposefully initiated, executed and promoted by the Marxists in the international format for the worldwide outcomes. This description fits well into the modern definition of internationalization as a special policy on the institutional and national levels reflecting the reality of globalization, which is shared by today prominent scholars of higher education (Altbach, 2002c; Knight, 2003; De Wit, 2002). Reforms planned and then executed by the Bolsheviks in the academic field were not defined by them as “internationalization”, but their policy was actually an international one and was quite similar to the modern description of internationalization.

*The Bolshevik Campaign for the Launch of World Revolution in Russia*

Having rather utter theory of world revolution and quite consistent plan of its execution, Bolsheviks had to reflect to the reality of the world war arriving to its end,

while the proletariat revolution being far from its commencement in Europe. Marxists of the European countries increased their legal activities, aiming for being heard in national parliaments, and consolidated with other liberal political parties. Lenin called this approach “a treason of the ideals of revolution”, and suggested that Russian Communists not wait until the arrival of the outcomes of the world war, but act immediately and initiate the beginning of the socialist revolution where its prerequisites were the most evident (Lenin, 1915c). Lenin wrote extensively, trying to prove that “Germany is not yet ripe for the revolution...while Russia is the weakest link in the chain of imperialistic countries...excessively impoverished by war...and thus...the prerequisites of revolution are most obvious in Russia, which... could be the first country in the world to have a successful proletariat revolution” (Lenin, 1916f). Lenin and his comrades in Bolshevik leadership proposed that although effectual and victorious first in just one country, proletariat revolution would still carry its global meaning (Lenin, 1916f). They argued that victory of socialist revolution and deployment of socialist construction even in one country would be a global achievement of the working class and would not diminish the international mission of the outcomes of the proletariat revolution. “Russian Marxists do not distort Marxist theory as social-traitors from Germany and Austria claim, but constructively develop Marxist doctrine adapting it to the realities of the current political moment” (Lenin, 1915d). In 1917, when the soon resolution of WWI became obvious while Russia was the only member of the Entente Alliance that did not expect to enjoy the triumph of military victory but has been sinking deep into economic crisis and social chaos, Bolsheviks aimed for launching socialist revolution in Russia. “Course for the socialist revolution in Russia should become a practical plan of action for the Russian

Marxists...it should give us a chance to fulfill the historical mission of transforming Russia from a backward country into the first socialist state in the world, and the beacon for the world proletariat” (Lenin, 1917d). Bolsheviks believed that “international value of Russian revolution will lead to ...free integration of nations...and finally to formation of the United States of the World, which is the commonwealth of free nations that we are associating with socialism” (Lenin 1917d).

During the Petrograd party conference in April 1917 Bolsheviks firmly decided for Russia to become the cradle of the World Revolution (Sedmaya Vserossiiskaya konferencia RSDRP, 1958). “Bolshevik party is responsible to launch the revolutionary activities immediately, seize the political power in the country and convert the imperialistic world war into a civil war for the hegemony of working class in Russia...From now on Russia should be considered as an ignition point of proletariat revolution and the ground base for its further successful progress into Europe and the rest of the world” (Lenin, 1917d). Translating Marxist idea of world revolution into the practice of political actions, Lenin and Bolsheviks considered Russian socialist revolution as the commence of the world revolution, and all socialist reforms to happen in Russia as the beginning of the construction of the future global communist society (Sedmaya Vserossiiskaya konferencia RSDRP, 1958). All revolutionary changes in Russia were expected to bear international meaning as they were not planned to change reality of social and economic life in the Russian state only, but to become a case of success of the revolutionary changes to be disseminated all over the world. In this logic of the Bolsheviks all social innovations, political and economic reforms that have been planned as part of the Russian revolution were considered to becoming further mandatory for

international implementation (Lenin, 1917c). In fact, it was the creation of the model of the new society to be established globally as soon as the Russian revolution would succeed, and then would spread all over the world with triumph (Lenin, 1917e).

*The Bolshevik Plan for Academic Reform in Russia*

Russian Marxists were very critical of Russian education under the Tsarist regime, considering it to be a completely undeveloped social service as compared to the educational systems of European countries and the United States. Lenin and his comrades in the Bolshevik Party leadership saw the need for the reform of existing higher education in Russian Empire as the principal issue of the proletariat revolution. They saw mission of higher education in the provision of professional education for all people. However, in the social realities of Russian Empire – a society based on the feudal principles of social inequalities related to one's family heritage, and social status of a person, as well as on the capitalistic principles of social inequalities related to a person's financial standing, - such a higher education mission could not actualize into practice (Lenin, 1905). Russian Marxists argued that only a proletariat revolution could change the political, economic and social situation in their country, which was then the most undeveloped economically and socially of world's imperialistic states (Lenin, 1916c). Lenin and other Bolsheviks claimed that only after the Marxists were successful in grasping the political power in the country could social transformation happen, creating a truly progressive and publicly accessible educational system. After Bolshevik's arrival to political power, Russian academics would become the proletariats of intellectual labor and an example to be followed all over the world (Lenin, 1917c).

The concept of a socialist education system was always an essential part of the Party Program of Russian Marxists. Starting from the first version adopted in 1903, Bolshevik Party program had a section devoted to the establishment of a new educational system, with higher education being part of the planned reformation. It contained a description of practical steps required for the introduction of socialist system of education in the frame of a proletariat revolution (Programma RSDRP, 2001). The importance of academic reformation in Russia is decisively indicated in the Bolsheviks plans, while a special focus was given to the constant Party propaganda work among the students (Vtoroi syezd RSDRP, 1959). Socialist academic reform in Russia was planned by the Bolsheviks in the frame of World Revolution concept, intended as an international matter. Thus, the Bolshevik policy aimed for the practical implementation of proletariat revolution in Russia, always had as its sub-section an international academic policy. Socialist Russia was expected to have new kind of citizens from the very beginning, constantly enlarging their part in the total population of the country. “Socialist citizens” were supposed to be all educated and all sharing the political ideology of the proletariat (Tretii syezd RSDRP, 1959). To attain this objective, Bolsheviks deliberated first to seize the political power in Russia; then, redistribution of the wealth of the society to the advantage of the working people was considered, as the second step; and, finally, the crucial and concluding step on the way of establishment of the new social order was planned as the introduction of a new legislation for the benefit of the common classes. After these initial acts of the revolution would have been accomplished, the socialist society could have been built step-by-step, following the logic of proletarianization of masses with mass education of proletariat at the same time (Lenin, 1902). Higher

education was supposed to become a social service opened to the working masses, - so that all intellectual professions would be occupied by educated proletariats. Bolsheviks projected to go step by step in the accomplishment of this reform: first, the legal basis for a new academic system would be established; then the professorate of the old regime would be attracted as an ally of the new, socialist government to educate masses of proletariat students; and finally, the historical task of the creation of intelligent population of new men should be fulfilled starting the reality of the new communist society (Krupskaya, 1915).

Bolshevik plans for practical application of the Marxist educational doctrine were based on the notion of implementation of proper proletariat policy and ideology immediately after the victorious proletariat revolution. Proletariat academic policy had to focus on applied knowledge, promoting vocational and polytechnic training (Lenin, 1920c). University system of the proletariat state should be based on self-governance, and has to be attentive to the needs of local communities. After successful formation even just in one country at the beginning, while being the product of world revolution, socialist academia should have a special international angle, and should be available to all people despite gender, race, creed, language and culture (Trotsky, 1923). Unlike bacchanalia of lawlessness of the class society, where all social norms are suppressed by the ruling classes, and laws are twisted in favor of capitalists, legislation of the communist society would be formed by common people and favor the needs of common people (Lenin, 1917d). Thus, the starting point of socialist academic reform was observed by the Bolsheviks as the task of formation and execution of the new academic legislation: first in Russia, and later, - all over the world.



Socialist higher education construction was forecasted by the Bolsheviks to become the quintessence of the academic, industrial and cultural achievements of mankind: it should be connected with the needs of life, applied and polytechnic in its academic core, and be based organizationally on the democratic principles of academic freedoms and social equalities (Krupskaya, 1918a). It should be the academic system of new social quality, offering professional education to masses, having in its foundation a university that is provided, protected and sustained by the state (Lenin, 1917c). Being proletariat in its political sense, socialist academe was observed as international in its very core. The fulfillment of the Bolshevik academic policy was expected in the fact of the establishment of the best system of higher education known to mankind firstly in Russia, to later become the only higher education system of the world. It was observed by the Bolsheviks as an international system in its academic origin and its political goal, and even in its practical organization and legislation (Lenin, 1917c).

The optimal organizational construction of the higher education in Soviet Russia seemed to the Bolsheviks as a compilation of the best achievements of the existing Western academic systems (Pokrovskiy, 1929). The group of Bolsheviks in the Party leadership, who later became the principal creators of the Soviet academic system, suggested that if the US public university system (land-grant universities) would be enforced by the polytechnic component, well introduced in the Humboldt's model of a German university, and also administered politically correct through the communist party control of the academic life, then it will be a desired proletariat academia of the future socialist society (Pokrovskiy, 1929). Bolsheviks saw serious advantages in the US public (land-grant) university system due to its connection with the needs of local communities.

During his trip to the USA in 1917, Leon Trotsky had a party task to learn about public higher education in America, and reported on his return, that American higher education is similar to the “Soviet” organization in its core, considering the meaning of the term in Russian language as “communal decision-making and local self-governance” (Lunacharskiy, 1917). Humboldt’s university model, unifying teaching and research into one integrated system of studies, was usually named by the Bolsheviks as the “polytechnic” academic system and was considered as the imperative component of the Soviet labor educational organization, bringing together all factors of modern education and its application into social and industrial life (Krupskaya, 1918b).

Proper combination of the US and the German university systems into one academic organism, provided with daily political supervision of the Communist party via its cells in every university was intensively discussed as the organizational core of the future academic system of Socialist Russia (Zinoviev, 1921). Together with profound political education and emphasis on recruiting proletariats to form the majority of the national student body, - this is socialism in academia and the goal of our work, stated the first director of the national department of education of the Soviet Russia A. Lunacharskiy (Lunacharskiy, 1917).

The key-outcome of the socialist academic reform was expected in the advent of the student body of the Russian academia formed from proletariats. After successful execution of this task all intellectual professions would have been occupied by people who are proletariats by the political beliefs, by the social heritage, and many of who would have been the active members of the Communist party (Krupskaya, 1918c). Thus higher education in the country would consist of a new type of professors – teachers-

proletariats, and a new type of students – next generation of proletariats, and a new type of graduates – proletariats, working as intellectual professionals (Shestoi Siezd RSDRP, 1917. Protocoly, 1958). Bolsheviks firmly believed that in order to create the first socialist academic system in Russia, they need to attract academics to the values of the world revolution. Lenin repeatedly called to work with professors, underlining that a decisive role in construction of the socialist education system should be assigned to a teacher. “We need to involve old specialists and make them our allies...to achieve a vital connection between professors, students...and then address broad masses of working people with the notion of enlightenment (Lenin, 1918a). The fact that not all of academics were capable of understanding the essence of the revolutionary changes developing in Russia and in the world was not so much their fault as their loss (Lenin, 1918b). “We need to work with faculty and change political vision of professorate in the universities. As Marx was saying it is essential to educate the educator himself - working with educators is the imperative part of building of a new socialist higher education system” (Krupskaya 1918c). Bolsheviks believed, that divide between the academic profession and the common people was artificially created by the Tsarist regime for a specific political purpose of controlling the masses of Russian population through keeping them away from education. The new socialist conditions should abolish this divide. Various forms of collaboration between teacher and students, professorate and population must be established, putting an end to the unnatural division (Krupskaya, 1918a). In fact the socialist scholar, who serves to people not political elites, is close to the people’s environment, and in most cases is connected with it in a thousand ways (Derzhavin, 1923; Pokrovksy, 1929). The socialist approach to academic profession will

ensure that universities flourish, and that through the joint hard work academics and communists together will raise the cultural level of the country, providing a better future to working people and promising a renaissance of the teaching profession, whose role can now become honored and respected. There should be no gap between professors and students, they should form one academic community united in study and research, in public life and in governing a university (Lunacharsky, 1976). Notion of self-governance based on autonomy and academic freedoms had to become an immediate practical result of the revolution. “Enlightenment of working masses and educational reform in favor of common people is the goal...and the condition of success of the proletariat revolution” (Lenin, 1920a).

### Conclusion

By the beginning of October 17 revolution Bolsheviks had a rather detailed and explicit plan for the academic reform. International component was very strongly present in this plan, being an organic part of the concept of world revolution. The academic reform in Russia was observed only as the first step for the global change of future universal educational system. The major challenge Bolsheviks saw in the fact of absence of really nationwide and really public system of education in Russia. Bolsheviks had a clear understanding that they need to start from the scratch, in fact not reforming but building the national higher education in Russia, to further become a prototype of the world proletariat academia. Bolsheviks envisioned construction of a socialist academic structure in Russia, not as a reform per say but rather as a creation of the new, global system of education.

Lenin and his comrades saw several positive outcomes from such specific strategy in national academia: use of the organizational principles of the US public (land-grant) universities enforced with the polytechnic context of the Humboldt academic system of Germany reflected the educational principles of Marxism; at the same time, merger of progressive features from various Western university models could provide international perspective to the academic reforms in Russia; this could rapidly lift educational level in Russia, making it a real precedent of success to follow worldwide. European and first of all German working class could receive actual proof of the proletariat revolution potentials to produce desirable social changes. If immediate social progress could be possible in economically backward and massively illiterate Russia, then the proletariat revolution would certainly bring progress and prosperity to the Western civilization. At the same time, becoming more civilized through the academic reform, Russia would serve as a political beacon for the colonial East (Lenin, 1920b). Being geographically and politically in the middle between Europe and Asia, socialist and educated Russia can produce the vital revolutionary connection of the West and East and thus build the backbone of the future communist global construction (Trotsky, 1919). Education was in the middle of social transformations expected from the world revolution that was meant to deliver internationalization as a natural policy of the future global proletariat state.

Using modern terminology it is possible to conclude that Bolsheviks observed the arrival of globalization as a worldwide economic and political reality at the beginning of the XX century. They determined WWI as the terminal climax of global capitalism – imperialism, and derived the possibility of practical execution of Marxist theory and successful accomplishment of World Revolution. Internationalization as a distinctive

policy of the victorious working class was planned to be the core of all social transformations brought by the proletariat revolution. Considering that the Bolshevik leadership purposefully planned to use positive experience of the Western academic systems, and planned to disseminate Soviet academic organization globally - such approach can certainly be defined as the policy of internationalization. Establishment of the Soviet social structure, including Soviet education system was planned not as a national reform, but as a global change. In 1917 Russia was only the starting point for the changing of the global society and for changing the world academic system accordingly. Thus internationalization was in the middle of the Bolshevik's academic reform started first in Russia, but intended to become a worldwide transformation.

**Part One: Internationalization in the History of Soviet Higher Education**

**Chapter 4: Formation of the Soviet Higher Education System and Emergence of Soviet International Academic Policy, 1917-1930s**

“The historical artillery round of the Aurora battleship announced the launch of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the beginning of a new era in the history of mankind!” This cliché has been used in thousands of Soviet books through decades of Soviet history (Bubnov, 1959; Bonch-Bruевич, 1930; Antonov-Ovseenko, 1957; Mints, 1973). However, for the population of the Russian Empire, the socialist revolution did not bring the age of enlightenment and social harmony. It meant the dramatic transformation of World war devastation into a Civil war massacre, followed by famine, class struggle, daily hardships, and the exhausting labor of millions of Russians striving for a better life (Fadeev, 1926; Babel, 1936; Sholohov, 1959). The Soviet mass mentality hardly associates revolution with the beginnings of grandiose academic reform. At the same time, one of the major slogans of the revolution was “mass education for the working masses”, reflecting the goal of the socialist revolution – the creation of a population of “New Men,” (Bezumensky, 1924).

The process of establishment of the Soviet academic system, to its organizational format and content known for decades of the USSR history, took about 20 years. Has Soviet government followed the same goals for national academia that were set by the Bolshevik leadership prior to the revolution? Was academic internationalism applied indeed as valuable part of the socialist educational policy, the way it has been discussed by the Russian Marxists before 1917? It is imperative to recognize the initial objectives of the Soviet leadership for the establishment of the national higher education system, in

order to determine the place of international academic policy in Soviet academia, during the period of the Soviet higher education formation. This chapter is aimed to answer the following questions: 1) What were the initial principles of the Soviet academic policy, and was internationalization a part of this policy? 2) How did problems with international recognition of the USSR influence the global status of Soviet higher education in 1920s? 3) What were the main parameters of Soviet academic policy during the so-called “period of socialist construction” in 1930s, and what were its practical manifestations in international affairs? This chapter focuses on the development of the international perspective of Soviet academia, from the victory of the Bolshevik revolution in October of 1917 until the beginning of WWII. International aspect of Soviet higher education is analyzed in this chapter as a reflection of the changes in Soviet government policy. Stages of progress in the formation of Soviet higher education system and corresponding changes in the Soviet international academic policy are at the center of this chapter. The research is based on the comparison of the original Bolshevik concept of socialist Russia as the first country in the world, practicing the academic policy of “open doors” and delivering enlightenment to the common people universally, with the later perception of the Soviet society as the citadel of socialism, expecting global war as the final resolution of the historical conflict with the world capitalism. The chapter will illustrate the organizational transformations that took place in Soviet academia by the end of 1930s, forming the foundation of the Soviet higher education model and the basis of its international academic policy until the collapse of the USSR in the 1990s.



*Russian Higher Education prior to the 1917 Revolution*

The reformation of Russian higher education, initiated by the Bolsheviks after the 1917 revolution, was not an easy task. Russian Marxists aimed to construct an unprecedented public system of higher education in the largest country of the world completely from scratch (Lunacharsky, 1917). In 1917, the Russian Empire didn't possess a developed national academic system. At the beginning of World War I there were only eleven universities in the country; by 1918, only five universities remained in Russia (Rodrigues, Leonov, Ponomarev, 2008; Anfimov, Korelin, 1995). Thirty-two higher vocational schools, twenty-four polytechnics and five conservatories formed the rest of the Russian higher education, not counting military, clerical and special government institutions, providing occupational training in selected professions (Avrus, 2001; Petrov, 2003; Tyagunov, 2011). Various historical sources provide different figures for the total number of students in Russia at this time, but usually the overall quantity of postsecondary students is given within the frame of 50-80 thousand (Ignatiev, 2001; Ivanov, 1991; Kurochkin, 2011). In 1913, the Russian Empire had a population of almost 180 million people, but only 85 thousand Russians, or less than 0.05% of the total population of the country, had higher education (Rashin, 1956; Statisticheskii Egegodnik Rossii, 1914). This statistic means that in 1913, among every 10,000 Russian citizens, only 5 people had higher education. US statistic sources show that over 800 people had higher education among each 10,000 Americans in the same year of 1913 (Report of the Director of the Census, 1913; Hillegas, 1915). The difference between levels of higher education among Russian and American populations by 1917 was about five educated Russians compared to about a thousand educated Americans for every 10 thousand

citizens in each country (Report of the Director of the Census, 1917; Rashin, 1956). At the time of the Bolshevik revolution, the USA had 200 times more people with higher education than Russia, while both countries had comparable total populations. By the end of 1917, Russia had less than 50 thousand students, which in fact placed the newly established Russian Socialist Republic among the colonial countries of Asia and Africa in terms of the national level of higher education (Andreev, 1998; Zhukov, 1998). Russia was one of the most illiterate and one of the least academically advanced countries in Europe (Mironov, 1991). The main features of Russian higher educational organization were: total government control and direct centralized budgeting; continued absence of university autonomy and academic freedoms; social, gender and ethnic restrictions for admissions; ideological censorship and political control over the social and academic life of students and faculty (Margolis, 1994; Soloviev, 1994). Russian academia didn't have any particular status or special recognition in the global university network, while the Russian government didn't have any special international academic policy (Fedorov, 2000; Zmeev, 2010). The offspring of Russian nobility could choose between studying in a national university or in abroad. Representatives of other social groups didn't have much choice and by 1917 mostly tried to get minimal vocational training with instant professional application (Avrus, 2001).

The world-famous Russian scientists of the early XX century addressed the Russian government with demands for immediate academic reform. Russian academics advocated the adoption of Western academic standards, namely academic freedoms, academic autonomy and the introduction of applied research into university curricula (Kavelin, 1904; Pavlov, 1951). The eminent Russian historian Vinogradov wrote in 1901

that until Russian universities achieved the same academic freedoms as practiced in the European academe, higher education in the country would not be fully developed to the modern level (Vinogradov, 2008). The founder of biogeochemistry, professor Vernadskiy, argued that the university should be run by professors with full academic autonomy and called for a national academic assembly that would adopt a new university charter, proclaiming European-like academic freedoms for Russian academic institutions (Vernadskiy, 1901). The creator of the Periodical table of the Chemical Elements, professor Mendeleev, demanded that all Russian professors be allowed to pursue research, pointing to the example of US higher education. “Russian academia will become universally recognized only after becoming European in its organization and American in its application,” stated famous chemist (Mendeleev, 1907). The coryphaeus of Russian geology, professor Obruchev, compared the situation in the Russian National Geological Committee to the development of geological science in the European countries, and stated that Sweden would have had just one geologist if it followed the Russian academic pattern of organization and staffing (Volobuev, 1987). Russian professors and students were very revolutionized and eager to act for the sake of modernization of Russian higher education, in the sense of adopting academic freedoms already well-established in European and US universities (Avrus, 2001; Kinelev, 1995). Considering the international origins of the transformations that Russian progressive academics suggested for immediate implementation, it is possible to regard them as a call for internationalization of Russian academia.

*Academic Internationalism as the Reflection of the Bolsheviks' Revolutionary Idealism*

The Bolsheviks were very sympathetic to the demands of Russian academics, and saw the introduction of Western academic principles into Russian higher education as one of the tasks of the socialist revolution. Although an internal issue, Russian academic reform was at the same time considered by the Bolsheviks to be part of the world revolution's progress and was expected to have global implications. The Bolsheviks' plan of educational reform could be equally defined as internationalization policy for Russian academe. Thus, the internationalization of Russian higher education was an integral component of the academic policy of the new Bolshevik government of the new Soviet state.

Immediately after their seizure of political power, the Soviet government proclaimed the enlightenment of common people of Russia as its vital mission (Lenin, 1917c). Members of the first Soviet government voted for the creation of the new Soviet legislation immediately, thus forming a legitimate basis for comprehensive academic reform (Lunacharsky, 1917). The declared focus of the first Soviet decrees was the provision of political freedoms, social rights and egalitarian opportunities to all common people. In the Declaration of Rights of Peoples of Russia, the guarantees were proclaimed to develop equally culture and education of all nationalities and ethnical groups that populated the former Russian Empire. Moreover, education at all levels was promised to be provided in respective native languages (Deklaratciya prav narodov Rossii, 1957). The Declaration of the Rights of Working and Exploited People promised equal access to education for all common people, including the universal right to receive higher education with no conditions and free of charge. New rights for education were planned

for immediate establishment in the Russian Soviet Republic, and to be extended all over the world after the victory of the World revolution (Deklaratsiya prav trudyashegosya i expluatiruemogo naroda, 1957). Civic ranking and related privileges or restrictions in education were abolished. Women were pronounced equal in all rights with men and were to receive equal access to all types of educational institutions, including universities (Dekret VTCIK i SNK ob unichtogenii sosloviy i grazhdanskih chinov, 1957). Newly adopted Soviet legislation proclaimed freedom of political activities in the national higher educational institutions, allowing any person regardless of his political affiliations to become a student or to work as a faculty member (Konstitutciya RSFSR, 1918). The special act “On the Recognition of Scientific Discoveries, Literature, Musical and Art Creations as State Properties” (1918) decreed any academic achievement or scholarly finding to be a national treasure with permanent state protection (O priznanii nauchnyh, literaturnyh, muzykalnih i hudozhestvennyh proizvedeniy gosudarstvennym dostoyaniem, 1918). “We have to do everything to establish the trust of Russian intellectuals in the Soviet Power, - this is half the battle for the young Soviet republic,” commented Lenin about new laws (Lenin, 1918b). According to one of the very few Western observers of the Russian revolution events of 1917, British writer Herbert G. Wells, the Bolsheviks indeed managed to attract Russian intellectuals to the ideals of revolution, and achieved surprising results in the academic development of the country and enlightenment of the population (Wells, 2007).

Two weeks after the events of October revolution took place, the new Soviet Government announced the establishment of the State Commission on Enlightenment (Dekret ob uchrezhdenii gosudarstvennoi komissii po prosvesheniu, 1957). The preamble

of the decree on the formation of the Commission said that through combining the most progressive examples of world education, it aimed to organize the first academic system, proletarian in its ideology while global in its application (Dekret ob uchrezhdenii gosudarstvennoi komissii po prosvesheniui, 1957). Provision of the principles of academic freedom and institutional autonomy was set as the priority for the Commission. The Decree clearly declared self-governance as the basic organizational principle for Soviet academia. Academic institutions were expected to function as autonomous establishments, and institutional administration had to provide regular management under the patronage of the local Soviet authorities. On the suggestion of the Commission, a University Soviet (Board) was introduced as the key organ of collective management in every Russian academic institution. All members of a university Soviet had to be elected annually by an assembly of all university teachers, students and staff. A University Soviet had to gather periodically to discuss and decide issues of university strategic management. When the matters were very important, an all-university meeting had to be held with the mandatory presence of not only faculty and staff, but students as well. This was a dramatic and the most democratic ever change in the core administration of Russian universities that “achieved the traditional organization of European university academia” (Bugaenko, 1967). The position of a chief manager was given to a University President, elected by a University Soviet and to a University Presidium as his council, which was a version of a President's Board at a Western university. Members of a President's Board would also have been elected by a University Soviet, as suggested by the Commission. All student affairs had to be managed by a Student Soviet - a special administrative body that would consist of the deputies elected by students. Finally, all

matters of international academic cooperation, including faculty and student exchange, or purchase of scholarly literature from abroad, were also to be decided by institutional management. “We should promote international academic collaboration and witness a conversion in the European mentality from observing Russian scientists as incidental intellectuals among the complete ferocity of the Russian population...to recognizing Soviet Russia as a new world center of academic knowledge” (Lenin 1919a). Another democratic innovation presented by the Commission was the eradication of the Russian traditional academic hierarchy. Only one faculty position of a “university teacher” was left, with all teachers carrying the equal title of a professor (*O nekotoryh izmeneniyah v sostave i ustroistve gosudarstvennyh uchebnyh i vysshih uchebnyh zavedeniy Rossiyskoi Respubliki*, 1918). The reformation was made “using the progressive example of academic democracy of the American higher education,” while the Bolsheviks went further in terms of internationalization of this rule. Foreigners were pronounced equal in their rights to Russian professors, and didn’t need to provide any additional documentation or process through a different application procedure to get a faculty position at a Russian university (*O nekotoryh izmeneniyah v sostave i ustroistve gosudarstvennyh uchebnyh i vysshih uchebnyh zavedeniy Rossiyskoi Respubliki*, 1918). Immediately after its formation, the Commission initiated a public discussion about the change of rules for admission into higher educational institutions (Zemlyanaya, Pavlycheva, 2011). New admission rules suggested complete abolition of the usual application procedure. All people regardless of their social, wealth, cultural or ethnic background, could become students. No admission privileges were allowed, no entrance exams were required, and no educational, language, cultural or citizenship documentation

was compulsory for presentation (O pravilah priema v vysshie uchebnye zavedeniya, 1918). According to the new regulation, anybody could become a student of a Russian higher educational institution: a person residing in the country or a foreigner, a rural or an urban resident, a man or a woman, an employed person or a jobless one, a representative of a national minority - all became equal for university admission and could become students at will. Higher education was proclaimed free of charge in Soviet Russia. Tuition or any other financial fees were completely prohibited. Not only Russian students, but foreigners as well, could study for free at any Russian higher educational institution. All students could apply for a place in a student dormitory and for a government stipend (O pravilah priema v vysshie uchebnye zavedeniya, 1918).

Internationalization was not spelled out in the Soviet legislation as a particular academic policy of the Soviet government, but “internationalism,” in the meaning quite corresponding to the modern definition of “internationalization” was legalized as the cornerstone of Soviet academic strategy, and was clearly underlined as a political principle of Soviet government (Lenin, 1918b). Reflecting the idea of the imminent arrival of the world socialist system as the final mission of the October revolution, the Bolsheviks went further than any revolutionaries before them in terms of their international academic policy. The subject of citizenship and related matters of immigration status, payments, educational and working rights – all these issues were completely abandoned for international students in Russian universities. It was actually the first practical step to a new world with no cultural boundaries or national borders. People interested in getting higher education in Russia could arrive at any Russian higher educational institution and become students without preliminary applications, without



getting a study permit or student visa, without presenting a passport or any other documentation (*O pravilah priema v vysshie uchebnye zavedeniya*, 1918). Moreover, foreigners had the same rights to receive a place in a dormitory or a state stipend as local, Russian students. There was even no requirement for knowledge of the Russian language. Classes were taught in Russian of course, but understanding the material and being able to study was the personal issue of each student. At the same time, every national university was obliged to have free-of-charge preparation classes in Russian language and in other subjects for those who needed additional training to cope with the university curriculum (*O pravilah priema v vysshie uchebnye zavedeniya*, 1918). New Soviet legislation canceled the traditional notion of a national educational system, while promoting the idea of academic internationalization in practice. Comparing the modern description of internationalization as “a practical policy of academic institutions or national academic systems reflecting global changes” (see Altbach, 2002c; Knight, 2003; De Wit, 2002), chosen by the author as an operational definition for this study (see Chapter 2, p. 43), to the reformation plan suggested by the Bolsheviks for the Russian academic system, it seems that Soviet academic policy indeed had internationalization as one of its original principles. However, before the Bolsheviks finished with the first step – the formation of new legislation to enable the actual beginning of academic reform in Russia - civil war broke out in February 1918. Three years of ongoing Civil War and the emergence of associated economic, military and political problems prevented the implementation of the original Bolshevik plans for academic reform. Simple survival became the priority for the population of the country and for the new political regime. “The situation inside Russia and its status on the world arena are critical, requesting

extraordinary measures from our government if we want to save the young Soviet republic” (Lenin, 1919b). Soviet state didn’t have the monetary or material resources to deliver actual autonomy, self-governance and academic freedoms to the existing few higher educational institutions in the country, much less to establish new universities or promote international activities. Even the principal, and the most privileged higher school in the country, Moscow University, addressed Lenin personally during January 1918 only on the subject of fuel (fire-wood) provision - with eighteen written requests (Letopis MGU, documenty za 1918). While Russian academic institutions hardly functioned at all during the period of the Civil War, anti-Soviet Russian intellectuals who immigrated to Europe established Russian academic networks abroad. Russian communities abroad envisioned themselves and were considered by many Europeans as the “carriers of Russian statehood” (Iovanovitch, 2001). Russian immigrants tried to preserve all major structures of state organization, including academia, hoping to be recognized as the heirs of the Russian Empire by European governments. Europe was expected to become a political supporter and a financial aid provider for the restoration of the “rightful Russian order instead of Bolshevik impostors” (Bocharova, 2005). The polarized differentiation of Russian academia reflected the political antagonism of the Russian society, splintered between Soviet “Reds” and Anti-Soviet “Whites.” From the very beginning of the Civil War, everything became very political in higher education and was observed through a sharp political “rifle sight” as having either Red or White perspectives (Evseeva, 2001a).

The notable ideals of academic internationalism in the new world of social harmony were impractical in light of the warfare that lasted for years. The grandiosely announced legal acts of Bolsheviks remained proclamations. Common Russians firmly associated

international relations with military intervention and economic blockades leaving no space for the notion of peaceful collaboration. Political hostility settled deep into the very definition of “international,” expressed in the Soviet anthem: “first we’ll demolish the old world to the ground, and then we’ll build our own, - providing tomorrow everything to those, who were nothing yesterday” (International, mezhdunarodnyi proletarskiy gimn, 1918). World Revolution delivered by force throughout the world was converted from a political idea into the practical policy of the Soviet government, reflecting the expectations of the Soviet people, with international academic policy becoming an essential component of this policy.

*The Establishment of International Partnerships: A Vital Task of Soviet Academia in the 1920s*

The victorious end of the Civil War major battles in 1920 didn’t bring relief to Soviet Russia. Famine and shortages of vital supplies became daily problems for the Soviet population in the early 1920s. The progress of educational reform, intended to build the best academic system in the world and disseminate it globally, was suspended till better economic times (Chamberlin, 1930; Levshin, 1986). “Russian science is experiencing a real catastrophe, being beyond the brink of survival,” wrote academician Vernadskiy in 1921 (Vernadskiy, 1993). The division of Russian academia into two parts, where a rather dysfunctional higher education inside the country was outmatched by more organized and well-funded Russian academia abroad, created quite a phenomenal situation of academic dualism at the beginning of 1920s (Evseeva, 2001b). At the time, many scholars around the world saw the situation of Russian higher education overall as its collapse in Russia and its salvation abroad (Simpson, 1939; Raeff, 1990). This was a

rather paradoxical time for Russian academia. On the one hand, the Soviet government introduced the proclaimed objective of the “proletarization” of higher education through its mass accessibility, proving in practice that Soviet power brings enlightenment to common people and is the pattern of development for the rest of humanity (Pokrovsky, 1929). On the other hand, the Soviet government could not provide for even the handful of national universities that remained in Russia, not to mention the creation of a new academic system open to the world (Safrazyan, 1977). Considering the network of Russian universities abroad and the international isolation of Soviet Russia, Bolshevik leadership needed to prove that Russian academia was both flourishing and loyal to Soviet regime (Kolchinskiy, 2003). The Soviet government was seeking an academic component in its international policy to have productive communications with foreign powers; as well as an international division in the national higher education to represent Soviet science as part of global academia. Soviet leadership decided to concentrate its efforts on the promotion of existing research centers and support to the scholars remained in the country (Zhukotsky, 2010). The Soviets had to solve quickly and efficiently a number of issues related to the global academic standing of the newly formed USSR (Makarenko, 2005). First of all, the Soviets had a vital need to break the international blockade and establish political and economic relations with industrial powers (Churakov, 2011). The establishment of scientific and technological partnerships between Russian scholars and their colleagues abroad was an imperative condition in order to receive foreign investments and modern technology, and machinery, all vitally needed to restore collapsed Russian industry. Lenin (1921a) was insisting that without involvement of knowledgeable specialists, especially famous Russian scientists... we won't be able to

build our economy and socialism (Ob edinom hozyaistvennom plane). Also, there was a political agenda behind the appearance of Soviet academia in the European and global arena – it was an important way of proving the Soviet regime as a long-lasting, steady and nationally endorsed political establishment. International academic cooperation was a vital channel to deliver a simple but an important message to the world: Russian academia is Soviet, productive, and open to international cooperation. It was an important political task to prove that the intellectual elite of the nation was not planning to run away from Soviet Russia and was researching and achieving, inventing and publishing, studying and teaching. “One of the key tasks of today for our Party is to attend academics to the construction of socialist society” (Lenin, 1922). Special government provision was given to world-renowned Russian scientists, including funding of their travels to other countries and publications abroad (Esakov, 1971). For example, the first Russian winner of the Nobel Prize, world-known physiologist Ivan Pavlov received promotion of his international activities from Lenin personally, who requested from Sovnarkom “to create the best conditions and provide necessary state funding to ensure the research work of Comrade Pavlov, and to publicize the results of the scientific work of his institute worldwide” (Lenin, 1921b). While the Soviet state didn’t have monetary resources to fund all applications for research funds, it provided favorable political conditions for Soviet academics to collaborate with their colleagues abroad, and to receive funds from foreign academic institutions and philanthropic foundations (Zhidkova, 1999). Following new postulates of national foreign policy, Soviet federal and local authorities endorsed direct international communication between Russian research institutions and foreign academic establishments (Bolshakova, 1990; Gershenzon, 1996). The Soviet government

also delivered legal authorization to Russian academic establishments to pursue international collaboration with foreign academic organizations, and to accept foreign aid for the institutional research activities (Bastrakova, 1973; Demidova, 2007).

Soviet authorities supported the participation of Russian scholars in international academic team work and in joint projects with budgets provided from institutions abroad (Soskin, 2000; Esakov, 2000). By 1925, the Central Party Committee required a special academic progress plan designed to make Soviet university comparable to the best universities of Europe and America, with Moscow State University becoming a leading academic institution of the world (Materialy po istorii AN SSSR, 1986). Moscow State University reported in 1926 that it had academic relations with 84 foreign universities of Europe, Asia, and Americas, mostly through research communication and exchange of scholarly publications (Letopis MGU, dokumenty za 1926). At the same time, Russian scholars received opportunities to apply for personal scholarships abroad. Provision of individual grants for Russian academics became the primary means of foreign financial aid to Soviet academia (Zhidkova, 1999). Academic stipends from the Rockefeller Foundation were the most famous example of monetary support to Soviet researchers in the 1920s (Kozhevnikov, 1993). Other foundations and organizations, like the Carnegie Foundation, The UK Royal Society, the Lorentz Foundation, and the Institute of International Education also supported Russian science in the 1920s (Crowther, 1930; Korzhihina, 1992). Beginning in 1925, international academic organizations sponsored study trips of Soviet researchers to foreign academic institutions and international scholarly meetings as well (Zhidkova, 1999). Hundreds of Russian scholars got a chance to study and do research in Europe and the USA due to foreign grants, which became one

of the key channels for modern scientific discoveries and new technologies to arrive in the USSR (Vucinich, 1984). Not only did it help the economic development of Soviet Russia, but it also positively influenced the global image of the USSR (Kozhevnikov, 1993). Many Russian academics, who later became famous names in Soviet science, like the physicists Landau, Tamm, Kapitsa, the biologists Vavilov, Alpatov, and the physicians Shvartz, Nasonov, and Kupalov used this opportunity to study in world-class research centers and establish personal relations with world-renowned scholars (Zhidkova, 1999). “Academics abroad are very interested to cooperate with our researchers and this is an important connection to the industrialized West that we need to use...to develop commercial and economic relations with foreign powers, beneficial to the USSR,” stated A. Rykov, Chairman of the Soviet Government after Lenin’s demise, in his address “On the perspectives of our development” to the members of Politburo (Esakov, 2000). Establishment of an international academic network for Soviet scientists was at the center of the 200<sup>th</sup> jubilee of the Russian Academy of Sciences solemnized in 1925 (Chizhevsky, 1974; Kumok, 1978). The Soviet government created a big international event out of the celebration, inviting at its expense over a hundred foreign scholars to attend. Eighty-five foreign members were elected to the Academy Board and several dozen joint research projects were launched during the jubilee academic conference in Moscow (Krivonosov, 2003).

The international exchange of scholarly publications was also well promoted at the time. “The Library Department of the Commissariat of Education had to inform constantly on the improvements being applied in Switzerland, America and elsewhere, so that we could reward those who made the most adequate improvements in our libraries”

(Lunacharskiy, 1927). By a special order of the Soviet government, national higher educational and research institutions received permission for the direct international exchange of scientific publications using state funding (Zhilkin, 1999). The international academic policy of the Soviet leadership positively influenced the global networking of Russian academia. Soviet scientists recalled later that the 1920s were years of freedom in worldwide communication, international research efforts, travel and study abroad, and joint publications, which helped to establish Soviet science and create vital knowledge and experience for young scholars who later became world-famous scientists (Kondratiev, 1966; Vavilov, 1947). “Our government in the 1920s really tried to form a vanguard of world science out of Soviet researchers. It was a time when the political leadership of the country treated academics with respect...and promoted the natural desire of our young Soviet scholarship to be a valued part of global academia” (Ioffe, 1975).

The educational policy of Soviet leadership was focused in the 1920s on the issue of the proletarianization of national higher schooling (Medynsky, 1947). According to this policy, several higher educational institutions were established on the outskirts of the USSR as branches of central Russian universities. A good example is the Central-Asian University, established in 1923 with the help of Moscow State University under the Party’s motto: “today we are establishing Soviet academia in Turkestan, tomorrow we will arrive to India” (TashGU im. Lenina, 1970). However, the grandiose task of educating the global proletariat was as yet impractical, and internationalization could not occupy as important a place in the daily activities of Soviet higher education as it had in the development of national science and research. Considering the practical realities of



life in the Soviet Union at the time, hardly anybody could be expected to come to a literally starving country and study in one of its few local universities. The lack of such expectation had been clearly stated during the First Congress of Communist International (Lenin, 1919c). The Comintern Congress, however, set the task of sending to the Soviet Russia selected members of national communist parties to study the “revolutionary experience” from Russian comrades (Vatlin, 1993). Special higher schools were established for the foreign comrades, like the Socialist Academy of Social Sciences, later renamed the Communist Academy (Smirnov, 1960; Gorodetskiy, 1964). These special educational institutions were academic only in their title, and had a mission of training political leadership for European and Asian states that were considered to be “standing on the edge of a proletariat revolution” (Esakov, 1971). Hundreds of revolutionaries from the Baltic States, Poland, Romania, Turkestan, Mongolia and other countries needing “enforcement of Communist orientation” studied in the USSR to become future leaders of their nations in the march toward World Communism (Zvyagelskaya, 2009; Vatlin, 1993). This international mobility had purely political mission, but was observed to be a prelude to the “international act of expansion of Soviet higher education all over the world” (Trotsky, 1923). At the same time, the Bolsheviks fulfilled their political declaration and invited common people of the country to become students. Student numbers increased greatly, from several dozen thousands by the end of the Civil war to over a hundred thousand by the end of the 1920s (Andreev, 2007). Still, it was more political than effective, since the new students from working classes could hardly cope with academic curricula (Ivanova, 1980).

Faced with an international blockade, wherein most industrialized countries didn't want to have diplomatic or trade relations with the Soviet Power, but waited rather for its collapse, the USSR could hardly expand typical international educational activities (Vatlin, 1993). Faced with difficult realities, Soviet leadership did not give up its international academic plan. Russian academia in the 1920s passed through a global experiment of its organization and content quite literally, being first divided into domestic and foreign dimensions, then facing total collapse as it attempted to become the first and the major locomotive for the creation of new global academia without borders and boundaries. Soviet academia survived and advanced, keeping its international dimension and even developing it. In the 1920s, the Soviets introduced to the world new terms, like “scientist-internationalist,” “academic internationalism,” and “world academic system,” reflecting their global academic ambitions and hopes for a worldwide network of proletarian higher education (Bukharin, 1924).

*Encircled by Enemies: Militarization of Soviet Higher Education and Centralization of International Academic Policy through the 1930s*

The end of the 1920s brought to the USSR the new reality of its internal development and its international standing. The year 1928 is considered by scholars worldwide to be the beginning of the “Stalin era” (Boobbyer, 2000; Litvin, Keep, 2005; Platonov, 2013). The proletarianization of Russian society, including national academia, was completed and the USSR entered the “construction of socialism” period (Stalin, 1929). It started with a “Great Break,” defined as a combination of collectivization, industrialization and cultural revolution. The new motto for the development of Soviet society was proclaimed by the General Secretary of the Russian Communist Party, Josef

Stalin: facing hostile capitalistic isolation, the USSR should build socialism by itself (Stalin, 1926). The new logic of the international victory of socialism suggested that first, a Socialist Society should be built in the USSR, and after Soviet Union became the world's dominant industrial and military power, it would promote Socialist Revolution throughout the globe, creating a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the World (Programma i Ustav VKP(b), 1937). Soviet leadership endorsed what appeared to many as an impossible dream: construct modern industry in a couple of decades, and combine this with the conversion of the Soviet Union into a well-organized and powerful military citadel, while simultaneously lifting the cultural and daily life level of all citizens (Shestnadtsataya konferentsia VKPb, 1929). In light of these new grandiose tasks set for the USSR, new objectives were posted for national academia as well. "Cadre is the decisive factor" - declared Stalin, thus ordering a focus on the training of professional manpower for the national economy (Stalin, 1935). Soviet higher education was given an assignment to instantly become polytechnic and massive, and produce in five years twice as many qualified specialists, predominantly in technical sciences and engineering (Davies, Harris, 2005; Rogachevskaya, 2005). The number of higher educational institutions was planned to nearly double, while the number of polytechnic institutes would increase almost 5 times (Gladkov, 1956). The number of research institutions expanded greatly as well: by the end of the first five-year plan period, there were over 1500 research establishments in the USSR, with 1/3 of them being experimentation units of higher educational institutions (labs and centers) or study facilities of the All-Union Academy of Sciences (Esakov, 1971; Lelchuk, 1984). By 1933, the USSR had 832 higher schools with 504,000 students enrolled (Dvadtsat let sovetskoi vlasti, 1937). The

incredible advance of Russian higher education during the 1930s is clearly visible in its comparison with US higher education: the gap in total numbers of students in 1917 between the two countries was about 200 times in favor of the USA or 1 Russian student for every 200 US students; by the mid-1930s, it falls to 1 Soviet student for every 3 US students (Snyder, 1993; Rakunov, 2011).

The “Great Break” in Soviet economy led to a major organizational change in the structure of Soviet academia. The political leadership of the USSR demanded that Soviet higher education become the best “production line for professional manpower” in just a decade (Shestnadtsataya konferentsia VKP(b), 1929). The most famous examples of prolific vocational training were to be copied and improved, like the famous Ford conveyor. “We need to pay heed to Ford and other capitalists, agree on all their conditions for crediting our economy, but in ten years our automotive industry should be better than the American one, and have more qualified specialists than Ford can dream about,” stated Kuibyshev, the head of the USSR Committee for people’s Economy in 1930 (Shpotov, 2013). The focus of Soviet academic reform was on converting the barely emerging national education system into a “forge of cadre” supplying qualified personnel of high qualification to all sectors of economic and social practice (Stalin, 1931). This task had to be achieved at any cost, - underlined Sergo Ordzhonikidze, the Chairman of the Highest Council of National Economy (VSNH), at the 17<sup>th</sup> RKP(b) Conference (Drobizhev, 1966). Soviet higher education was constructed as a network of training divisions in each field of industry, and its top-down administrative structure reflected the political task of converting the country into a unified military camp. All higher institutions were distributed between state departments managing activities and

development of particular industries or social sectors. Each All-Union Commissariat received its set of higher educational institutions reflecting the profile of the department, together with the task to train as many specialists as were needed to fulfill the current and forthcoming five-year plans. For example, the Commissariat of Agriculture administered and funded all agricultural higher schools in the country, and was responsible for both the quantity of needed professionals in agronomy, veterinary and other fields of agricultural sciences and also the quality of their professional knowledge and their ability to apply it in practice. The Commissariat of Health had the same kind of control over training and practical application of all specialists in medical professions all over the country. All federal departments were constructed in the same mode, covering all types of intellectual labor and professional vocations.

Scientific research was organized, administered and funded in the same manner. It was mostly concentrated outside higher educational institutions and performed through various divisions of the Academy of Sciences (Knyazev, Koltsov, 1964). Given different tasks higher education and science were separated organizationally (Lapko, 1972). Higher professional training was fully devoted to the preparation of the cadre, while academic research aimed to provide industries with new inventions, technologies, machinery, and equipment (Panachin, 1977). The brightest graduates of higher schools, named “the top layer of state cadre,” were directed into research institutions and were privileged to work in the “ranks of Soviet people’s intelligencia” (Hisamutdinova, 2007). Research activities were considered professional work, not studies, and were separated from education (SSSR v tsifrah, 1934). Academic research formed a special division of the Soviet administrative structure. The formal state establishment that produced

academic research was the Academy of Sciences (Kozlov, 2000). Its assembly was identical to the organization of national higher education: leading administrative functions were concentrated at the federal level in the All-Union Academy, which supervised Academies formed around specific fields of application, like the Academy of Medical Sciences, Agricultural Sciences, Pedagogical Sciences, etc. (Materialy k istorii Akademii nauk SSSR za sovetskiy period, 1950). Territorial academic institutes formed the national network of subordinate academic establishments (Komkov, Levshin, 1977). Formally, the Soviet Academy of Sciences had the ability to conduct international activities, but actually they were channeled mostly through the departments of federal government – All-Union Commissariats, each related to its own department. International academic mobility was organized accordingly: Soviet academics going abroad were “state trainees” or “Soviet specialists” directed by the state to execute a precise government task, or to receive a training required by state. Foreign academics arriving in the USSR were defined as “foreign specialists” contracted by the Soviet state to execute some special scholarly task (Industrializatsiya Sovetskogo Souza, 1999).

The application of international specialists changed according to the organizational reforms in Soviet academia. Foreign academics were now considered as qualified manpower from abroad, and were invited at the request of the industrial commissariats, or profiled sections of the Academy of Sciences, for pragmatic assistance in applied projects. When the chairman of the State Commission of Moscow Metro Construction, academician Gubkin, suggested inviting a number of well-known foreign academics in technical sciences, the request was processed from the All-Union Academy of Sciences to the Commissariat of Transportation. It was endorsed by the Moscow City Party

Committee, got approved by the Politburo and delivered as an order for execution to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Kak my stroili metro, 1935). Over 50 experts from the USA, Germany, the UK, and France were invited as “foreign specialists” between 1932 and 1935 (Morgan, 1935). They were formal guests of Metrostroy (Metro Construction Project), subsidized by the Commissariat of Transportation, and worked for months with a team from the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Yet this was not counted as an international academic project by Soviet leadership (Kasatkin, 2010). In the report of the director of the Metro construction project L. Kaganovitch to the Party congress, this act of international academic cooperation was named “the use of foreign specialists for the needs of Soviet industry in the reality of a temporary lack of national cadre of the required qualification” (Kaganovitch, 1935).

Beginning in the 1930s the most advanced theoretical and empirical research was produced outside Academy of Science, in a parallel national academic structure formed out of the special experimental, inventive and investigative units within the system of the Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD). This special academic network was aimed to conduct valuable research expected to influence industrial and military potency. It was formed as part of the Main Department of Labor Camps (GULAG) system organizationally, and was regarded as a “top state secret,” and purposely had no international dimension by definition (Khromov, 2002; Rasskazov, 2003). Most of the famous Soviet projects, such as space-rocket construction, anti-corrosion lubrication of metals, and atomic energy use, started and often existed for years as special, secret, and highly guarded programs of the GULAG system (Kapitsa, 2008). Many famous Soviet scientists like Kurchatov, Korolev, Tupolev, and Sakharov worked at the special research

facilities, instead of teaching at universities and educating students. These “leading Soviet brains” lived in isolated facilities guarded by NKVD, often under nick-names, and had no access to the outer world for years (Shostakovsky, 2002). At the same time, working in classified facilities, the Soviet academic elite had access to the global academic accomplishments. They could order the latest scholarly literature on any subject from all over the world, request descriptions of modern inventions and translations of foreign publications, and receive stenographic records of international scholarly meetings. The most special scientific information could be delivered to this “crème de la crème” of Soviet academia that worked under the personal supervision of Comrade Stalin, but they couldn’t travel abroad, or meet with their foreign colleagues even inside the USSR, since they were regarded as “the most valuable attainment of Soviet society” (Esakov, Rubinin, 2003). The organizational reform of Soviet higher education forced Russian academia to convert from being an assembly of critical thinkers openly debating methods and outcomes of scholarly research into a “solid element of the Soviet state loyal to the government and serving the interests of common people” (Vosemnadcatyi Siezd VKP(b), 1939). The international component of academic work became a matter of secret affairs, controlled by special state agencies and turned into the privilege of selected Soviet scholars with access to publically restricted information from abroad. The militarization of Soviet academia brought secrecy as an organic part of the new reality. Each higher educational institution received a new so-called “Department N 1” administered by the local NKVD office, with the task of supervising over all professors and students with regard to their loyalty to the Soviet regime. Part of “proper loyalty” was the absence of any communication with foreigners. “Department N 2,” also housed



in each academic institution, was a representation office of the army (RKKA) and had to keep the military status of each student and academic updated. It was a way to prohibit any unauthorized mobility even within the country and to draft students and scholars to active army duty at any time (Obshestvo i vlast, 1998).

Such organization and ideology of higher education was quite unique, and had no analogous structure in the West. This trajectory of Russian academia was the most significant reformation in its history, and made it impermeable to internationalization. Perceiving the USSR as the bastion of socialism encircled by imperialistic countries “willing to strangle Communism in its cradle,” Soviet leadership militarized national higher education and appointed federal departments of the national military structure as the new carriers of state international academic policy (Stalin, 1938). All international affairs were completely removed from the institutional level of administration and were executed exclusively by units of the federal government. International scholarly matters were relocated under the authority of federal divisions specifically responsible for operations abroad. The collection of scholarly information worldwide moved from universities and libraries to the Commissariat of International Affairs (NKID). The NKID was instructed to provide constant supervision of scientific discoveries, inventions and academic publications through Soviet diplomatic missions and to regularly purchase academic literature abroad for Soviet researchers (Maisky, 1964). The gathering of useful technological and scientific information became the responsibility of GRU RKKA - the intelligence service of the Red Army (Krivitsky, 2000). International communication and mobility was mostly done through the Central Party Committee that controlled the Executive Board of Communist International (Comintern) (Mlechin, 2011). Invitations to

foreign scholars and study trips for Soviet academics were done via a special federal organ, the Supreme Soviet of the National Economy, under the supervision of the Foreign Office of the VKP(b) Central Committee and under the supervision of the Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NKVD) (Petrov, Skorkin, 1999). NKVD created a Foreign Department in its structure, which had an office for academic activities abroad (Mlechin, 2009). The Commissariat of Defense (NKO) also created several new departments related to study abroad activities and the mobility of “Soviet specialists” to foreign countries as consultants and instructors (Sovetskoe rukovodstvo: Perepiska, 1928-1941, 1999). These new administrative units reflected the needs of Soviet international academic policy, and worked in tight cooperation, reporting directly to the Politburo (Sotskov, 2011). The NKID, NKO and NKVID, - the three most militarily focused Soviet Commissariats, with foreign analytical and intelligence services, examined and organized modern research and technical information from foreign states and industrial organizations, supplying Soviet scholars with the latest advancements in world academia (Mlechin, 2009).

As this history illustrates, through the 1930s Soviet academia gave up international activities to other federal divisions - but this was in no sense a cancellation of the international academic policy of the Soviet state. Rather, it was a transformation of the focus and organization of an international academic component, based on the reality of war-time necessities. In times of war, international issues fall typically either under official diplomatic matters, hosted by the state department of International Affairs; or under non-official activities of the intelligence and secret agencies of the state, usually hosted by departments of Internal Affairs and/or Military Affairs. The organizational re-positioning of international academic activities was done by the Soviet authorities

according to the logic of a war-time administration. All reformations were happening under the Stalin's motto, declaring education as a weapon whose effect depends on who holds it in his hands and at whom it is aimed (Stalin, 1934). The international academic policy of Soviet leadership not only existed, it developed in the 1930s. Dozens of special decisions were issued by the Politburo of VKP(b) Central Committee and Federal Soviet Government (SNK) regarding invitations for foreign specialists for the needs of industrialization progress, study abroad mobility for Soviet specialists, and the purchase of modern academic literature abroad, acquisition of technological know-how and technical blue-prints of modern machinery, equipment and inventions (Direktivy VKP(b) i postanovlenia sovetского pravitelstva o narodnom obrazovanii, 1947). Academic international activities continued on; however, this was happening within the new structure of Soviet state and mostly outside the system of Soviet higher education (Shafarevitch, 1991; Chesnova, 1999). Party structures were selecting students and faculty who presented the most promising research abilities for training abroad or special research projects involving work with foreign academic materials. Special NKVD structures checked the selected candidates for the possibility of their participation in study abroad programs, and supervised every aspect of foreign participation in scientific or industrial projects progressing in the USSR (Sotskov, 2011). Academics who passed through the preliminary selection process were formally enlisted into the RKKA and usually received a military officer rank (Krapivina, Makeev, 2006). Then, being Soviet military specialists, they were cleared to study abroad, or to work together with foreigners at industrial sites (Hoteenkov, 1987; Golubev, 2004). The Soviet state acted in a defensive mode, guarding its technological and scientific achievements from the

foreigners who were considered as potential enemies; and protecting its scholars as a valuable national resource for economic, military and social progress.

Success in the execution of the “Construction of Socialism” plan brought the USSR in the late 1930s to the status of a developed industrial country. Measured by the amount of gross industrial product, the country occupied second place in the world, behind only the USA (Verhoturov, 2006; Werth, 1995). Along with economic progress, the Soviet academic system advanced rapidly. By the 1938-39 academic year, the USSR had over a thousand higher educational institutions, with almost a million students enrolled, and about two thousand research establishments, not counting the huge network of secret research facilities administrated by the GULAG system (Harrison, Davies, 1997; Latsis, 1987). The total number of “Soviet intelligentsias” or persons working in intellectual professions reached ten million (Lapko, 1972; Narodnoye hozyaistvo SSSR v tsifrah, 1940). It was still less than ten percent of the population of the country, but this number represented a 100 times increase compared to pre-revolutionary times (Chuntulov, 1987). The Party plan of converting backward, agricultural Russia into a modern industrial power with limitless, well-trained human resources seemed to be working out most successfully (Reese, 2011; Oganessian, 2008). At the same time, Soviet society was an ideological monolith. Evidence of popular opinion reveals a sincere belief in the perfection of the Communist doctrine, and an overwhelming admiration for the leader of the country, Comrade Stalin (Vituhnovskaya, 2000; Bazhanov, 1992). Explaining the love of the Soviet people for Stalin, the famous German novelist of the time Lion Feuchtwanger wrote: “There is no doubt that an excessive worship of Stalin by the great majority of Russian people is absolutely sincere. People really think that what they have

and what they are - all is due to the efforts of Stalin. This veneration is the organic result of the successes of the USSR” (Feuchtwanger, 1937).

Beginning in the mid-1930s, the Soviet state placed its international academic policy between the surveillance of NKVD and the intelligence of NKID and NKO. The Party Politburo was the highest authority and acted abroad via the Comintern as the “fighting unit of world Communism and its vanguard – the USSR.” The world revolution had a new implementation plan, on that included a new world war that was supposed to finish the great matter of expansion of communism globally started by the Bolshevik revolution. “The world observes the triumph of Soviet academia with admiration, waiting for it to become soon Soviet global academia...Now, when the Red Army is the most powerful military force in the world, we can say to our comrades worldwide – it will not be long before knowledge and prosperity will be shared by all people...the anticipated Soviet Power of the world will arrive soon,” remarked Stalin casuistically on the eve of World War II (Stalin, 1938). The international academic policy of the Soviet state was changed organizationally and reformed in its content to adequately reflect its new reality - the military status of the USSR (Davies, Harrison, Wheatcroft, 1994; Krapivina, Makeev, 2006; Shtamm, 1985).

*Spanish War: The First Practical International Experience for Soviet Academia*

Since the famous War Speech of Churchill, the invasion of Poland by Nazi Germany on September 1, 1939 is commonly considered to be the beginning of World War II (Churchill 1986; Murrey, Millett, 2001; Weinberg, 2005; Grechko, 1976; Ustinov, 1988). Soviet leadership, however, regarded 1936 as the starting point of a new global military conflict. In his speech to the 18<sup>th</sup> Party Congress, Stalin made an important

announcement: he stated that a new global war had already started in 1936, and was escalating throughout Europe, also expanding in other parts of the world (Stalin, 1939). In public speeches during next two years, Stalin and members of Politburo confirmed their complete confidence that the new world war had started in 1936 with the events in Spain. “The Spanish Civil war is not an internal conflict...it is a new European war of the forces of progressive humanity against the evil of imperialism, in its most radical version – fascism” (Vosemnadcatyi Siezd VKP(b), 1939). Following the logic of the Soviet leaders, all the international activities of the USSR since mid-1930s may be understood as functions of wartime Soviet society. This includes academic activities as well. The events of the period suggest that Soviet international academic policy indeed reflected the realities of wartime after 1936, and Soviet higher education acted as part of the Soviet state military organism until the end of WWII (Novikov, 2012). Without suggesting reconsideration of the time-period of WWII adopted by the world over half a century ago, I think it is important to follow the logic of the Soviet leadership, starting “War times” for the USSR in 1936, in order to understand developments and applications of Soviet international academic policy during the period of WWII. After announcing the beginning of a new world war in 1936, the USSR central authorities acted in a traditional mode of military help to the Spanish republicans, who were observed as comrades Marxists and promoters of progressive socialist ideas (Pozharskaya, Saplin, 2001). However, the Politburo soon changed its position. “Soviet leadership should be cautious in its European diplomacy during the development of a new world war and present the involvement of the USSR as humanitarian help of Soviet people to their brothers-workers,”- reprehended Stalin his comrades during several Politburo sessions devoted to

the Spanish events (*Stalinskoe politburo v 1930-e gody*, 1995). Reflecting the instructions of the “Genius World Leader,” higher education was named a valuable component of aid provision to Spain (Adibekov, 2004). Soviet educational help was offered free of charge, in the format of classes for illiterate Spanish people, supplies of Soviet textbooks, courses of Russian language, and Marxist study groups led by Soviet teachers (Pozharskaya, Saplin, 2001). Historians usually mention a total of about 10,000 Soviet specialists who worked in Spain in 1936-39 (Danilov, 2004). Considering that all of them had professional training, it is possible to count them as “higher education specialists” directed abroad with a special international mission. They fulfilled a number of educational tasks, forming in Spain a network of Soviet-type schools of secondary and higher learning levels (Starinov, 1964). “Soviet academic help” allowed twenty thousand Spanish people to receive Soviet-style professional training in their own country, while about three thousand Spaniards received higher education training in the USSR (Merono, 2006). Most of the training was done in Russian, and thousands of Spaniards studied the Russian language (Kolesov, 2011).

Spain was the first approbation of the Soviet government in application of its international academic policy in the war realities. The Spanish experience was considered a valuable call for the improvement in the quality of training of Soviet professional cadre (Starikov, 2013). For the Soviet population, the Spanish war resulted in the arrival of thousands of European refugees, many of whom became students in the Soviet higher schools. Spanish immigrants in the USSR were not only privileged, with the provision of housing mostly in large urban centers, but were also invited to study in Soviet higher schools and to receive professional training. Soviet universities were instructed to provide

Russian language courses to the immigrants, help them study, accommodate them in the dormitories, and issue monthly stipends (Babitsky, 2009). Soviet universities started to offer Spanish as a foreign language, and Spanish songs and expressions became common among Russians. Spain bore the notion of the beginning of global Sovietization (Babitskiy, 2009). Spain provided first-hand experience to the Soviets on the delivery of teaching and study abroad in the Soviet format. The relatively small scale exercise, was a valuable international experience for Soviet academia. As an image of European reality for thousands of Russians, it appeared to be more helpful to the Soviets than a serious influence on the Spaniards. “Cooperation with Spanish comrades helped our people not only in their professional development as technicians or militants, but provided them with an invaluable experience of practical internationalism. It is the best school of raising internationalists-professionals, able to disseminate Soviet Power worldwide (Chuev, 2002). Participation in the Spanish war was the first real test of the Soviet concept of academic international expansion.

### Conclusion

Reflecting on the development of Soviet international academic policy during the first two decades after the establishment of Soviet state, it is obvious that a specific state guideline for the worldwide educational activities was constantly present in the Russian educational practice. Starting in 1918, Soviets were trying to create a universal academic structure, implementing the postulates of Marxism, and essentially, using the historical experience of human civilization. Faced with such a colossal goal, the Soviet government positioned itself as the first national administration to work out and apply a specific policy of internationalism, where academic internationalization played an important part.



Soviet leadership not only tried to imbed internationalism into the national reform of higher education, but also attempted to promote the idea of a globally united academia. The policy of internationalism in Russian higher education was based on the advent of the World Revolution, and thus had a straightforward political intent. It stepped far from the idealism of building the most progressive universal academia and instead focused on pragmatic outcomes, and to that end, academic cooperation with antagonistic capitalist powers solely for the benefit of the Soviet national economy. In the 1920s the state allowed Soviet academia to proceed with direct inter-institutional global activities, largely because it was preoccupied with vital national issues; in the 1930s, however, state authorities realized their need for professionally skilled people and quickly folded academic issues under federal management and supervision, moving to control every aspect of education and consolidate international activities in a unified manner. An academic culture related to cognitive and creative missions of higher education was replaced by a military culture of vocational drilling, leaving no space for “impractical” academic debates. By the beginning of World War II, focused on the role of the USSR in the new global partition, Soviet higher education had become another critical military asset and international academic exchanges were reduced to receiving scholarly literature from abroad, and a source of practical training for the needs of the state. Universities were converted into state uniformed, militarily organized training facilities, instructed “to lift the level of training at universities to an equal height with the level of training in the military schools of Red Army” (Voroshilov, 1939). The initial ideals of the Bolsheviks, who aimed for universal public enlightenment, were replaced with the pragmatism of vocational training. Soviet higher education was organized as a state system of

professional manpower drilling, structured by the need for practically trained graduates able to defend and expand the Soviet state (Chudnov, 1993). The formation of the Soviet “System of Professional Manpower Training” seems to be an alternative to global academia, rather than a variation of universal higher education. Soviet higher education had a very clear political objective for worldwide Sovietization, and met the new world war well-prepared to transform global academia into a universal Soviet-style system, according to Party orders.

## **Chapter 5: Sovietization: The Mainstreaming of International Academic Policy**

### **During the Cold War**

Internationalization of Soviet academia was perhaps most pronounced during the Cold War period. Academic systems of over a dozen European countries passed through a challenging process of Sovietization, wherein traditional European organization of universities was switched to the Soviet-like model of vocational training. A number of Asian countries passed through the process of academic Sovietization as well. Some, like Korea, adapted quite well to the militaristic structure of Soviet-type higher education. Some, like Mongolia, accommodated academic networks constructed in their countries by the USSR, and observed Soviet Union as a “big brother.” Much changed in world politics and in the realities of the “Communist Bloc” countries during the forty years of the Cold War period; however the essence of the centralized structure and politicized content of higher education didn’t change until the final collapse of the USSR that brought the end of the “Soviet Commonwealth” that stretched from Berlin to Beijing during the 1940s-1980s. In the 1940s Russian academia had an important turn in its development and a new period in its internationalization (Kaftanov, 1949). After the Red Army crossed the pre-WWII borders of the USSR in 1944, following the retreating Nazi troops, Russian soldiers brought to Europe the Soviet way of life, practically expressed as Sovietization (Applebaum 2012; Gibianskii, 2003; Naimark, 1997). The conceptual foundations of Sovietization policy, including its academic dimension, were formed before WWII and were taken by the Soviet leadership as the starting point for the global expansion of socialism (Stalin, 1939). At the time, the international political strategy of the USSR was based on the notion of the “salvation” of Europe from Nazi tyranny, with

further “liberation of the world from the vice of imperialism” (Molotov, 1952). The natural outcome of the “liberation campaign” in Europe, and its later dissemination into Asia, was understood by the Soviets to be the transformation of “liberated” countries into socialist states with Soviet-style political regimes. Soviet ideology prophesized that the Red Army would appear as a welcome savior, that freed the oppressed peoples of Europe from the Nazis, and the oppressed peoples of Eastern Asia from the Japanese militarists (Stalin, 1952a). The Soviet government firmly stated that it never had any occupation plans; however, responding to requests from local populations, Red Army units remained in liberated territories after WWII as guarantors of peace (Fedoseev, 1945; Sokolov, Tyazhelnikova, 1999). At the same time, Soviet Union sent its educators and other specialists as friendly helpers and promoters of progressive reforms, long awaited by the common people of countries tormented by war. The Soviet public mentality naturally associated progress with socialism. In this context, the international policy of Sovietization was the logical reaction of the USSR to the expected anticipation of liberated peoples and countries, longing for the Soviet way of life. “After the world massacre, unleashed by imperialistic countries...Soviet people had a historical obligation to promote socialism as the first step to the global Communist Society” (Stalin, 1952b). Academic Sovietization was assumed to be an essential part of the USSR’s progressive, peaceful policy, reflecting the educational needs of the local populations willing to reach the heights of the Soviet academia (Medynskiy, 1947).

This chapter is devoted to the longest period in the Soviet academic internationalization – the Sovietization policy during the Cold War era. It presents the organizational and conceptual changes in Russian higher education, which influenced the

international academic activities that progressed on national and institutional levels. The chapter also depicts the political context of different stages of Sovietization policy. This chapter answers the following questions: What activities of Soviet academia operationalized the Sovietization policies during the formation of the Eastern Bloc? How did the advancing technical revolution influence the international academic policies of the USSR in the late 1950s-1960s? Why did the Soviet Communist Party superiors declare victory in the Cold War several times through 1950-80s, based on the global advantage of Russian academia, and what was the global response to these proclamations? How did academic programs in Third World countries correlate with the policy of “Disarmament” announced by Soviet leadership in the mid-1970s? What were the practical outcomes of Soviet academic internationalization for Russian higher education and for world academia by the mid-1980s? The international extension of the Soviet higher education system and its relationship to the “victorious march of socialism worldwide” is at the center of this chapter. Academic international policy of the USSR represented global objectives of the Soviet political leadership. On the other hand, it impacted greatly organization and social status of the higher educational systems of many countries in Europe and worldwide. Sometimes it was in line with the educational aspirations of the involved nations, but often contradicted with traditions and ambitions of the local populations. Insight of the Eastern Bloc countries on Sovietization of daily life, state organization and national academies has been well analyzed by scholars from all over the world during recent decades (Brzezinski, 1967; Connelly, 2000; Petrov, 2011; Peteri, 2000; Kalynuk, 2012; Naimark, 1997). Researchers have drawn on various materials, including some formerly secret documents, recently released in the Eastern

European countries and in the former republics of the USSR (Sovetskiy Faktor v Vostochnoi Evrope, 2002). There is no sense in repeating well-presented descriptions of the view on academic Sovietization in the European countries of the Soviet Block during 1940-50s. Rather, this chapter focuses on the evolution of academic Sovietization from the Kremlin perspective. How academic Sovietization was understood by the Soviets, what turns in international educational policy happened during the forty years of Cold War period, are discussed here.

*Soviet Perception of the Role of Sovietization Policy in the Post-War World*

The victorious ending of WWII brought a new global perspective to the Soviet population. The public Soviet sentiment was an overwhelming triumph that the most global, brutal and devastating military conflict in the history of mankind had ended and the Russians emerged victorious (Tvardovskiy, 1976; Simonov, 1989). The communal enthusiasm of Soviet people, feeling themselves as the saviors of the world, was supported by Soviet leadership. Politically, the message was clear: source of the victory is the socialist system, and the leadership of the Communist Party, - and this is well known to people worldwide (Zhukov, 2010). The common narrative was that the USSR had brought peace to all people of the world, and provided an actual basis for peace as an eternal reality (Stalin, 1984). Naturally, anti-Nazi allies and all the peoples of liberated Europe and Asia were friends of the Soviet people. The concept of a new world beginning, based on brotherhood and new life - peaceful and prosperous – dominated in the USSR (Fadeev, 1957). A new reality brought new political slogans, new perspectives, and creative plans from the Soviet government. The militarization of Soviet society was no longer the sole national political focus. At the same time, however, political barometer

of the world was falling (Pechatnov, 2006). According to the political leaders of the Allied forces, the actual development of “cooler relations” between the USSR and its Western allies started immediately after the division of Germany into four occupation zones according to the London Protocol, signed in September 1944 (Gollancz, 1947, Zhdanov, 1947). A distinct separation was established between the US-UK occupational zone that soon became Western Europe, and the Soviet occupational zone, which formed Eastern Europe. The border-line between the capitalist West and the socialist East was drawn by politicians right down the middle of Europe (Roberts, 2005; Ustinskih, 1997).

Reflecting the post-war reality, Soviet leadership chose a conciliation position, actively using the language of peace in international relations and refusing to acknowledge the existence of “Cold War.” Stalin voiced the position of the USSR, publically announcing that Soviet people did not believe in any new war, and that the Soviet government firmly trusted the liaison between the USSR and its former war allies (Stalin, 1946). At the same time, new international realities and internal politics forced Soviet administration to make adjustments in different spheres of its politics, including international academic policy. Helping foreign nations strive for a better life was presented as a basic tenet of Sovietization. The quintessence of Sovietization was formulated as follows: “when we are asked for help, we must provide support to all common people of the world, who are in need. We do not force social changes, we do not seek political benefits...we just help our fellow-workers in war-torn countries” (Zhdanov, 1947). The key principle of Academic Sovietization was the positive response to requests from the governments and institutions of “liberated countries,” who sought educational help (Soveshchania Kominforma, 1998). A documented request for help that arrived from

abroad, and a public discussion as to its delivery, provided political justification for the international actions of Soviet government and Party leadership. Recently released documents from the Politburo sessions of this era confirm this routine. Naturally, educational help was associated by the Soviet leaders with the “proper ideological orientation” of supported nations (Bulleten rassekrechennyh dokumentov, 2004). To facilitate academic aid to “friendly nations” in times of peace, administrative adjustments were made in Soviet academia. Firstly, an All-Union Ministry of Higher Education (Minvuz) was formed in 1946 (Sobranie postanovleniy i rasporyazheniy Soveta Ministrov SSSR, 1946). Minvuz became the only USSR central organ of state administration devoted to academic affairs (Kaftanov, 1952). The management logistics didn’t change significantly at the institutional level, but decision-making was faster now, since it was processed via one centralized state organ (Narodnoe Obrazovanie v SSSR, 1987). Secondly, responsibility for international academic matters was returned to Ministry of Education. Minvuz became fully liable for the promotion of international academic cooperation and the execution of joint activities with institutions and governments abroad (Sobranie postanovleniy i rasporyazheniy Soveta Ministrov SSSR, 1946). International academic exchange, library-publications exchange, and student mobility came under the hand of the Ministry of Higher Education, which added a Department for International Education to its structure (Vysshaya Shkola SSSR za 50 let, 1967). The Ministry also formed a “Public Board for the Matters of Foreign Students,” which consisted not only of state officials, but also included members of the Academy of Sciences and representatives of various diasporas of foreign students studying in the USSR (Karpov, Severtsev, 1957). Reorganization also happened in the structure of the



Communist Party. The Central Committee received a new, special Department for Science and Higher Education (Afiani, 2005). It was created to supervise Soviet academia and promote academic Sovietization in “friendly countries.” The focus of the department was on “politically correct assistance” to the “fraternal parties” which justified its formation as an extension of the Department of Propaganda and Agitation (Zhdanov, 2004). Yuriy A. Zhdanov, son of the Politburo member and chief-ideologist of the Central Committee in the 1940s, was appointed as the head of the Department, making a remarkable career in one day from a teacher’s-assistant at MGU to a member of Party Central Committee (Yury A. Zhdanov: Biografiya, 2005).

Similar changes in academic organization were happening simultaneously in the liberated territories, now called “countries of people’s democracy” (Apor, Rees, 2008). Each European country of the Soviet sway established a Ministry of Education as a centralized administrative body for national academia that would be responsible for all aspects of academic life at both national and institutional levels (Vakarchuk, 2011). Appointments of university administrators, hiring of institutional faculty, salary sizes and student recruitment, curricula formation and selection of textbooks - all of these matters were now decided on a national level and delivered to institutions as a government order (Avdulov, Kulkin, 2001). In accordance with the Soviet tradition, research and education were separated, becoming different areas of activity with separate administrative structures, divided between the national ministry of higher education, and the national academy of science (Kozhevnikov, 1990). Two major organizational changes happened in higher education at the national level in every country of Eastern Europe: a) the state became the sole possessor and ruler of academic establishments; b) the national

communist party assumed the role of a governor for all educational issues. Similar to the USSR, education was pronounced the cornerstone of ideology and thus a fundamental issue for socialist transformation (Novikov, 2012). From Poland to Bulgaria, national academies lost their distinctive institutional constructions, despite their historical traditions and their diverse economic and cultural realities. They became state organized, administered, funded and controlled systems of professional manpower training. All academics in each country of the Eastern Bloc became state employees, responsible for carrying out state regulations and ministry instructions. The conversion of academic establishments from their distinctive individual structures into some version of the unified Soviet organization was performed through the first post-WWII decade. It was achieved with the assistance of Soviet authorities within the same political model and in the same manner, as it had been achieved in the Baltic countries, as well as in parts of Poland, Finland and Romania, that were “incorporated” into the USSR in 1939-1940 (Krivonosov, 2003; Hufner, 2003).

*Specifics of Academic Sovietization in the “Liberated Countries” of Europe*

The particular features of academic Sovietization were present in the countries of the Eastern Bloc, mostly due to difference in national levels of academic advancement. Variations of Sovietization also depended upon the specifics of the political and cultural situation in each country. Even though, Germany was the only country formally divided into occupation zones, with its Eastern section being under the military and political dictatorship of Soviet authorities, it had the least direct administration in its academic fields from the USSR. The Sovietization of German higher education was expressed instead through the promotion of the local Communist party as the leading political force,

and in the establishment of centralized state management (Lozhkin, 2012). The Soviet occupational authorities didn't open new academic establishments, and didn't order German academics to use Russian textbooks. There were very few Soviet professors teaching in German universities, and only a small number of German students studying in the USSR, compared to numbers of foreign students coming from other European countries (Hufner, 2003). On the contrary, Soviet engineers and scholars came by the thousands to learn German industrial and academic techniques, to study the organization of research and examine the "German polytechnic methodology" (Kozhevnikov, 1990). Soviet authorities participated in the process of academic Sovietization in Germany mostly on its early stages, supervising the removal of the pro-Nazi professorate from German universities (Sovetskiy Faktor v Vostochnoi Evrope, 2002). Czechoslovakia experienced a similar situation, where the "hidden resistance" of local academics was the key-issue to the invention of the Soviet-like curricula and the introduction of mandatory studies of Marxism-Leninism (Petrov, 2011). Formal explanations of difficulties with converting traditional university teaching into Soviet training programs was usually expressed in terms of the absence of Marxist literature in Czech language, and a lack of textbooks written in the Soviet context. The Soviet authorities tried to solve problems through massive publications of academic literature for Czech higher education in the USSR, and by sending Soviet teachers to Czech academic institutions. Poland was another "fraternal country" that received a massive supply of Soviet textbooks and Soviet teachers for local academic institutions. Here, the key problem was of a different kind: many Polish higher schools had been established by the Catholic Church or with the participation of church organizations (Shabelnikov, 2011). The separation of church from

state, the closure of all clerical educational establishments and theology departments in public academic institutions, along with the prohibition of private higher education, were very unpopular reforms in Polish society. Mandatory study of the Russian language was also culturally unpopular (Gibianski, 2003). In Hungary, and especially in the countries of Southern Europe – Romania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Sovietization was expressed not only in the organizational reforms of local academies, but also in massive and mandatory study programs for the of Russian language, the promotion of Marxist studies, the provision of Soviet textbooks and extensive academic mobility. Thousands of local students studied annually in the USSR, while the Soviets constructed in the first five post-war years over fifty higher education institutes in the “Slavic fraternal countries” (Osnovnye dokumenty SEV, 1970).

The outcome of “Sovietization” was understood in the Kremlin as “the creation of a new, communist minded generation of European people through the socialist academic system” (Fadeev, 1974). A leading role in the process was given to Soviet specialists who were directed to each country as experts in the “creation of a local cadre of intellectual specialists” from the working masses of each country (Kerdivarenko, 1967). Soviet scientists and teachers sent to the friendly countries of Europe had the important political task of assisting local Communists in removing the anti-Soviet professorate and replacing them with “progressive scholars” (Tchougounov, 1961). The goal of this process was explained in the declaration of Politburo to the “recently liberated European nations”: Academics in the USSR willingly share knowledge with their foreign comrades, helping them to make a path to the peaks of science for the sake of the global wellbeing of humanity, instead of following the temptation of gold (Gibianski, 1995). The

establishment of the international network of Party Higher Schools and the creation of “Soviet Academic Centers” was set as a priority of USSR policy in Eastern Europe after the establishment of The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in 1949 (Masliyehuk, Portnov, 2012; Zwass, 1989). “We need to train Proletariat scientists for our allies, so they will be able to defeat Capitalist science just as the Red Army will destroy any imperialist army” (Voroshilov, 1955). The most significant outcome of the conversion of academies in the countries of Eastern Bloc into the Soviet format was an unprecedented level of centralization. Now, decisions from Moscow were delivered as far away as Belgrade or Berlin, and were as mandatory for them as they were for any small Russian town or a local Russian college. For example, a request to enroll 12 Polish historians for a one-month training at the Party Higher School of VKP(b) Central Committee in 1950 was delivered through the Secretary of Polish Communist Party to the head of the International Committee of the VKP(b) and was approved by Stalin personally (Dokumenty vneshnepoliticheskoi komissii TsK VKP(b), 1949-1953). Two years later, in 1952, an approval for accepting 75 students from Albania to study in the universities of Russia was delivered by the head of Albania Enver Hoxha via the Soviet Ambassador in a secret note, addressed to Stalin. A personal and positive decision on the matter was returned to the Albanian leader in the same manner (Fursenko, 2006b). The Soviet leader was ruling the academia of the Eastern Bloc in the same way as he was distributing tanks during the battle for Moscow in 1941 – personally. The level of centralization in academia within the USSR and Eastern Bloc countries was rather extreme, and reflected the growing politicization of all social matters in the Soviet realm (Fursenko, 2006b). The initial description of the Cold War as an anti-Soviet propaganda crusade of the Western

imperialists, aimed to discredit the progressive international policy of the Soviet Union, transformed into open recognition of a political confrontation between East and West. A declaration on the formation of The Warsaw Pact adopted in 1955, presented the new perspective of Soviet academia and its allies: after we have defeated Fascism and liberated the world from the actual threat of war, imperialist countries, led by the USA, imposed a “Cold War” to us, the USSR and its allies have formed the Warsaw pact as a military treaty to remain a peaceful international community distributing enlightenment and scientific progress throughout the world and stand always ready to defeat any aggressor” (Fesykov, Kalashnikov, Golikov, 2004). This statement serves as the logical conclusion to the period of academic Sovietization in the countries of Eastern Bloc, and the beginning of a new period – the construction of the World System of Socialism.

*The Reformation of Higher Education in the Countries of South-East Asia*

Resolution of WWII in South-East Asia, or “the Pacific War Theater”, was not as forthright as in Europe. Even though the forces of Japanese aggression in China, Korea and Mongolia were defeated by the allied troops by September 1945, the region was not at peace, even after the capitulation of Japan to the Allied forces of the USA and the USSR (Ivanova, 2005). China became embroiled in Civil war for another four years; in 1949, the unified Peoples Republic of China was established on the Mainland (Borisov, Koloskov, 1980). Korea was divided into two zones by the demarcation line of 38th parallel between the Soviet and the American liberation armies. Each portion of Korea - Southern and Northern - proclaimed itself as an all-Korean government. This led to a Civil War in Korea as well, which resulted in the Korean War, involving former militants of allies on different sides and threatening to grow into a full-scale conflict between the

USA and the USSR. Mongolia kept its dedication to the USSR and stood firmly as a pro-Soviet state, thus becoming involved into various military conflicts in the region on the “socialist side.” Unlike, political confrontation in the post-WWII Europe between the pro-Soviet East and the pro-capitalist West, which didn’t go beyond the harsh statements, the Cold War in Asia involved actual combat between local pro-Soviet and pro-American forces (Vasilevskaya, 1969). In such a reality, the original concept of Sovietization, formed in the 1930s and signifying the delivery of the Soviet way of life through a battle with the powers of world capitalism, found its true application.

Academic Sovietization started in China with the massive delivery of martial technology and a stream of Soviet specialists in military industry (Wang Zhen, 2003). After the victory of Communist forces led by Mao Zedong in 1949, the focus of Soviet aid switched to civic technologies and academic mobility, designed to construct in China a Soviet-like national system of science and higher education (Bo Yibo, 1991). The mainstreaming of academic Sovietization in China was explained in the Common Program of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC). Establishing an economy of a socialist nature, the main educational tasks of the government shall be the training of personnel for national construction work. Efforts shall be made to develop the natural sciences and universal public education, higher education shall be strengthened, and technical education of cadres shall be stressed. All this is to be done in a planned and systematic manner (The Important Documents of CPPCC, 1950). The statement reads like a VKP(b) Politburo declaration from the 1930s. The first step toward the creation of a Chinese national academic system was the foundation of the Chinese Academy of Sciences in 1949, a replica of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and

formed with direct assistance of the Soviet academics (Kheing Jdige, 2001). The publication of the President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Sergey Vavilov, which described structure and activities of the Soviet Academy for common readers, was translated into Chinese and used as a practical guide by Chinese statesmen (Vavilov, 1947; Nesmeyanov, 1959; Guo Moruo, 1955). In the first year after its establishment, the Chinese Academy of Sciences sent over a hundred of its scholars to the USSR to study Soviet academic organization and Soviet experience in research work. Forming the first plan of national economic development in 1951-52, Chinese government specifically underlined the need to promote Soviet academic experience, with a focus on the application of scientific achievements for national industry and enlarging a study in the USSR program for Chinese students (Karnauh, Min, 2011). In 1954, introducing the first Chinese Constitution, Vice-Chairman of China Liu Shaoqi stated that China was following the path of the Soviet Union, which would lead common people to economic prosperity and academic enlightenment (Shaoqi, 1954). Almost forty thousand Chinese trainees studied in the USSR in the 1950s, the largest population of foreign students in Soviet Union at the time (Chichkin, 2009.). Most of them received practical training in different academic centers, technical labs and research facilities (Chichkin, 2009; Hisamutdinova, 2007). At the same time period, over ten thousand Soviet academic specialists were sent to China to help with the construction of local industrial and research establishments (Baichun, Fan, Tszuchun, Lun, 2010). In 1954, the Joint Chinese-Soviet Committee for Academic and Technological Collaboration was established. It operated for ten years and accomplished approximately a hundred academic projects in China with the participation of Soviet specialists and equipment and



technologies delivered from the USSR (Koshel, 2005). The draft of the Chinese twelve-year plan for national academic reform and research development was reviewed by the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and adopted during the visit of a large group of Chinese scholars to the USSR led by Mao Zedong in 1957 (Bernstein, Hua-Yu Li, 2010). This plan laid out fifty-seven major directions of research, mainly applied, that formed over six hundred academic projects. 156 projects were planned for implementation with the direct involvement of Soviet researchers and professional specialists (Sladkovskiy, 1980). The advent of China as a world scientific power was framed as the outcome of the twelve-year national academic program (Baichun, Fan, Tszuchun, Lun, 2010).

Conditions for successful execution of the academic development plan were formulated by Chinese Government Premier Zhou Enlai as follows: a) immediate delegation of the most prominent researchers and best graduates of higher schools of China to the USSR for practical training and graduate studies; b) the annual invitation of up to a thousand Soviet academics to work in the research and industrial facilities of China, helping with creation of the national academic network and training of local professional cadre; c) use of Soviet specialists working in China as teachers at the local higher schools and managers at the industrial sites of the enterprises, constructed according to the “Project 156” plan; d) directing the best young researchers and university graduates to study the experience of the Soviet Academy of Science with further job assignments at the units of Chinese Academy, thus promoting the Academy to become the locomotive of Chinese academic and industrial development (Sladkovskiy, 1980). Using the recommendations of Soviet academics, the Chinese government also created a network of academic institutions under each national ministry, following the

pattern of the Soviet academic organization (Bo Yibo, 1991). At the peak of Soviet-Chinese collaboration in the mid-1950s, Soviet leadership considered the industrial and academic enforcement of China to be a natural extension of the Soviet academia and the cornerstone of the “World Socialist Camp.” Soviet academic aid to China was presented as a historical awakening of Asia to the global scientific glory (Khrushchev, 1962). The climax of the academic partnership was the delivery of atomic bomb blueprints and nuclear technologies to China (Baichun, Fan, Tszuchun, Lun, 2010). At the same time, in the second half of the 1950s, the political tone of Chinese official statements regarding national academic development started to change: documents noted that not all Soviet economic and academic principles might work in China, that supposition about China’s impotence to progress academically without the USSR is not accurate, and the receiving Soviet academic and industrial aid is only one step in the advancement of China, which should result in the ability for further self-development (Mao Zedong, 1967).

Not surprisingly, process and outcome of academic Sovietization in China was observed rather differently by Russian and Chinese political leaders. The Politburo clearly stated its understanding of academic partnership with China as promoting the establishment of a replica of Soviet academia and as the natural outcome of China’s choice of a socialist political path. China was considered an extension of the USSR in terms of its academic development, with Chinese science and higher education constructed and functioning in the Soviet mode, relating to the USSR somewhat as a “Big Brother” (Khrushchev, 1999). Chinese leadership, in contrast, wanted to go its own way, as Chairman Mao underlined repeatedly (Mao Zedong, 1967). Chinese Communists seemed to have their version and particular understanding of everything: Chinese

Marxism, the Chinese path to Socialism, a Chinese economic program, and a Chinese academic plan. The Chinese version of academic Sovietization was not observed to be strictly Russian. Mao and his comrades plainly stated that China needed Soviet help, but would build its own, original, national academia. China should take progressive and useful information from Soviet academic organization and research experience, but not to imitate Russian academic construction. To use Soviet experience without duplicating the Soviet system – this was the theme of the Chinese academic reforms. Later, this conceptual difference grew into a critical component of the Soviet-Chinese crisis in 1957 – 1960s (Karnauh, Ming, 2011).

Korea was other “liberated country” of the South-East Asia to experience academic Sovietization. After the establishment of the demarcation line by the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel, Soviet military specialists stayed in Korea until 1953, and outside of direct military duties, also fulfilled educational tasks (Koshel, 2005). About four thousand Soviet army specialists, mainly from technical units, worked in the late 1940s in Korea as trainers for local military and industrial personnel (Koshel, 2005). Political disagreements between the USSR and the USA about the Korea’s future, led to formation of separate governments in the Northern and Southern parts of Korea in 1948 (Orlov, 2000). The result was in the formation of two separate states: pro-West oriented South Korea, and pro-Soviet Korean People’s Republic (Okorokov, 2008). The head of the North Korean state was a former officer of the Red Army, the leader of Korean communists Kim Il-Sung, and most of his government was formed from Korean immigrants to the USSR who served in the Soviet Army during WWII (Hoare, Pares, 1988). Immediately after obtaining political power in North Korea, the new government sent a large official

delegation to Moscow and signed eleven agreements with the USSR regarding economic, military and academic partnership (Volkogonov, 1995). Since the beginning of Korean War in 1950, the attention of the global public and historians was focused on the military and industrial assistance of the USSR to North Korea. However, since the initial Soviet-North Korean collaboration of the late 1940s, Soviet academic aid had been an important part of this assistance (Volkogonov, 1995). China was a constant Soviet partner in aid provision to Korea, and many activities were either joint Soviet-Chinese efforts or Soviet help for Korea via China. For example, some of the Soviet specialists sent to China since 1949 moved later from China to Korea and worked there helping Koreans to set up local industrial and academic enterprises (Okorokov, 2008). The general pattern of Soviet academic assistance to Korea was similar to the academic Sovietization happening at the same time in China. Prior to WWII, Korea was a predominately rural country with no national system of higher education. The first steps of academic Sovietization in Korea followed the usual pattern. Soviets delegated several groups of scientists to Korea to form a plan for its academic development, and Koreans started to arrive to the USSR as students (Vanin, 1988). The first group of Soviet scholars came to North Korea in 1948 under the leadership of academic A. Oparin, and laid the groundwork for the formation of a five-year plan for industrial and academic development (Lankov, 2000). In the next two years, Soviet academics assisted in the formation of 15 higher educational institutions in Korea (Tsoi, 2003). At the same time, about 300 Koreans arrived in the USSR as students. Most of them were enrolled first in Siberian universities, but later, after a number of complaints about severe climate conditions, Korean students were transferred to the higher schools of Southern Russia to finish studies (Tsoi, 2003). Despite the

progress of Korean War, academic collaboration with the USSR continued and even advanced. Over 500 Koreans were sent in 1950-1953 to the USSR for professional training, mainly in the technical sciences (Okorokov, 2008). The preparation of national professional manpower was observed as providing the social basis for the future well-being of Socialist Korea after the defeat of the “imperialistic stooges” in the South (Kim Il-sung, 1958). Soviet assistance remained the back-bone of national academia in North Korea for decades. But even with extensive help from the USSR, North Korea failed to develop an advanced national higher education. Academic Sovietization in Korea didn’t mature to a self-governing academic system. The majority of research and industrial applications for the Korean economy were developed in Soviet academic institutions located in neighboring territories, predominantly in the Novosibirsk academic Center (Vanin, 1988). The national higher education network didn’t achieve the expected advancement, despite constant delegations of Korean students sent to the USSR. About fifteen hundred Koreans studied in the Soviet higher schools during 1950s, forming a significant portion of North-Korean academia, but it was less than 0.015% of the population of the country (Pak, 2003). In addition to accepting Korean students for training, the USSR sent about five hundred specialists of Korean descent to Korea. These were the so-called “Soviet Koreans” who mostly lived in the Soviet areas of Siberia and the Far East. They formed a special cluster of “national Korean cadre” trained for a future socialist Korea. “Korean training camps” were set up in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, and by the end of Korean War they had trained several hundreds of Korean specialists who were transferred to North Korea and mostly worked as military commanders, statesmen and administrators of industrial enterprises (Okorokov, 2008). These cadres were unique

to academic Sovietization in Korea. At the end of the 1950s, Korean leadership disputed Khrushchev Thaw and recalled all Koreans students from the USSR. They also refused from further intensive Soviet help with economic and social development. Refuting the “revisionism policy of Soviet leadership,” Kim Il-Sung reduced Sovietization in Korea, including its academic dimensions, and concentrated on the Korean idea of “Juche” (Rumyantcev, 1992; Lankov, 2000).

The introduction of academic Sovietization policy in Mongolia happened in full accordance with the original plans, worked out in the USSR by the end of 1930 (Pyatdesyat let narodnoi revolutcii v Mongolii, 1970). Mongolia was the first state to follow Soviet Russia’s practice of Marxist social organization, and Mongolians were the first foreign students who came to study in Russia (Baabar, 2010). This happened immediately after the proclamation of the independent state of Mongolia in 1921, which was recognized only by the USSR (Lomakina, 2006). In 1924 Mongolia announced its “socialist path of development,” hoping to convert in one of the republics within the USSR, and became a faithful ally of the Soviet Union (Tretyakov, 2003). Academic reforms that were accomplished in the USSR by the end of 1930s progressed in Mongolia after WWII (Graivoronskiy, 2007). Its national system of higher education and science was structured by the Soviets, and functioned in the same organizational patterns as the Soviet academic system. Soviet scientists and engineers, geologists, teachers and physicians came to Mongolia in the thousands during the 1940s, when Soviet leadership decided to protect Mongolian comrades from Japanese military expansion (Zhalsapova, 2009). Soviets played key roles in the establishment of Mongol national industry, higher education, medicine, social services and science. Being analogous to the Soviet academic

system, education in the Mongol Peoples Republic was general and unified, free and equal to all citizens despite social, cultural or religious backgrounds, applied and tightly connected with the national industry, and formed on the basis of Marxist ideology and governance of the Communist Party. Considering the almost complete illiteracy of the Mongolian population, Russians taught in educational institutions at all levels and students used Russian textbooks (Batsaihan, 2004). At the same time, Russian language studies became mandatory in all Mongol schools, and Mongols began professional training in Russian universities in order to become teachers (Suprunova, 2007). About 500 Mongols studied annually at the pedagogical schools of Siberia: Irkutsk, Tomsk, Chita, Ulan-Ude, Novosibirsk, - as well as at universities in Leningrad and Moscow (Delgerzhav, 2007). In 1941, Mongol writing was reformed to use the Cyrillic alphabet, which simplified teaching for Russians in Mongolia, and studying for Mongols in Russia (Romashova, 2011). The Soviet Ministry of Higher Education developed study courses and training programs for Mongolian higher education (Demberel, 2011). By a special order of the Soviet Ministry of Education, the city of Irkutsk was selected as primary base for the training of Mongolian professional manpower (Malakshanov, 2006). Irkutsk higher educational institutions had annual quotas for Mongolian students, who were supported by the Soviet Union (Batsaihan, 2012). About 300-400 Mongol applicants were enrolled annually to study in Irkutsk for 4-6 years. Over 10,000 students from Mongolia were trained in Irkutsk from the 1930s to the 1970s (Tomskih, 2011). Among the graduates of Irkutsk higher schools were many famous Mongols, including Y. Tsendenbal, the leader of Mongolia and of its ruling Communist Party for over 30 years (Batsaihan, 2012). In Novosibirsk and Tomsk, - neighboring urban centers, - a network of

special academic institutions was established to study the history, culture, and languages of the Turkic peoples that were the traditional population of Mongolia, and their connections to the Russian territories. A good example is the Institute for Mongolian Studies, Buddhism and Tibetology of the USSR Academy of Sciences that was created in the late 1940s (Svinin, 2000). A new definition was introduced in Soviet academic language - “mongoloved,” to describe academics who studied the historical and modern development of Mongolia (Danilova, 2007). A number of specialized Soviet military research institutes built training and research facilities in Mongolia. The Novosibirsk Center of Fundamental Physics, well known as the special research facility for Soviet nuclear power studies, had its training field in the Gobi desert (Mitin, 2008). The Irkutsk Research Institute for Plague had special labs in Mongolia (Sovetsko-mongolskie otnoshenia, 1975). Many of the academic facilities of the GULAG system were established in Mongolia in 1930s as well, and were devoted to key issues in military research, including chemical weapons, nuclear weapons, and jet-fuels (Perchenok, 1995; Krasilnikov, 2007). The Mongol State Committee for Sciences was organized as a replica of the USSR Academy of Sciences, had financial provisions from the USSR, and received Soviet specialists to head research units related to Mongolian government offices, including agricultural, cattle-ranching, geological-mining, medical-epidemiological departments (Suprunova, 2007).

Commenting on the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Soviet-Mongol cooperation in 1951, Stalin stated that the same tight partnership with nations around the world should be achieved as it had been in Mongolia, where the victory of Soviet education, the supremacy of Soviet science and Soviet industrial organization were so obvious. “Mongolia is an example that



socialism can bring even most undeveloped countries to prosperity and enlightenment. This is a remarkable example of the superiority of the Soviet way of life” (Stalin, 1952b). Soviet official media broadcasted Stalin’s definition of Mongolia worldwide, as an example of a jump from the misery of feudalism straight to industrial progress and the enlightenment of socialism (Peipinsch, 2012). The success of educational progress in Mongolia and its great academic advancement with the help of the USSR was publicized as the value of Sovietization that should be the goal for oppressed peoples of the world (Rumyantsev, 1992; *Pyatdesyat let narodnoi revolutcii v Mongolii*, 1970).

Academic Sovietization started by the Soviet leadership in European and in Asian “liberated countries” after WWII, developed differently and achieved dissimilar results in the East and in the West. In the European countries of Eastern Bloc, Soviets had to deal with long-existing and well-developed national academic systems. In the most European countries occupied by the Soviet troops by 1946, higher education was more advanced than the Soviet academia. Academic Sovietization there had to process through two stages: a) deconstruction of existing academic organisms based on the principles of institutional autonomy and self-governance; and dismissal of historical university traditions of academic freedoms in studies and research; b) establishment of the Soviet standards of unified, centralized, and state funded system of vocational training. Often, the process of academic Sovietization in Europe received resistance from the local academics, students and general public (Lozhkin, 2012; Petrov, 2011). Countries of South-East Asia, that became Soviet allies late 1940s, had either undeveloped national academia or didn’t have higher education system at all. Here, academic Sovietization progressed according to the plans of the Soviet leadership and received mostly positive

reactions of the local population. At the same time, China, being a large country with colossal man power, decided to seek its own path in political, economic and academic developments, breaking out from the “Soviet friendly circle,” even remaining a “communist state” in the world politics. It seems that the policy of academic Sovietization practiced by the USSR after WWII worked positively only in the former colonial, economically undeveloped territories, having impoverished, socially disadvantaged and uneducated populations. Peoples of these Asian countries considered academic Sovietization as the generous provision of the great and powerful Soviet Union (Pozhilov, 2010; Uanga, 2002; Kulturnye i nauchnye svyazi mezhdru SSSR i MNR, 1981.).

*Academic Composition of the World System of Socialism and Educational Patronage of the Third World (1960s-1980s)*

The mid-1950s stands out in Soviet history due to the events of global magnitude that occurred in the USSR at that time: the formation of the Warsaw Pact, constituting the Cold War confrontation between East and West; the political course of de-Stalinization, suggesting the possibility of democratization for the Soviet regime; the Sputnik launch, beginning the space age of humanity. Soviet authorities considered these events to be the dawn of a new era in world history – the victorious construction of the World System of Socialism that would change the world forever under the leadership of the Soviet Union and its Communist Party (Chertok, 2007). Western academics viewed this era as a chance of humanity for global unity, based on the values of peace, democracy and human rights (Cousins, 1953; Rotblat, 1962). Russian educators remember this period as “Khrushchev Thaw” that progressed under the same slogans, but with the practical application of

global Sovietization (Ehrenburg, 1961; Pyzhikov, 2002). The Khrushchev Thaw began in Soviet academia with the reorganization of the National Academy of Sciences in 1957 and the introduction of the Educational Act of 1958 (Koptiug, 2007; Coumel, 2006). These were not separate matters, but correlated components of the reformation period in Soviet academia that progressed during the decade of 1956-1966 (Kuraev, 1990; Pihoya, 2000). After the famous call for de-Stalinization in Soviet society pronounced at the 20<sup>th</sup> CPSU Party Congress, Soviet scholars hoped for the arrival of democratic collegiality to the organization of academia in the USSR (Aksutin, 1989). Many letters were written at the time by individual academics and research teams to the Party Central Committee and personally to Premier Khrushchev, requesting administrative changes (Khrushchev, 2010). Soviet academia desired to become a natural partner in the international scholarly communication, claiming that restrictions on international academic collaboration had negatively affected the quality of internal research, and prevented Soviet academics from reaching the summit of possible academic achievements (Ivanov, 2000). Broadly publicized Soviet slogan "Catch up and overtake America" can never be fulfilled unless Soviet academia would become as global as the US one, - warned Russian scientists (Kapitsa, 1994). In 1957, Soviet leader called for a special and closed joint session of Politburo and Presidium of Academy of Sciences which resulted in a special directive, stating negative results of isolationism policy for Soviet academia in the past and a need for immediate reform in organization of research and higher education in the country (Fursenko, 2006b). Territorial and subject branches of the USSR Academy of Sciences received permission to have direct communication with "friendly foreign scholars" (Bezborodov, 1997). However, the traditional secrecy of research remained in Soviet

higher education “in order to preserve trusting Soviet scholars from the spying West in the reality of Cold War” (Chertoprud, 2002). At the same time, the Iron Curtain was lifted, allowing Soviet academics and students to have direct communications, and scholarly exchanges with selected by authorities foreign academic establishments (Krymskaya, 2011). A few central higher schools, like Moscow State University, received the privilege of having international affairs on the institutional level (Letopis MGU, 1958).

The climax of Khrushchev Thaw in academic international policy was the organization of World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow in 1957 (Grechishkin, 1976). Thirty four thousand young people from 131 countries attended the event (Rinskiy, 2007). Moscow Festival was a real discovery of the world for the Russians, and revelation of Soviets to the world. It shook the USSR bottom-up, being the first international event having not only planned and organized events, but a waterfall of spontaneous gatherings and meetings of young people from all over the world with the Russians (Smolyanitskiy, 2001; Slezin, 2010). The Festival started a lot of new developments in Russian culture, but most importantly it moved the mass mentality of the Soviets from observing foreigners as potential hidden threat to associating them with opened and actual friendship. The concept of “foreign” started to bear positive connotation: foreign clothes, like jeans, foreign music, like rock-and-roll, foreign sports, like badminton became matters of student fashion (Boguslavsky, Lazarev, Marysheva, 1981). The symbol of the Moscow festival – the “Dove of Peace,” - remained for decades an important emblem of internationalism for Soviet students. Great success of the festival promoted international academic exchanges. Not only the quantity of foreign scholars

and students arriving to the USSR grew since 1958 quite rapidly, reaching the total number of ten thousand students by 1959, but Soviet students also started to go abroad with study purposes (Dmitirev, 2003b). Event of the most political importance was arrival of the first group of Soviet students to the USA in 1958 (Yakovlev, 2005). According to the special US-Soviet agreement on the promotion of educational and cultural exchange, five US universities hosted seventeen Soviet students for an academic year, using funds provided by the Department of State (Richmond, 1987). Russian students studied US history, American political and legal system. They lived in campus dormitories together with American students, and commented most positively about their study trip to the USA. “Now I know that American and Soviet peoples can live in peace...this is a great example of international cooperation that should be promoted and enlarged,” – stated one of the Soviet visitors in the interview to Columbia University newspaper, before departure to the home-country (Yakovlev, 2005). During the same 1958-59 academic year, twenty one US students studied in several Soviet universities, and were also pleased with their stay in the USSR (Tsvetkova, 2007).

Though started as East-West collaboration, international academic mobility of the USSR soon was focused by the Soviet leadership at the countries of the Third World. Turbulent anti-colonial movement started to progress all over the planet, promoting extensive geo-political changes. Major events were happening in Africa, where seventeen newly independent states were established in 1960 alone (Foderaro, 1976; Houser, 1989; Meredith, 1984). Politburo immediately pronounced Africa as a priority for the “policy of international aid provision” of the USSR (Davidson, Mazov, Tsytkin, 2002). The new Communist Party Program, adopted in 1961, suggested that developing liberation

movement of colonial peoples will become the concluding and decisive stage in the formation of the World System of Socialism. Newly formed national states will naturally turn to socialism, leaving imperialistic countries of the West as a minority on the globe (Programma KPSS, 1961). Kremlin forecasted soon arrival of global communism and pushed academic Sovietization into the highest gear.

*Peoples' Friendship University: A Myth of International Academic Paradise in the USSR*

The most famous manifestation of new concentration of the Soviet academic international policy was the formation of the Peoples' Friendship University (Ob Organizatscii Universiteta Druzhyby Narodov, 1960). The formal purpose of this higher educational institution was to address educational needs of peoples in Asia, Africa and Latin America by providing professional training to the future members of growing global family of “liberated nations” (Savin, 2009). The broad conceptual framework for the formation of the university was well rooted into the original notion of academic Sovietization worked out in 1930s, suggesting provision of free, applied, and ideologically correct higher education to the states of “pro-socialist orientation” (Belov, 2000). The University was named after Congolese independence leader Patrice Lumumba in 1961, underlining its particular political focus (O prisvoenii Universitetu druzhyby narodov v Moskve imeni Patrisa Lumumby, 1961). To enable Peoples' Friendship University (PFU) to fulfill important political task, Soviet government provided this higher educational institution with superior status and special administrative and funding privileges. PFU had a direct subordination to the central authorities bypassing all intermediate levels of administration, including All-Union Ministry of Higher Education. Expenses of PFU were annually calculated as a special line of the federal budget. It was

the only Soviet university after Moscow State University to have a special monetary attention of the Soviet government (Afiani, 2005). Peoples' Friendship University had a privilege of direct contact with the Ministry of International Affairs, and with the Embassies of Foreign states in the USSR, as well as with the Soviet Embassies in the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America where USSR had so-called "Houses of Friendship" as special establishments promoting Soviet policy, culture and lifestyle and major student recruitment centers (Pyzhikov, 2002). Internal administration of PFU also differed from an ordinary Russian university: it had a special position of the Vice-Rector for International Academic matters, and an Office for International students; its institutional party committee, could directly contact with the Foreign Department of the CPSU Central Committee; its Planning and Budgeting Department could operate with currency; it had its own publishing house, printing textbooks, scholarly articles and advertisement prospects in foreign languages and disseminating them worldwide (Shevchenko, 2006). Considering all these special provisions, no surprise that Peoples' Friendship University had a rapid and broad publicity all over the globe. Over two thousand applications were submitted from about a hundred countries for the opening 1961 year of PFU's functioning (Mironov, 2010). Organization of studies and daily life of students at PFU also differed much from an ordinary Russian university. The average annual enrollment in 1960-80s was about half-a-thousand students, from which 90% were coming from abroad and about 10% were Soviet citizens. A peculiar moment about selection of Soviet applicants was in the fact that all of them had to present political recommendations, proving their ideological proficiency to represent USSR in front of foreigners, and documentation proving, their proper social background. Most of Soviet

students at PFU were selected from provincial low-income and common families (Bolotina, Dergachev, Charskaya, 2009). All enrolled to PFU students were provided for free with accommodation in on-campus dormitories, three-course daily board in on-campus canteens, and medical care in the specially constructed on-campus health facility. PFU had its own specially build library, cultural center and sports complex. Academic life was quite special at PFU as well: all enrolled foreign students had to take a one-year preparatory study course in Russian language before starting regular course work. Each student had to take a complex of so-called “social studies”, including Marxism-Leninism, History of the USSR and few other political subjects, despite of the chosen academic concentration. This was the only matter of disagreement between Soviet leadership and authorities of the home-countries of some students (Belov, 2000). Some governments, like China, Indonesia, Iran, were sending through the diplomatic channels formal demands to exclude political courses from the mandatory study curriculum of their students at PFU (Androsova, 2011). Embassies of other countries, like Cambodia, Ceylon, and of some African states, were suggesting to their students to ignore political classes, promising no academic consequences from PFU (Golubev, 2000). The Peoples’ Friendship University functioned for over 50 years, and presents a quite unique example of academic internationalization, but it can hardly be considered a mainstream example of international policy in Russian higher education. It was an exclusive and politically focused project of the Soviet government aimed to deliver immediate positive results for the global standing of the USSR and its academia. It also was a good example of impulsive decision-making of the Soviet leadership willing to reach the desired goal at all costs. Considering that PFU annual financing equaled to combined budgets of about 15



ordinary Russian higher educational institutions, due to the full coverage of all tuition and life expenses to the studying there foreigners, including provision of monthly stipends almost twice larger than the state monetary support to regular Russian students, - Peoples' Friendship University was indeed an academic experiment sustained by the whole country (Khrushchev, 1997). It presented a dreamlike Soviet life not only to the foreign students; it was a fairytale from the perspective of common Soviet people, as well. PFU evidenced the continued strength of political will in Soviet higher education, with academic internationalization as a mean to achieving politically expedient goals (Dorofeev, 2010).

*Foreign Students in Russia During the Brezhnev Stagnation Period*

The general network of Russian academic institutions also became more involved in dynamic international activities after the 1960s. However, academic internationalization did not penetrate the core of Soviet higher education, so it did not influence its organization or managerial policy. The usual pattern of politically oriented, top-down decision-making was left unchanged. In the typical centralized manner, Soviet leadership ordered to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to enforce recruitment of students in the countries of the Third World and bring the USSR to the leading world position in terms of study abroad; Federal Agencies responsible for defense and security matters had to determine which regions and urban centers of the country, being typical research areas, should be protected from the outer world and thus become “close zones” and “closed cities,” prohibited from visitations of foreigners, including foreign students; the Ministry of Higher and Professional Education got a directive to create the list of higher educational institutions that were allowed to receive foreign students and scholars

(Khrushchev, 2010). Execution of these orders was accelerated by the chain of international emergencies, like events in Berlin, Turkey, Middle East, and by the Cuban 1962 crisis as the climax of Cold War confrontation. By 1963 the organizational work on the formation of the system of international academic mobility to and from the USSR has been completed (Arbuzkin, Muramete, 1979). According to different and often conflicting data sources, about fifty Soviet higher educational institutions were selected as “appropriate hosts for foreign students” (Belov, 2000; Galenskaya, 1988; Androsova, 2012; Kerov, 2000). This constituted only 6-7% of the total number of universities in the country, leaving the predominant number of national higher education out of international activities. According to the detailed state instructions, all study applications from abroad were streamed to the International Department of the Ministry of Higher Education, wherefrom the distribution was made directly to the universities or to the particular federal ministries, having profiled universities (Voilenko, 1978). Such distribution of potential foreign students was done annually with provision of related budgeting to each host-university. Final decision had a format of a special directive of the All-Union Soviet of Ministers, defining contingents of students-foreigners by countries and by professional specializations for the next academic year, with the distribution by the higher schools, according to the established list of Soviet universities, allowed to receive foreign students. University administration was responsible for the academic activities of the foreign students it hosted, reporting to the Office of International Students of the Ministry of Higher Education; the municipal government was obliged to work tightly with the university administration regarding accommodation, material and food provision for hosted foreign students, and to facilitate their non-academic (cultural, sports, social)

activities; the local Party committee was responsible for the proper ideological aura around foreigners, and their Marxism-Leninism education; the local KGB office observed issues of security and traced the personal interests/activities of the students. All state agencies involved in hosting foreign students also had to follow the “general political course of the CPSU” (Davidson, Mazov, 1999).

Through the 1960s-1970s, special attention was given to foreign students from Africa. Central Party Committee formed a special “Section of African matters”, USSR Academy of Sciences established a Research Institute of Africa, and Ministry of Higher Education opened a special division for African students at its International Office (Mazov, 1999). Soviet Young Communist League (Komsomol) created a Committee of Friendship with Youth of Africa, and African students studying in MGU and PFU initiated formation of the Association of African Students. All these activities, related to Soviet academia, were part of political euphoria developing in the USSR about Africa’s choice for a “non-capitalistic future” (Davidson, Mazov, Tsytkin, 2002). About two thousand African students studied in Soviet higher schools annually at the time, mostly in Moscow and Leningrad (Gribanova, 2009). However, public excitement about positive outcomes from educational and cultural help to the fighting comrades of Africa, widely broadcasted in official Soviet mass media, could not prevent problems in interracial and intercultural communication between Africans and Russians. The quite sudden appearance of hundreds of African students, who had no knowledge of the cultural and linguistic traditions of Russians, was met with animosity from many Russian youth, who were, absolutely unprepared to socialize with representatives of other races and cultures. Many examples of race-based verbal and even physical abuse were reported by the

Association of African students. Formal complaint notes were delivered to the Soviet leadership: one famous address to Khrushchev in 1960 and another to the Premier of Soviet Government Mr. A. Kosygin in 1965 drew broad attention of historians after recent revelation of formerly secret documents of Party Central Committee (Mazov, 2000). Conflict matters between local and foreign students in Moscow and other locations didn't receive any publicity or any other formal reaction from the Soviet authorities. Usual recommendations of Soviet authorities to enforce ideological work at the universities hosting foreign students obviously could not solve intercultural problems. A minor issue, considered as absolutely normal and innocent by the Russians could be deliberated as an offence by the Africans. For example, Russian language does not have any other or polite word for an African person - "negro" is the only term used. However, in other languages and cultures, especially in English, this word may hold negative cultural or social connotation. On the contrary, few foreigners arriving to the USSR could guess that wearing jeans or sneakers may be considered there as a show off underlining wealth of the owner, and could be envied by Soviet youth. At the same time, international student services or intercultural studies were neither subjects of research, nor issues of practical management in Russian academia.

With the development of liberation and revolutionary movements in the countries of Asia and Latin America, Soviet government paid special attention to the students from the "struggling regions." Students from these areas were treated not only as foreigners, studying in the USSR, but also as comrades freedom-fighters (Belov, 2000). Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and few other Russian cities received dozens of students from Cuba, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Chile, Lebanon, Syria, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam

(Avrus, 2001). The number of foreigners in Soviet universities doubled in the decade of 1960s, and reached by 1970 the total number of about 25 thousands students, climbing to 70 thousands by 1980 (Androsova, 2012). Quantitative growth of international academic mobility to the Soviet Union didn't influence the quality of international student services in Russian universities. The essence of Soviet academic policy remained unchanged, traditionally adapting only to the changes of the Party political barometer. Major concentration was on the propaganda of the "values of socialism" and the enforcement of the World System of Socialism. Small groups of radical extremists in the Third World countries, having "socialism" in the title of their organizations, were often proclaimed as "representatives of progressive youth of the world" and their members were invited to visit and study in the USSR, using Soviet financial help (Dorofeev, 2010). At the same time, world-known international student movements, originated in the West, were not recognized by the Soviet academia at all (Altbach, Uphoff, 1973). Cultural rapport, political tolerance, social integrity didn't interfere with the daily practice of management of international students' activities in the USSR. Soviet political establishment fully endorsed demands of Arab states in the Middle East through 1970s, but when a group of students from Syria, Lebanon and Jordan, studying in Moscow requested in 1974 help with adjusting class schedules to have a thirty minutes break for a daily prayer, they got a negative response on the grounds of this being a private religious matter, while church is separated from government and education is separated from church in the USSR (Bolotina, Dergachev, Charskaya, 2009). Formal requests from the Embassies of these countries didn't help as well (Androsova, 2011). At the peak of the Vietnam War, about 650 Vietnamese and Chinese students, studying in Moscow, marched through downtown

with the slogans of solidarity to fighters against the “American aggression in Vietnam”, expecting full understanding from the Soviet authorities. But the demonstration was dispersed by Moscow militia force (Soviet police), and eight students were arrested for organization of not sanctioned public gathering (Nagaitsev, 2009). Right before the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow several groups of Latin-American students-musicians were performing on the streets of the Russian capital, suggesting pedestrians to sponsor concerts of Native American artists during the Olympic week. Their activities were considered as “mendicancy in public places” and authorities of MGU were ordered to prevent repetition of such actions in Moscow (Shiryaeva, 1980). These and many other recorded incidents between foreign students and Soviet authorities in 1960-70s, show that individual approach to studies and personal decisions about ideological classes or political events often requested by the foreigners educating in the USSR conflicted with the norms and regulations of Soviet life (Shevchenko, 2006). Academic freedoms, manifested in students’ individual study programs, election courses, deciding on final research concentration; multiformity in political beliefs and social practices of different nations; diversity of various religious, social and cultural traditions, - remained unsolved problems for the foreign students during the Soviet times. It seems that lack of professional academic management was an important reason for troubles that foreign students had in the USSR. Party ideological directives, state uniformed regulations, and orders of institutional and ministry administrators substituted international higher education as a research subject and daily practice in the Soviet academia. International academic policy of Russian higher education carried original objectives of Sovietization

and had an unchanged organizational format through the entire Cold War period. The need for change was obvious on both institutional and national levels.

Conclusion

General degradation of Soviet system, during the Cold War era, especially in the period of Brezhnev's stagnation, led to the regression of the Soviet academia. Lack of financial resources, and timeworn centralized command administration brought Russian academia to the state of regression. Soviet higher education and its internationalization policy of academic Sovietization arrived by mid-1980s to the crisis situation. Even though, the number of foreigners studying in the USSR reached over ninety thousand students per academic year and several thousand Soviet scholars annually studied abroad, and Soviet higher education had communication with about 200 academic establishments worldwide, the policy of academic Sovietization did not succeed. The number of countries with Soviet-like academic system didn't grow extensively during 1940s-1980s, as it was hoped by the Soviet leadership. Soviet version of internationalization did not bring the USSR to the leading position in global academic mobility. Soviet organizational principles and Soviet academic methodology were not considered as the best in the world. The concept of compulsory victory of socialist academic system in its competition with the Western capitalistic didn't prove its "obvious fidelity", as CPSU Program predicted. By mid 1980s instead of reaching wellness of the Communist Society, announced in the KPSS Program, Soviet people faced shortages of food, causal goods, and low salaries. Soviet professors didn't have increase of payments since 1946, but if then the comparison between a professor's salary and a salary of a qualified worker was 7:1, in 1986 it was already 1:2, in favor of a worker (Avrus, 2001). Soviet academics

arrived to the brink of survival, similar to the situation of the Civil War times, receiving less than 10% of the needed funding (Iodko, 1988). The Soviet Union reached the point of economic bankruptcy and had no funds to sustain global academic Sovietization. This was not a new revelation for the Soviet leadership; in 1965, in his suggestions for economic reform, Soviet Premier A. Kosygin underlined that state international policy, including its academic dimension, could not be sustained by the national economy (Glagolev, 2005; Kuraev, 1990). The organizational structure of international academic activities was largely unchanged in Russian higher education during the whole Cold War era. Soviet academia needed radical reforms of its organization, administration and budgeting, while its international policy, designed to spread worldwide a rapidly declining ideology, required complete reconsideration in order to correlate with modern developments in global academia.

By the end of the Soviet era, Russian society, including academia, was teetering on the brink of comprehensive crisis. Perhaps it was not yet obvious, what changes would be preferred; but change was inevitable, and was expected by the community of Soviet people. Status quo could not continue.



**Part Two: Internationalization of Russian Academia in Post-Soviet Period**

**Chapter 6: Perestroika Reforms in Russian Higher Education**

Gorbachev's Perestroika launched the famous era of reforms in the 1980s. Their political significance and social impact were comparable to the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. It was a time of impressive transformations, leading to the final collapse of the USSR and the beginning of a new, post-Soviet epoch in Russian history. For Russian academia this was a very special period of reformation that continued for over twenty years. Academic reforms had started in 1984, a year before Gorbachev's arrival in power. At that time, the reforms were described as an extension of Soviet organizational principles and the enhanced emphasis of polytechnic education in order to benefit the state economy (Ob osnovnyh napravleniah reformy, 1984). From 1985 onward, academic reform continued within the frame of Perestroika modifications of Soviet society, which resulted by the end of the 1990s in the removal of an ideological context from Russian higher education and the victory of the "Open Doors" concept in Russian academic policy (Dneprov, 2011). Perestroika reforms meant to strengthen the original Soviet organization of Russian higher education, in fact infused the Western concept of internationalization into all levels of Russian academia. The objective of academic internationalization changed dramatically from a vehicle of global Sovietization to becoming a deliverer of Western higher education traditional values and modern organization to Russia.

This chapter discusses how the crisis of the 1980s led the Soviet system to the necessity of educational reform, and why international aspects of academic policy gained superiority by the end of the decade. Special attention will be given to the Gorbachev

“Open Doors” policy of that resulted in international agreements for academic cooperation and exchange. US-Russian academic collaboration will be analyzed expressly, as a vital part of the sharp turn in relations between the Soviet Union and the USA, ending the East-West academic confrontation of the Cold War period. The rapid promotion of internationalization as a priority of Russian academia is at the center of this chapter. The logical climax of the chapter is the examination of the 1992 Educational Act that legalized international academic activities at institutional and individual levels, and endorsed internationalization as a routine educational practice and a key criterion of success for Russian higher education.

*Perestroika in Russian Academia as a Response to the Demand for National Educational Reform*

The call for academic reform arrived well before Perestroika. Russian academia at large was unsatisfied with the state of national higher education. Students didn't want to waste time studying for several years only to receive low-income careers, and then to face the need to self-train again to match practical job requirements (Shishikin, 2011). The professorate was devastated by salaries in academia being lower than in any other field, and research being not counted as a professional activity (Tatur, 1999). Institutional administrators wanted more room for decision-making and fewer restrictions from central authorities (Dneprov, 1992). Federal bureaucrats were unhappy with the quality of graduates, but had no state funding to influence the situation (Zhukov, 2001). In 1984, after much deliberation, the Soviet Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and Ministry of Higher Education suggested corrections to the existing organization of “professional cadre vocational training”, recognizing that it did not reflect the modern needs of the

Soviet economy (Ob osnovnyh napravleniah reformy, 1984). The introduction of the reform statement declared that its context refers to the recent Party decisions, promoting modern developments in Soviet education (Dvadtsad Shestoi Syezd KPSS, 1981). At the same time, educators immediately related new reform to the reorganization of 1958 that focused on the provision of vocational training in secondary schools and the practical application of higher education (Ob ukreplenii svyazi shkoly s zhizniu i o dalneishem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniya v SSSR, 1958). Their comparison of two reforms was based on the similarity of the final goal – to boost national productivity by enforcing professional training of human resources related to the “technologically-industrial age” (Rozov, 1992; Shadrikov, 1993). In this context, the “new” reform of mid-1980s sounded like a continuation of the unfulfilled tasks posted 15 years before (Kuraev, 1990; Golenkova, 2003). However, there was an important difference between these reforms: educational reform of 1958-64 had an international destination, aiming to build basis for the academia of the World System of Socialism (Dvadtsad Vtoroi Syezd KPSS, 1961). Educational reform of 1984 suggested no international dimension at all (Ob osnovnyh napravleniah reformy, 1984). It was one of the lowest points of participation of Russian higher education in the global academic issues. Soviet international academic policy did not have any significant development since early 1960s (Borisov, 2008). Provision of educational aid to developing countries, following the political lead of the USSR, remained the major task for Russian academia for over thirty years. Most of agreements about international academic mobility, signed by the Soviet authorities prior to 1980s, were either completely “frozen” or had an evident tendency for reduction in numbers of participants from the Russian side (Sofinskiy, 1982).

Gorbachev came to political power at the time of “lethal sickness” of Soviet society, when growing indifference of Soviet population to the Party ideological cliché was enforced by deepening economic impasse, and coincided with serious crisis in the Soviet international policy (Medvedev, 1994; Yakovlev, 2009). In the reality of increasing tension with the USA and Western countries, hosting foreign students from pro-Soviet countries of Asia and Africa continued as the only feasible international activity of Soviet academia (Noskova, 2003). And even this traditional academic activity was educational only in the format, while pure political in its reasoning and context, being not well provided financially (Gribanova, Zherlitsina, 2008). In March 1985, in his first public speech as a newly approved Soviet leader, Michael Gorbachev supported a “course for consolidation of Soviet people to fulfill the historical tasks of the Communist Party” and confirmed the continuation of the “rightful goals of Soviet policy,” including “politically correct angle of the strategy for academic aid provision to the countries-members of the World System of Socialism and its allies throughout the world” (Materialy Martovskogo Plenuma TsK KPSS, 1985). However, a month later, Gorbachev called unexpected “paramount session” of the Party Central Committee and announced a plan for Perestroika (Materialy Aprel'skogo Plenuma TsK KPSS, 1985). At the time, the focus of the proposed reforms was to intensify scientific and technological progress in national industry through the enforcement of research and education. In relation to this task, Gorbachev demanded a fast and efficient reformation of the organizational structure, investment and international policies of the Soviet academia “in order to reach to the positively new level of quality of the Soviet society” (Materialy Aprel'skogo Plenuma TsK KPSS, 1985, p.23-25). It was the first time in Soviet history that a political leader of

the country announced the direct dependency of its economic development upon the advancement and international status of national academia (Gorbachev, 1990). Gorbachev's leading postulate in his proposition for the policy of "New Thinking" was to recognize the interdependence of all parts in the modern, highly interrelated world (Becker, Horelick, 1989). The global image of the USSR was supposed to change from a mighty military superpower to the frontrunner of international educational and technological progress, peaceful and willingly sharing its innovations with the rest of the world (Gorbachev, 2012). Gorbachev was forceful in promoting his belief that Perestroika can win only having full support of the intellectual elite of the country, through successful integration of scientifically advancing Soviet Union into the global network of academically innovative and industrialized countries (Shevarnadze, 1988). A series of meetings with world leaders and international visits, related to the new Soviet international agenda, happened during the next few years (Medvedev, 1994). This was the beginning of Perestroika transformation of the Soviet international policy, observed by the Soviet leadership as a prerequisite for successful internal reforms (Gorbachev, 1998).

*US-Soviet Academic Partnership – the Turning Point Toward an Open Doors Policy*

The starting moment of Perestroika in international higher education for the USSR was the US-Soviet summit in Geneva, in November 1985. Even though, the major topic of the meeting was the matter of arms control, in the final statement of the summit several US-Soviet agreements were announced that played a vital role in the future development of Soviet international academic policy (Gorbachev, 1995). Firstly, a principal joint declaration on the equal importance of people-to-people and formal

diplomatic communication between the nations changed the context of future international communication for the Soviets. This started not only US-Soviet, but a broad Soviet-West collaboration on individual and group, institutional and region-to-region levels (Kerr, 1985; Filippov, 1994). Secondly, the US-Soviet Geneva statement of 1985 changed dramatically the very concept of “international activities” in the Soviet public mentality. Prior to Gorbachev times, “international” was usually associated in the USSR with formal and inter-government level of communication. Now, Soviet leadership truly promoted interactions of Soviet people with foreigners on a common scale, supporting grass-root initiatives (Yakovlev, 2009).

The Geneva summit resolution specifically highlighted an agreement between the Soviet Union and the USA to expand programs of bilateral educational and scientific-technical exchanges, including specific examples such as cooperation in the development of software for school instruction; measures to promote Russian language studies in the United States and English language studies in the USSR; annual exchange of professors aimed to conduct special courses in history, culture and economics at the relevant departments of Soviet and American institutions of higher education; mutual allocation of scholarships for the best students in the natural and social sciences, technology and humanities to study in a university of the partnering country for an academic year. The relevant agencies in each country were instructed to develop specific programs for these exchanges (Joint Soviet-United States Statement on the Summit Meeting in Geneva, 1985).

Such a radical transformation of US-Soviet relations brought to life unprecedented educational mobility and scientific cooperation between the two nations during 1987-

1991, launching a new era in Soviet academic internationalization (Vyshee obrazovanie v SSSR, 1990). A US-Soviet program for academic cooperation was adopted for five years, starting from January 1986 (The General Agreement between the USA and the USSR, 1985). Original program of US-Soviet academic collaboration was edited several times through the following five years always furthering initial ideas of equal opportunities for the scholars of both countries on the grounds of mutual benefit, and extending primary concept of supporting individual and institutional scholarly initiatives (Petrik, 2007). Such management approach was unusual for the Soviet traditional administration based on top-down governance of state authority. Subsequent US-Soviet academic agreements of 1987-1991 contained most detailed description of organizational forms and contexts, funding specifics and expected outcomes of academic cooperation between the nations, specified to individual and institutional levels (U.S., Soviets Expand Plan For Students, 1988). Scholarship for study abroad and research grants were to be available upon requests of academic organizations and individuals from each country. Moreover, applicants had to provide evidence of established communication with hosting institutions or scholars, and had to provide a discussed and jointly approved program of study with explicated goals and outcomes (Schweizer, 2003; Wieck, 1992). The study itineraries, lengths of stay, dates of arrival, size of delegations, financial and transportation arrangements and other details of exchanges and visits had to be agreed upon by the individuals and institutions involved, with full provision of the information to the adequate government agency of each country not less than thirty days in advance (Vneshnyaya politika Rossii, 1996). Renewal of the bilateral academic exchanges agreement in 1988 enforced East-West academic cooperation, providing more stimulating

conditions for the scholarly cooperation (Cultural relations, exchanges for 1989-199, US-Soviet Program, 1993). Several types of exchanges were recognized as essential academic interactions:

- Long-term advanced research, where at least 40 advanced researchers and professors were expected to part in the mobility from each side for up to one academic year, for study and scholarly research;
- Short-term advanced research mobility of at least ten professors, and advanced researchers to conduct scholarly research for periods of between two and five months;
- At least 30 language teachers were planned to travel each way to participate in summer courses of two months to improve their competence in the language of the receiving side;
- Each government pledged to encourage and fund exchange of scholars directly between academic institutions involved into advanced research for up to 60 person-months from each academic year.

The agreement installed a continuous practice of direct inter-institutional exchanges between Russian and US academic establishments, promising full support from both governments, including financial provision. Professors and specialists from universities or other institutions of higher learning from each side were to participate in such mobility for periods of one to ten months to lecture and to teach and conduct research. The sending institution was expected to choose, at its own discretion, candidates for participation in the exchanges, and the receiving side, at its discretion, was to decide about the placement of these candidates (US-Soviet Cultural Relations and Exchanges, 1993). The first Soviet-American non-government Foundation “Cultural Initiative” was founded in 1988 as well (Chernyshov, 2007). This was an important event for Soviet



higher education, opening an opportunity of direct application for the Russian scholars to the Western funding source of academic activities, bypassing government structures. Also, the foundation created and sustained first 33 Internet-centers in Russian academic institutions, thus starting the new chapter in Russian academic internationalization (Soros, 2001). US-Soviet academic cooperation had a direct effect on the internal development of Russian higher education promoting new, democratic climate in its administrative organization. Attention to a scholar and a university was the first important result of the advancement of internationalization in Russian academia. This not only energized Russian scholars, who rushed to communicate with their American and European colleagues; in addition, global penetration of Soviet academia became a vital part of the general promotion of the openness of Soviet society (Richmond, 2009). US-Soviet academic exchanges alone grew almost four times during the discussed five years, reaching by 1991 nine thousand students and scholars involved in international mobility (Tsvetkova, 2006).

*Open Doors Policy: From Discovery of Global Academia to Integration*

International academic cooperation with the USA initiated and promoted scholarly interactions with other Western countries, European first of all (Richmond, 2009). Soviet government established collaborative relations with state and private organizations of United Kingdom and France, Western Germany and Canada, Scandinavian and Balkan countries (Shevarnadze, 1988). British-Soviet Cultural Agreement of 1987 provided a framework for academic exchanges between the countries and British Council included Russian scholars in its annual plans for global academic mobility (Duncan, Pravda, 1990). In October 1988 British Secretary of State for Education and Science first time

visited the USSR and signed first bilateral agreement for exchanges between Soviet and British universities, while British Council made available additional funds for these activities (Duncan, Pravda, 1990). In 1989 Nordic Council of Ministers comprising Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden, considered inclusion of Baltic area of the USSR with Leningrad as the center into the sphere of Nordic cooperation in higher education and research, thus starting the continuous academic exchanges and joint research activities between Scandinavia and the USSR (Russia) (Gunnarsson, 2010). Russian students became usual participants of student exchange programs at the universities of Copenhagen and Stockholm, arriving in dozens every year to each institution (Westergaard, 2009). Since 1988 French Ministry of National Education opened a special unit at the French Embassy in Moscow to work directly with the Russians willing to study in France, suggesting special grants to those who are willing to study French language (Rapport Annuel Alliance Francaise, 2003). In 1989, during the Annual International Congress of AIESEC, the USSR was officially incorporated into the Association (Istoriya AIESEC v Rossii, 2013). A year later, 18 Soviet higher schools, suggesting degree programs in economics and management, were full members of Association, while another 15 Soviet universities became prospective members (Karavaev, 2002). About a hundred Soviet young scholars studied abroad every year using the AIESEC programs (Istoriya AIESEC v Rossii, 2013). Soviet academics, institutions and national higher education as a whole started to actively participate in many international organizations, promoting global academic cooperation, like UNESCO, International Association of Universities, European Association for International Education (Dneprov, 1992). All new academic interactivities had one

important sign – focus on individual and team scholarly communication. New international academic agreements adopted by the Soviet state were considered and formatted on the state level but aimed to endorse integration of Soviet higher education in the global academic network on the personal level (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992). The function of the state was limited to facilitation of the academic exchanges and research partnerships, while creation of the content of educational interaction, and formation of substance of joint research were delegated to the academics themselves. It was a real organizational revolution for the Soviet academia (Filippov, 2003). Expansion of academic cooperation with the Western countries focused on the individual academics as applicants and participants of international mobility, and members of joint inter-institutional research led naturally to the direct and free from government supervision East-West communication on the personal level. Even most protected areas of research like nuclear studies, were opened for a dual cross-national academic communication and analysis, starting from the establishment of US-Soviet joint study program in 1986, aimed to produce social and behavioral science research directed toward the prevention of nuclear war (Soviet-American Dialogue in the Social Sciences, 1990). Traditional Soviet veil of secrecy was taken away from advanced technological research, institutions producing it, and academics, working at these institutions. Soviet people together with the foreign public started to learn about real achievements and problems in the Russian national academia (Sakharov, 1996). The most exciting aftermath of the Gorbachev's policy of "Open Doors" for the global academia was the international exposure of Kurchatov Institute that was the most secretive Soviet center for creation of atomic weaponry since after WWII (Gagarinsky, Yatchishina, 2013). Being the

most advanced form of academic internationalization known in Russia, the “Open Doors” policy delivered to Russian academia the notion of academic freedoms, and demonstrated methods of their practical implementation.

*Interconnections: Pluralism in Domestic Policy and Open Doors in International Policy*

Glasnost (Transparency) and Pluralism pronounced by Gorbachev and his team as the key principles of “New Thinking” policy resulted in national academia in the format of mass petition of Russian educators and students for democratization in higher educational institutions and their independence from the traditional government administration. Soviet leaders and Soviet population were in absolute togetherness for the first time since Bolshevik revolution, trying to convert political course of the country towards Democratization and Internationalization. It would not be an exaggeration to presume that internationalization provoked democratization in Russian academia in late 1980s and delivered concept of Perestroika to the “academic population” of the country in a practical format. Political changes endorsed by the XIX Party Conference and First All-Union Congress of People’s Deputies significantly furthered international dimension in the academic policy of Russian academia. It was the beginning of a real boom in the East-West international academic mobility. Special enforcement was given to the academic exchanges in economic, social sciences and humanities. Hundreds of scholars from Europe and the USA came to the Soviet Union to do research using formerly classified documents and closed information sources; graduate students in Russian history, language and culture picked formerly restricted for foreigners cities and provinces to do thesis case studies; dozens of previously classified academic institutions and even “closed cities” became open to foreign academics and available for conducting

joint research. English language studies became extremely popular in the USSR: in Moscow alone by 1990 there were over a hundred English language programs and centers, suggesting various study courses, and a certified center for taking the TOEFL test has been opened (Chistohvalov, Filippov, 2009). Russian academics and students also had a number of new opportunities to study in abroad. Most of the East-West academic exchange programs were opened under the supervision of the Embassies, like IREX office was opened in Moscow as an extension of the US Embassy. Not only was this a crucial outcome of the Cold War finale, but the beginning of the free and growing to become quite massive inter-educational and inter-cultural East-West academic communication for Russian educators, resulted shortly in hundreds of new study courses, dozens of new higher educational institutions and collaborative research projects. In 1990, reviewing only US academic publications, 56 Russian editions were reprinted, mostly to be used as text-books for the Russian students (Shadrikov, 1993). Every aspect of higher education, including curricula and text-books, language of instruction and actual teachers, individual studies, practices, and group research became practically available in the international format for thousands of Russians (Belaya kniga Rossiyskogo obrazovaniya, 2000). Academic mobility, student exchanges, collaborative research, participation in international academic meetings and joint publications were becoming normality for recently secluded from the world Soviet academia. It looked absolutely obvious that “Open Doors” policy became a reality for Russian higher education. Over two thousand Soviet scholars took part in joint research and collaborative conference presentations and joint publications in 1990, while over sixty Russian organizations received foreign visitors from study abroad programs (Karavaev,

2002). The development of East-West academic collaboration seriously influenced the traditional domain of Soviet academia – the professional training of students from Third World countries.

*Foreign Students in the USSR During Perestroika*

Reformation of Soviet academia, promoted by Perestroika development, progressing in conjunction with economic disorder and social mayhem during the 1980s, seriously influenced educational and living conditions of foreign students in the USSR. Even though the number of countries within the “World Socialism System” decreased, the number of foreign students in the USSR arriving from Asia, Africa and Latin America remained steady through 1980s, an average of 90-100 thousand students per academic year (Dmitriev, 2003b). Operating only with absolute numbers that seemed impressive, Russian officials and academics didn’t present publically the percentage of foreign students in national academia, which was less than 2%, or the percentage of the number of foreign students, studying in the Soviet Union, as related to total numbers of foreign students worldwide, which for the decade of 1980s was less than 10% (Narodnoe hozyaistvo SSSR, 1989; Vysshee obrazovanie v SSSR, 1990). At the same time, in reports to national government and to international organizations, like UNESCO, two data figures were provided for circulation: a) USSR occupies third place in the world as the host-country for foreign students, after USA and France; b) foreign students study in over 700 higher educational institutions all over the country (Dmitriev, 2003; Petrik, 2007). This was supposed to provide positive impressions about state of Russian academia and its international activities for domestic and global public. In fact, the reality was far from affirmative and serene. Almost one third of foreign students arriving to the

USSR by 1990 were from African countries. These students often had low level of general academic knowledge and needed at least a year of training in “preparatory course” to begin studies at a higher educational institution. Most of them didn’t speak any Russian upon arrival to the USSR, and needed a year or two of extensive language training before attending classes taught in Russian. The vast majority of students were coming without any funds, counting for the usual coverage of all academic and living expenses from the Russian government. And, finally, they expected to work in prestigious and well-paid positions at the Soviet-built enterprises and social service complexes upon their return to the home countries. But all these prospects were getting blurry through 1980s. Soviet financial support and investments in the economy of “friendly countries” in abroad decreased to almost zero by 1990. The countries of Eastern Bloc, that were the usual partners in the aid provision, now were getting out of the Soviet domain fast, radically turning anti-Soviet and pro-Western in their foreign and international academic policies (Scott, 2000). Established “Soviet cultural centers” were closed due to the deficiency of funding in 66 states of the Third World, leaving almost no presence of Soviet academia in the countries of Asia and Africa (Noskova, 2003; Zak, 2007). This was a serious erosion for the basics of the Soviet international academic policy – absence of ideological influence and lack of financial support to the native potential students, absence of privileges during the study period in the USSR and no guarantees of good jobs upon return to the home-country, created an issue of making choice between going to study to the West vs. studying in the USSR. Having no instruments of political influence and providing no funding, Russian academia could lose many “friendly partners “ in the Third World, and thus fail to keep the position of an

academic superpower. In fact, this process started in mid-1980s, brought Russia by late 1990s to the level of a Third World country in the field of international academic mobility. By the beginning of nineties, “international issues” were associated for Russian public and for the Russian government predominantly with the East-West relations. Nobody paid much attention to other international matters, and foreign students in Soviet Union were quite on their own at the time (Arefiev, 2008; Saginova, 2005). Comprehending the reality well, Soviet government didn’t have monetary resources to change the situation and was involved too deep in the vital process of political transformation progressing in the homeland.

*Democratization as the Driving Force and Goal of Academic Internationalization*

Inspired by the international policy of Open Doors, academic democratization became a major issue for Russian higher education (Dneprov, 2006; Petrik, 2007). Firstly, “in order to be in line with the progressive concept of continuing post-secondary education developing in the world,” the USSR State Committee for People’s Education was formed, uniting all federal organs administrating different levels of education in the country (Ob organizatsii i strukture upravleniya narodnym obrazovaniem v strane, 1988). The new All-Union Federal Agency for Education was headed by the well-known Russian scholar Gennadiy Yagodin, who was not only a supporter of Perestroika reforms, but also had extensive experience in international academic affairs (Cohn, 2013; Uryavina-Kupriyanova, 2005). Soon after his appointment, Minister Yagodin called an All-Union Congress of Soviet Academics and suggested for discussion a new concept of further development for the Russian education system, based on the “global academic notions of humanization and democratization” (Arkadiev, Krivosheev, 2012). Soviet



conservative politicians and educators considered this as an attempt to destroy the basics of Soviet education system in favor of Westernization (Eklof, Holmes, Kaplan, 2005). Despite of the critics, a freshly “academic team for developing of a new educational reform” proposed almost immediately new regulations for the assignment of administrative positions in higher educational institutions. The first set of instructions issued in 1988 had a very unusual preamble: “...fulfilling recent decisions of the Party Central Committee and Soviet Government, as well as reflecting to the historical academic tradition of self-governance embraced globally ...” (Petrovskiy, Slobodchikov, Bim-Bad, 1988). The actual regulations suggested in this and further orders and instructions of the All-Union State Committee on Education suggested new procedure of appointment and replacement for heads of academic departments, deans of schools, and later for rectors of higher educational institutions where several candidates for one administrative post were allowed, and even expected, all faculty members of a department, school or a university were invited to take part in the election proceedings holding equal voting rights, usual mandatory Party membership of any administrator was abolished, and the final appointment had to reflect the actual elections results (O pervoocherednyh merah po razvitiuy obrazovania v RSFSR, 1991). The new administrative regulations were immediately named an “academic revolution”, and began an avalanche of organizational changes, reflecting the concept of New Thinking (Dneprov, 2011; Tatur, 2013). Indeed, it was very serious deformation of the core of the Soviet academic system. It placed “Vox Populi” above the opinions of government officials, shaking the customary grounds of Soviet social organization. Even more important, the politicians, who promoted these reforms, and the new legislation, they’ve

conducted, referred to an international academic tradition in explaining the need for change (Asmolov, Yagodin, 1992). Never before had a Soviet internal legal act about education related to global trends in academia! Academic internationalization not only penetrated deep into the Soviet higher education, but caused serious changes to the internal organization and administration of Russian national academia. This was really an unprecedented reformation. At the same time, democratic innovations in Russian academia correlated in time and connected in context with crucial ideological transition in public mentality of Soviet people. Critical moment in this process belongs to the XIX Party Conference of 1988 that proclaimed course for “humanization and democratization of Soviet society” (Materialy XIX Vsesoyuznoi konferencii KPSS, 1988). The conference adopted a number of remarkable political declarations intended to change the political system of the country, and promote democratization. It proclaimed Glasnost (Transparency) as a key principle of state authorities and affirmed immediate legal reform. The most impressive aspect for the Soviet population was the denunciation of sacred Soviet postulates about the glorious construction of industrial greatness of the USSR in 1930s, and the definitive role of the Soviet Union in 1940s, as the protector of world peace and defeater of Nazism. Historical documents and conclusions of the joint **international** academic commission proved Soviet leadership of the period acting more as a perpetrator of Soviet people and defender of autocracy inside the country and internationally (Materialy XIX Vsesoyuznoi konferencii KPSS, 1988). The fact that a report of the Politburo was prepared by an academic committee, including foreign experts, who had used materials from both Soviet and alien historical sources was as shocking to the Russian public as the revelations about the magnitude of Stalin purges

and secret protocols of the 1939 Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact. The Great Patriotic War being an untouchable “sacred cow” of the Soviet society for all post-war generations was “brutally slaughtered” by the Gorbachev team: the fairytale about heroic Soviet people gifting life and peace to the world was ruined and replaced by a tragic story of enormous hardships Russians had to live through, suffering from the Soviet regime! This was a sensitive moment of ideological collapse of the Soviet Power, where academic internationalization played a vital role. Soviet society got split into two parts: supporters of the “New Thinking” concept, willing for the USSR to transform into a civil society through a complex of profound improvements; and protectors of the traditional Soviet ideology, presenting Soviet Union as a world leader and superpower, needing no major reforms. Tension between these portions of Soviet society was growing fast getting to the point of a possible breakup of the Soviet Bloc and a civil conflict inside of the Soviet society (Gorbachev, 1993). Subsequent historical events proved such expectations to be reasonable, while the international component in the collapse of the USSR, and its academic division in particular, became a unique element for the Perestroika progress.

Next step in the cardinal political reformation of the Soviet society was the first session of the Congress of the USSR People’s Deputies in 1989. Elections to the Congress were the first free execution of the true choice of Soviet people since the beginning of the USSR, which brought dozens of famous Russian intelligentsias to the actual politics (Brown, 2009). It was the culmination of Perestroika period, due to the famous statements of the Congress: not only had it assumed highest legal authority in the country, it also sanctioned plurality of political parties, established presidential administration and elected Gorbachev as the first President of the USSR, approved rights

of Soviet republics to seek state independency, and proclaimed course for international integration of Russia as an equal, civil and transparent partner of global community (Pervyi Syezd Narodnyh Deputatov SSSR, 1989). Andrey Sakharov, the famous Russian academician and dissident, was one of the deputies of the Congress, and named it “the first gathering of Russian intellectuals, following in their political proposal modern academism, common sense, and human morality” (Sakharov, 1996). Internationalization and specifically academic integration of the USSR into the world were underlined as priorities for the new Soviet policy. The Congress approved the new concept of academic development for the country suggested by All-Union State Committee on Education, and aimed for the accomplishment of the organizational reform of Soviet education, transforming it into the modern academic system, based on the notions of the civil society (Dneprov, 2011). It was a quite real, while, unfortunately, very short period of the victory of democracy and liberalism in Soviet politics, including its academic division (Yagodin, 1989). All-Union government lead by Gorbachev continuously promoted international dimension of the new political course of “Open Doors”, broadly involving foreign experts as advisors for the academic reform and other transformations of the Soviet society (Graham, 2002; Hazbulatov, 2012; Müllerson, 2012). Active consultations were going on regarding international equivalency of Soviet diplomas and scholarly degrees. Joint US-Soviet academic exchange committee formed in 1985, initiated creation of the Convention of Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees Concerning Higher Education between the states belonging to the European Region, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. by 1991 (Sazanova, 2007). In fact, it was a quest for the full integration of the Russian higher education into the global academic network. An outcome of the Soviet

academic reform of such magnitude was logically assumed as organic part of the peaceful conversion of the USSR into a non-Soviet civil society (Gorbachev, 1995). Transformation of the USSR into a democratic federation of self-governed civic regions and republics, accompanied by the adequate organizational restructure of the former Soviet academic network, freeing Russian intellectuals to become natural part of the world academia, was considered as tightly connected process by the “founding fathers of Perestroika” (Yakovlev, 2009).

*Role of Academic Internationalization in the New Russian Educational Concept*

Soviet political leadership, All-Union State Committee for Education, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, academic professionals and common population of Russia, - were all concentrated on the major issue in the field of education, – new national concept of education and scholarship. Key topics of formal discussions and public debates about Russian higher education were: institutional autonomy, academic freedoms and organizational democratization (Lukov, 2005). Reflecting to these hot topics, and following standpoints of the All-Union Congress of People’s Deputies, All-Union State Committee for Education established and applied nation-wide a special program of sociological surveying “Public Opinion” (Ovsyannikov, 1999). The program was created by a special Research Institute for Problems of National Academia, founded by the State Committee in the frame of Perestroika reformation, while it had a direct connection to the innovations happening in the Soviet international academic policy (Yagodin, 1989). Everything about this institute and the program “Public Opinion”, it executed, was directly related to the new understanding of international academic policy in the Soviet leadership. First of all, the very idea of studying public opinion was not just unusual for

the traditional top-down administrative system of decision-making in the USSR; it was absolutely foreign to the Soviet political establishment. Secondly, the chosen method of study in the format of sociological poll was not just innovative, but ideologically incorrect. Sociology was proclaimed as a “false science” in the famous 1936 Party Statement “On Perversions in Science” and since didn’t exist in the list of “allowed sciences” in the USSR (Astafyev, Shubkin 1996; Weinberg, 1974). Finally, involvement of foreign experts in the internal and politically sensitive matter as “public opinion” was considered almost as a national treason by the old-minded Soviet autocrats (Ovsyannikov, Iudin, 2001). Now, the breeze of Glasnost “blew in” a positive attitude to the Western academic methods, and a study of public opinion was considered as another sign of democratization arriving into the Russian educational system (Trenin, 2006).

In three years the program conducted nineteen surveys in 60 higher educational institutions of the country and presented to the team of Perestroika reformers of Soviet education very interesting analytical material:

- Perestroika or simply speaking reformation happening in an institution was of importance and interest to the 100% of students and 91% of faculty members. At the same time, progress of reforms in the country in general was a matter of constant attention only to 39% of faculty and 12% of students (Obshestvennoe mnenie i Perestroika visshei shkoly, 1987);

- Democratization progress of the organization and administration of the state academic system was evaluated as sufficient by 53% of institutional administrators, and 26% of faculty. 68% of academic faculty and staff expressed vital need in furthering process of democratization up to complete autonomy of academic institutions where scholars should

experience academic freedoms and fully use rights for electing administrators of all levels. Students didn't participate in this survey (Dokumenty Gosobrazovanie SSSR: Programma Obshestvennoe Mnenie, 1990);

- Need for a new typology of higher educational institutions, rooted into historical academic traditions and relevant to the Western (traditional) definition of a university was supported by the 2/3 of participants of a special survey "Universities of Russia". The analytical report concluding the survey stated that majority of respondents approved an idea of grading all higher educational institutions as local, regional and national, while providing title of a university only to those institutions, that have combination of teaching and research, focus on fundamental studies, and mandatory minimum of humanitarian subjects in the compulsory part of curricula. Participants of the survey fully supported suggestion to provide universities with the right of establishing institutional study programs and research projects, issue institutional diplomas and degrees, and forming institutional budget as well as direct annual expenses without supervision from the federal authorities. At the same time all educational establishments that received university status, should be named as "state universities", meaning highest, national status. Institutions making focus on applied sciences were suggested to be named "institutes" and treated as higher schools of lower than university status, being either of local or regional calibers. All higher educational institutions were expected to have the right to establish direct international academic affairs, including monetary issues (Ovsyannikov, Iudin, 1988). Results of the surveys conducted in the frame of the program "Public Opinion" were discussed by the Russian academic community and general public nationwide, and were considered in the formation of the final draft of a

new model of state education (Dneprov, 2011). Conservative wing of Soviet political leadership, named the public discussion of the future of Russian academia as “stab in the back” of the USSR, and announced position of Russian academics “an angry hiss of Western agents” (Ligachev, 2012). The new academic model of Russia was one of the most radical reforms suggested during Perestroika times. In fact, it was supposed to dismantle completely Soviet system of higher education, and replace it by the “democratic organizationally, progressive in its content, and integrated globally” national academic system. Gorbachev named the draft of the academic reform as the “real return to the original principles of Soviet Power” that was meant to be the first example of actual civil society (Gorbachev, 1999).

In the frame of this division, political leadership of the Soviet Union promoted deliberation of the academic reform through the public dialogue, and initiated First All-Union Congress of Educators, All-Union Assembly of Rectors of Soviet Higher Schools, and endorsed vast organizational reconstruction of the national academic system towards “world academic standards” (Petrovskiy, Slobodchikov, Bim-Bad, 1988; O strategii obrazovaniya, 1989; Abramov, 1995). In 1990, new academic concept was formatted into the “Main Principles of New Educational Policy in the USSR” (Shishikin, 2011). It was designed to deliver modern and internationally recognized quality of national academia by the end of the XX century, through democratization, decentralization and depolitization. New program suggested integration into global academia by year 2000 as the major task of the reform (Yagodin, 1989). Advancing all-union discussion that started in late 1980s, the last step towards legal ratification of the new academic concept was made during the meeting of Gorbachev with the rectors of Soviet universities



(Molodtsova, 1990). First Soviet President not only fully enforced the ideology of the new academic concept suggesting concentration of organizational reform on the application of the global academic traditions of university autonomy and academic freedoms, but also directly associated its practical implementation with the success of Perestroika. Gorbachev underlined that new academic policy, once converted into all-union legislation, will become a valuable manifestation of the original ideas of Perestroika (Gorbachev, 1988). Academic intellectuals were pronounced as “ambassadors of Perestroika to the world”, who played crucial role in the transformation of ideologically dogmatic and politically conventional Soviet order into an egalitarian and globally integrated civil society, based on progressive, technologically advanced national economy (Gorbachev, 1995). However, progressing during the most turmoil political period in the modern Russian history, the debate about new context and organizational format of the national higher education did not resolve into the construction of a new, non-Soviet, model of the Russian educational system. Developing through the conclusive stage of the Perestroika reforms, and reflecting on-going political battles between different partisan groups of the Soviet society, academic reform arrived to the phase of conversion of the ideas into the legislation right at the moment of the collapse of the USSR. At the same time, when All-Union State Committee on Education was preparing the new Education Act for the adoption by the next All-Union Congress of People’s Deputies, Russian Federal Republic, having still the formal status of RSFSR within the USSR, initiated academic reforms on the republican level.

*Academic Internationalization as a Priority of the 1992 Education Act*

After the arrival of Boris Yeltsin to the political power in RSFSR in 1990, and adoption of the Declaration of the state sovereignty of RSFSR, proclaiming superiority of republican legislation over the All-Union one, Yeltsin's cabinet promoted Russian reforms, including the academic one in the format of contradiction and even opposition to the All-union Gorbachev's reformations. This created a lot of chaos among the academics, most of who worked through 1980s as one team of reformers. Now, Gennadiy Yagodin, the head of All-Union Committee on Education, who formed and governed the group of academics, preparing new concept of national education, got involved into the political collisions with the standpatters in the All-Union government, demanding his dismissal, while his "right hand" in the federal ministry and the author of many articles of the draft of the new education law, Eduard Dneprov, was elected as the Minister of Education of Russia by the Russian republican parliament, to "accomplish educational reform" (Dneprov, 2006).

Russian academic reform received a new phase in its development transforming from the Soviet, All-Union event into a Russian national activity, and changing political position accordingly, from being part of Perestroika, into becoming a division of the post-Soviet Russian policy. Remarkably enough, the international dimension of Russian academic reform didn't get lost in this transformation, while it received a much more practical angle. New, post-Soviet, version of Russian Education Reform had a very pragmatic focus in the organizational format and in its academic content (Balyhin, 2010). It appeared to be the major academic conversion in the former Soviet space from Berlin to Beijing, at the same time, playing the role of a concluding event in the series of

educational transformations in the former Eastern Bloc. After the downfall of pro-Soviet governments in Eastern Europe, the former European allies of the USSR not only stopped their involvement in the “World System of Socialism”, but strived to establish, politically independent and economically pro-Western national regimes, while national academic systems in these countries aimed for prompt de-Sovietization (Scott, 2000b). Academic component of the Soviet Bloc collapsed swiftly and completely. Reunion of Germany and fall of Berlin wall in 1989, not only represented the end of the Cold War and prelude to the breakdown of the USSR; it was the beginning of fast progressing anti-Soviet academic reforms on all the territories of the former Soviet domain. Pioneers in such reformation from the former USSR were Baltic republics that started the process of dismemberment from the USSR, with demands for research to be published in native languages, and teaching being done using native textbooks (Rajangu 1997). After dissolution of the USSR, all former Soviet republics followed the same pattern thus promoting their own, national independent academic agendas (Afanasev, 1998; Shohov, 2010).

Reflecting to these global while briskly happening changes, Russian national version of the academic reform had no universal cultural perspective, as its All-Union draft had with the claim for the historical and worldwide value of the proposed educational development, but referred to international academic policy as a beneficial tool for promotion of advantageous changes in national academia (Dneprov, 2006). This alteration solidified in the 1992 Educational Act, could be considered as its principle distinction – it was the first legal act of post-Soviet Russia, holding a countrywide importance and with an international dimension, yet having no political introduction

addressed to the world, or claim for the global significance. The usual Soviet tradition of presenting internal reformation as the next step to the transformation of the human society, conceded to the pragmatism of national essence, where international aspect was present as a subordinate to the domestic needs. Retaining the conceptual focus of the original draft of the “Perestroika academic reform”, text of the 1992 Russian Educational Act contained the ideology of integration of Russian academia into the global academic network. Through the whole document consisting of 120 pages described in 60 articles of the new law, there were constant references to the European university traditions, global academic trends, modern teaching methodology, and world standards in higher education and advanced research (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992). Moreover, it was the first Russian legal act using internationalization as a term and providing its explanation with the reference to the “global academic tendencies” (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992). At the same time, references to the global tendencies, world standards, and academic internationalization had pure practical meaning and were used in the context of domestic needs. For example, institutional autonomy was defined as a privilege of a higher educational institution to organize independently search and hiring of faculty, staff personnel and administration, while being responsible for the employment decisions in front of the Federal Ministry of Education. Decision-making about research topics for scholars, and selection of academic literature for study courses was also delegated to the institutional level, which in fact canceled the Soviet tradition of mandatory use of the unified textbooks countrywide for each study course approved by the federal authorities by the order of the Ministry (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992). European university tradition was named as the reason for such

innovations, thus justifying the changes as a “step into the global academic modernity” (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992). At the same time, Department for Study Programs and Teaching Methodology remained active within the structure of the Federal Ministry of Education (Dneprov, 2011). Special article of the new Education Law established all administrative positions in higher educational institutions as elective – from the head of an academic department to a Rector of an academic establishment. It was presented as the “mainstream of global academia”, however such procedure existed in the soviet times as well. The actual control of the authorities over academic institutions was executed through the act of “adoption of an elected candidate”, which was formatted in the special, while uniformed “Ministry order on the appointment”. The Ministry order was considered as the main and final document delegating administrative authority to the newly elected head of an academic institution (O zakluchenii dogovorov o vzaimootnosheniyah obrazovatelnyh uchrezhdeniy s uchreditelyami. Instruktivnoe pismo Minobra RF, 1993). Educational Act of 1992 didn’t have in its context specific mentioning of such procedure, but the Ministry instructions, regulating administrative appointments for academic institutions, were not canceled or changed, and didn’t lose their authoritative power. In fact, with every adoption of a new version of the 1992 Educational Act that happened five times in the following fifteen years (in 1996, 2001, 2004, 2006, 2012), Ministry instructions regulating the execution of the Law were re-approved and stated as mandatory every time. The title of the instructions always bared reference to the original text formulated in the order of Sovnarkom from 1936 (Rekomendacii Minobra RF po protsedure provedeniya vyborov v vuzah, 2006). At the same time, few articles bared the direct reflection to the political changes happened

during the Perestroika period. A special paragraph was devoted to the prohibition of any sort of political activities, agitation and propaganda in higher education institutions. Students, faculty and staff were forbidden to use buildings and grounds of an academic institution for politically related gatherings. Formation of chapters of any political party or public organization with a political agenda was proclaimed illegal on campus (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992).

Federal Regulations for Higher Educational Institutions with The University Unified Charter were valuable attachments to the 1992 Educational Act, mandatory for complying, and describing types of higher educational institutions legally approved nationwide. A new structure of higher education was introduced in the country: it was not only very different from the traditional Soviet one, but was often named since, as the major impact of “Westernization” on the Russian academia (Borisov, 2008). First of all, academic institutions could now be founded as state and non-state establishments (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992). This opened a legal procedure to form private higher schools charging tuition fees, and obviously was a direct influence of the Western university model by the admission of the authors of the Act (Dneprov, 2011). Over 350 private colleges and universities were opened in the next ten years, mostly in Moscow and St. Petersburg (Rastopshina, 2006). Few of these institutions got rather famous, both inside the country and internationally for their academic excellence, like Institute for Business and Politics of St. Petersburg, International Academy of Business and Management, Moscow International University, Moscow University Synergy (ANVUZ, 2013). However, common Russians, accustomed for generations to free higher education, didn’t find new type of higher schooling much appealing and often criticized

appearance of “capitalistic nests in national academia” (Platnoe Obuchenie, 2011; Lapkin, Pantin, 2003). The other innovation of the 1992 Educational Act, which was attributed by the Russian public to the influence of the West, was new classification of higher educational institutions. Highest position was given to a university, which was declared as a licensed by the state educational establishment providing study programs of all academic levels up to the doctoral degrees, in multiple academic divisions of humanitarian, social, natural, and other sciences, suggesting fundamental (theoretical) and applied professional training and producing scholarly research using the joint efforts of faculty and students. A university could have institutes and colleges in its structure, open branches and divisions nationwide and throughout the world, engage into industrial activities and create businesses to accumulate profit (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992). The most important privilege of a university provided by the new law was the permission for any kind of institutional international activity based on direct communication, academic cooperation, and even joint business collaboration with foreign establishments and government agencies of the other countries. This was not only defined as “internationalization” in the text of the new Educational Act, but constituted the actual arrival of academic internationalization into Russian higher education in the global meaning. Long time existing Soviet version of international academic policy as the intervention of Sovietization to the world, deriving from the notion of globalization as dissemination of Soviet Power throughout the world via World Revolution or through the “peaceful enlargement of the World System of Socialism”, was replaced by the 1992 Law with the concept of full integration of Russian academia into the global academic

network, with natural adoption of globally accepted definition and application of internationalization.

*Prerogative of an Institutional Internationalization - A Turning Point for the Role of Internationalization in Russian Academia*

Chapter 4 of the 1992 Educational Act was specifically devoted to the Academic International Affairs. Even though, the international aspect was well present in many articles of the Law, specific address to the international affairs was made at the end of the document, following long established Soviet tradition. The chapter consisted of two articles: one describing basic legal grounds for the cooperation with foreign countries and international academic organizations in the field of education; the second one was devoted to so-called “external economic affairs”. Such division also reflected Soviet tradition of separating issues of political matter falling into activities titled as “cooperation, collaboration, participation”, and reflecting “progressive international policy of the state”, from pragmatic business matters leading to the monetary resolution, as “joint research projects, joint enterprises for research application, and contracts with foreign enterprises, academic establishments and public organizations”. First type of interaction was expected to aim for friendly academic cooperation, presenting Russian academia well in abroad. Second kind of activities was focused on receiving benefits for the state, national academia, or a particular Russian academic institution. It was the first internal act of Russian legislation since 1920s that specified state priorities and organizational basis for international academic activities, thus explaining legal grounds for internationalization progress in the country. It was the first piece of Russian legislation delegating international activities to the level of academic institution, not only



allowing direct inter-institutional international cooperation, but enforcing it and permitting for all kind of benefits, including the monetary ones, to be collected, held and used on the institutional level as well (Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii, 1992). Article 58 describing legal international economic activities of Russian academic institutions, directly compared them with business enterprises and stated that national higher educational institutions were allowed from now on to establish direct partnership business relations with the foreign entities, engage into direct legal contracts and receive profits in favor of an institution or through setting a joint academic program or joint legal venture. No additional approvals were required from the federal authorities for such activities to be formal, legal and actual. International academic activities, including the monetary ones were just to follow general legislation of Russian Federation and basic protocols of the Ministry of International Affairs and usual regulations of the Federal Revenue Agency. Student and faculty exchange could also be part of inter-institutional international agreements, while payments and other funding issues related to such agreement were to be managed by the institutional administration. According to the 1992 Educational Act, Russian Ministry of Education immediately issued instructions on the practical formation of International Offices at the national academic institutions. Universities received prior attention and were not only allowed to establish special institutional units dealing with international affairs, but could have a position of a Vice-Rector for International Affairs to supervise the activities, while decision-making about the number of employees in such office and its budget were delegated to the institutional administration. Hundreds of universities all over the country, that had long history of international academic relations, like Moscow State University, as those who were

prohibited from international activities for different reasons, usually due to the military production in the region, like Samara, Saratov, Tomsk universities rushed to open international offices, form management body for international activities at the institutional administration, and establish direct communication with the foreign academic entities (Saginova, 2004; Trenin, 2006). Boom of institutional academic internationalization started from the 1992-93 academic year produced real intervention of global academia into Russia, reaching to hundreds Russian universities and thousands of Russian scholars. This was the actual beginning of a new period for the Russian academia when study trip to abroad or participation in an international conference or a joint research became a personal matter. From now on a teacher or a student became a decision-maker of personal international activities, just informing institutional administration about his plans, while executing the whole procedure of “going into abroad” himself. The same became true about international students and foreign scholars who now were arriving to study or do research on the basis of personal arrangements with Russian colleagues or a Russian institution. Federal authorities were supposed just to provide general monitoring on the level of proper documentations and tax payments. Such reality was not only absolutely new for the Russian academia, but extremely foreign in its ideology and organization, manifesting a radical and colossal change in the substance of Russian international academic policy. Academic internationalization moved from its usual pedestal of national government policy to the level of institutions and individuals.

Conclusion

Perestroika reforms played a crucial role in the development of Russian academia, and produced a fundamental turn in the academic international policy of the state. It was the most decisive change in academic internationalization that happened since the moment of introduction of international academic policy at the dawn of Soviet Power. Original introduction of specific international policy in the academic sphere happened as part of the establishment of the Soviet regime being part of the new ideology of Marxism-Leninism aimed towards the accomplishment of World Socialist Revolution. The task was national, but intentioned for the global application; and international academic policy originated as the strategy of the Soviet state for dissemination of its national yet social order worldwide. Within the Soviet conceptual pattern, international academic policy of Russia was initiated and further developed through the history of the USSR as politically correct, Soviet policy that should be delivered internationally in the frame of the natural while global dispersion of the Soviet way of life and social organization. In the other words, it was Soviet academia that was considered in the USSR as the only proper one worldwide that had to become globally established by different means, including forceful military ones, within the division of World Revolution. “International” aspect of Soviet academic policy was simplified to the notion of “international delivery” of the Soviet academic organization and content to the rest of the world. This philosophy and associated policy of the Soviet leadership governed Russian international policy in general and Russian international academic policy in particular throughout the Soviet period of Russian history. Its slogan could be summed up to the following statement: “We, the Soviets, constructed the best academic system humanity

ever knew, and we will deliver it to the rest of the world. With the establishment of the Soviet education system globally, people of the world will receive broad knowledge, professional training and will become enlightened ideologically. This will be the triumph of the human academic advancement and all peoples of the world will be grateful for having the best, and the only proper academic system around the globe – the Soviet one. Then the world will arrive to the glory of Soviet way of life, thus marking the beginning of the new and the most progressive era in the history of mankind – epoch of Communism” (Suslov, 1982). Perestroika transformation initiated by the Gorbachev team, equals to the Bolshevik revolution in the depth and magnitude of its impact on the Russian society and global community. For Russian academic policy and its international dimension it meant a complete turnaround. The climax of Perestroika in academia was the formation of the draft for the 1992 Education Act, which in its core was a “Gorbachev’s reformation” delayed by the socio-political events to become active in after-Gorbachev and post-Soviet times. Perestroika reforms in Russian academia brought a completely new notion of international academic policy. After decades of repeated statements that Soviet educational system is the best, Soviet science is the most advanced, and it is the mission of the USSR to deliver its progressive academic organization to the world, five years of Perestroika was the period introducing a very different motto to the Soviet people and to the world. First revelation to the Soviet population was the suggestion that academic progress happens worldwide, not ONLY in the Soviet Union. It’s the shame that Soviet education system is excluded from intensive international academic communication. Secondly, new Russian leadership surprised Russians suggesting them to not only teach the foreigners in the Soviet academic pattern,

but study their academic culture as well. Russian academic international policy turned from a well-known and simple concentration on the global Sovietization to a new focus on learning and accepting outside academic experience. Russian academia was expected to integrate in the global academic network. Perestroika aimed Russian academia to abandon Sovietization policy of changing the world, introducing Soviet academic organization and content to the others, but to change itself adopting organizational principles and teaching methods, research approaches and study programs from the developed Western academic systems. A radically new slogan was suggested by Perestroika to the Russian academics: we don't have the best in the world academic system; our education needs the world not less, but more, than the world needs our participation in global academia; we should study and change according Western university traditions and educational standards; our future depend upon international academic policy attracting world academia to deal with us (Dneprov, 2006). Soviet academic principles of uniformity and state authority should be replaced with Western principles of academic freedoms, institutional autonomy and liberal knowledge. Then we may arrive to the same academic future as the rest of progressive world, which is ahead of us on the path to the Knowledge Society (Galagan, 2000). "We need to ask the academic world to take us on board of their academic march to the progressive future" (Yagodin, 1989). Comprising a huge turn in the organization, mission, principles and overall ideology for national academia, Perestroika reforms created a completely new reality for Russian academia and requested great changes in the national academic policy. Yeltsin's political team leading Russia into 1990s had to face these challenges in daily work with national academia internally, and with the global academic network

internationally. The introduction of institutional internationalization by the 1992 Education Act, brought a whole complex of new issues, necessitating immediate attention on national, regional and institutional levels. Hundreds of newly established offices for international affairs in universities needed thousands of professionals in international academic management; but such study programs didn't exist on the Ministry of Education list of professional curricula. The recruitment of foreign students required reorganization to reflect the novelty of coordination between traditional federal management and emerging institutional activities. Academic mobility and research collaboration demanded attention and funding as well. Russian academia faced a broad spectrum of daily needs related to internationalization with no established organizational structures or associated funding to deal with them.

**Chapter 7: New Mission of Academic Internationalization in Market-Driven Russia**

The arrival of the market economy to Russia in the 1990s forced the end of exclusive state ownership of materials, means of production, and manpower. It brought about the collapse of the Soviet organization of the Russian state, which is analyzed in much current academic literature (Brown, 2001; Gaidar, Chubais, 2011; Guriev, 2009; Kotz, Weir 2007; Yasin, 2002). The new reality arrived quite unexpectedly for Soviet people and was aptly called “shock therapy” (Murrell, 1993; Gaidar, Pohl, 1995). Fulfillment of the 1992 Educational Act and transformation of the international policy of Russian academia had to progress during this strenuous period for the Russian economy and society (Artemenko, Chubarov, 2010; Kablov, 2009). This chapter focuses on the correlation between the arrival of the market in Russia’s economy and the introduction of the Western concept of academic internationalization to Russian higher education. Were the educational innovations of the 1990s a continuation of Perestroika academic reforms, or do they represent a different era in the development of Russian academia and its internationalization? This is the key question addressed in this chapter. What was the impact of the national economic debacle on Russian international academic policy? Could acceptance of the Russian Federation into the coalition of Bologna Declaration participants be considered the full integration of Russian academia into the European and global academic network?

*A New Academic Internationalization: the West Comes to Russia*

Since 1992, the Russian Federation had experienced a new international reality, becoming a separate state surrounded by independent countries. Instead of being the core of a huge commonwealth of Soviet states, having political standing of the planetary

magnitude, Russia became one of the equal members of the network of so-called “Newly Independent States,” formed from the ruins of the Soviet Union. Even though Russia was recognized internationally as the heir of the USSR, starting from its role in the United Nations, it had lost the usual Soviet title of a “global superpower”. The new worldwide status of the Russian state influenced the global position of Russian academia. Following the policy of its national government, Russian academia had to establish new relations with the rest of the world. The Russian Minister of Education wrote in 1992 that everything was going to change for Russian educational system – its organization, content, policy, and focus. Russian academia was at the edge of the most radical transformation in its history (Dneprov, 1992). “Today we are building a bridge from the dead-end branch of the path of human civilization to its global mainstream; academia is the major component in the construction of this bridge” (Dneprov, 1992, p.3). This sounded like full confirmation of the Perestroika reforms initiated by the Gorbachev administration, advancing the integration of the country into global economic and social networks. This final destination was articulated by Russian leadership repeatedly and later became the definition of “Westernization” in Russian higher education (Chudinov, 2012; Dudareva, 2010; Rozhdestvensky, 2009). At first, Westernization had a very positive connotation for Russian academics: it implied a constructive change of focus in the international academic activities from the Soviet tradition of inter-government agreements, directed for execution to the federally selected Russian universities, to the Western tradition of direct inter-institutional and individual academic exchanges, and joint research projects. Such perspective of academic international policy was broadly embraced by the Russian academia (Afanasiev, 1999; Golubev, 2007). Adopting the new



Educational Act into practical installation in July 1992, Russian President Yeltsin stated that internationalization of national science and higher schooling should become the priority of current reformation in the country, as it constituted fully half the battle for the establishment of civil society in Russia (Yeltsin, 2008). Placing internationalization at the core of national education reform was a political endorsement of the course for the transformation of Russian academia from its distinctive Soviet format to a traditional university paradigm, fully incorporated into the global academic network. “Collapse of Berlin wall should be followed by termination of the Soviet ideological stereotypes that the USSR is the beacon for human progress. Russia should become an equal partner of the global network of nations – we are opened for international cooperation, we invite Western countries to collaborate with Russia in all forms of friendly partnerships,” – this statement of Yeltsin became a new motto of Russian international policy (Yeltsin, 2008).

The establishment of the Russian Federation as a new member of the international community required Yeltsin’s government to endorse and reinstate numerous international treaties, authorized during Soviet times, as well as sanction new agreements with foreign countries and international alliances (Lukyanov, 2006). Following the slogan that brought him to political power “True democracy without Party supervision, and true prosperity without state control,” Yeltsin and his team immediately furthered cooperation with the West in academic arena (Yeltsin, 2008). By the end of 1992, Russia had sixty-nine bilateral international agreements specifically referring to academic collaboration, wherein seventeen were new protocols for inter-institutional academic cooperation with countries in the European Union and North America (Dneprov, 2011). In 1993, after the first Yeltsin-Clinton summit, the two sides pledged to uphold "a dynamic and effective

United States-Russian partnership" (Goldgeier, McFaul, 2003). The joint communiqué of the US-Russian summit noted Yeltsin's pledge to continue reform efforts up to the complete privatization of state industry and legal permission for private ownership on land in Russia; while the US side provided aid to support democratic reforms in Russia totaling 1.6 billion dollars (Public Papers of William J. Clinton, 1994). The direct result of these political agreements was the increase of academic activities of the US state organizations and private foundations in Russia. Only in 1990s, International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX), that was founded in 1968 by leading US universities to administer academic exchange programs with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries, could open its field office in Moscow (IREX History, 2013). Before the 1990s, IREX operated only one way, bringing scholars from the USA to the USSR. In the Soviet Union, the program was considered as an "inter-government arrangement," aimed to provide research abroad opportunities to the American academics. In the eyes of Russians, IREX scholars were arriving as guests of the Soviet government; no direct communication with Soviet academics was requested for them by the authorities, and the program itself was quite unknown in the Soviet universities (Avrus, 2001; Krymskaya, 2011). By 1995, IREX became a well-known program for international academic exchanges in Russia, opened a network of offices throughout the country, and had "American educational centers" in more than ten large cities (Petrova, 2007). US State Department provided application opportunities for Russian academics through a number of US philanthropic organizations, including Ford, McArthur, the Carnegie Foundation, and government-funded special academic exchange programs, such as Fulbright (Kortunov, 2010). In the mid-1990s, a number of US-based global organizations

supporting academic internationalization had offices in Moscow (Larionova, 2012). The most famous became the “Open Society” program of the Soros foundation. Its special effort, “University Internet Centers,” had a 100+ million dollars budget, and helped to establish 33 Internet centers in Russian universities, fully computerized and connected to the global informational network (Soyfer, 2005). Later, the Soros initiative was expanded, and by the end of 1990s it had a number of programs supporting Russian academia, including the network of the Open Society Institute, the Soros professor and Soros student individual award programs, and several academic journals published in Russia (Soyfer, 2005). At the same time, the Russian government lifted all regulations from Soviet times that restricted the access of foreign scholars to informational sources or academic institutions (Kozlov, Lokteva, 1997). These initiatives led to a vast enlargement of academic mobility between the US and Russia. The 1990s averaged over 50 thousand academic visitors annually from both countries (Dneprov, 2006).

European programs for international academic cooperation also enlarged their presence in Russia in the 1990s. The British Council was the first European academic agency to expand its activities in Russia by establishing a fully operational office in Moscow in 1992. During the following decade, the British Council founded 15 territorial centers throughout Russia, from St. Petersburg to Krasnoyarsk (Kortunov, 2010). These centers focused on the individual selection of Russian students and researchers to study in Great Britain via individual grants. Approval of the scholarships was based on the opinion of English scholars after an examination of personal proposals (Tsentry Britanskogo Soveta v Rossii: 20 let istorii, 2013). In a major departure from past norms, neither the Russian state government nor the applicant’s institutional authorities

participated in decision-making about the grant provision and study abroad period. The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) took the same path and opened an office in Moscow in 1993, as part of its global network (Germanskaya sluzhba akademicheskikh obmenov, 2013). Unlike the organizational pattern of its cooperation with Russian scientific circles during Soviet times, German academia didn't ground its activities in the system of bilateral agreements between national governments, but operated directly with Russian academic institutions. The agency set the whole complex of its councils in Russian universities, promoting short-term study trips to Germany for Russian students and providing research opportunities at German universities for Russian scholars, especially for experts in technical and natural sciences. The only condition for applicants was knowledge of the German language; at the same time, DAAD funded the creation of German language and cultural centers in Russian academic institutions. Over 50 German study and cultural centers were opened at Russian universities, during the 1990s (Dmitriev, 2003).

The dissemination of study abroad opportunities for Russian students and academics based exclusively on personal academic merits of an applicant involved 100,000 Russians through the decade (Dezhina, 2005). By the mid-1990s, US and EU academic programs created study abroad possibilities for thousands of Russian scholars even from very remote, provincial academic institutions. Russian academics could study abroad without the political control and ideological guidance of the Party, without bureaucracy or supervision of institutional, local or federal administrations. Once approved, the international grant funding was usually delivered to an individual Russian researcher directly. The 1990s became the time when academic internationalization

became synonymous with individual academic grants for Russian students and scholars (Arefyev, Dmitirev, Sheregi, 2002). International academic mobility of the previous decades was observed by ordinary Russian scholars as activities happening outside their daily lives and having no relations to their personal teaching and research realities. “International” was a synonym of “governmental.” If Soviet authorities allow some foreign academics to come and work in the USSR, it has nothing to do with the common Soviet professors from typical Soviet universities (Avrus, 2001). International visitors were supervised and provided by special federal authorities, communication with them was restricted by special federal regulations and they didn’t have any real impact on common Soviet academia (Marcinkevich, 2009). Now, internationalization became a reality for the Russian academics: they could interconnect with the foreign colleagues in person, or via modern means of communication; they could go abroad with academic purposes as individuals, not as “formal representatives of the Soviet science;” they could receive foreign academic literature and publish their own studies abroad; they even could make some personal income from international activities. While the Russian state was getting more and more distant from the needs of national academia, barely covering half of its material and financial needs; and while numbers of state academic institutions and state academic employees was dropping about 20% nationwide, international academic collaboration became the source of material sustainability and scientific preservation for Russian academia (Tatur, 1999; Zak, 2007). The coryphaeus of Russian academia stated at the time that the global academic network acted as a “magic wand” that saved Russian science in the face of the collapse of the Russian economy (Dneprov, 2011). Such deliberation carried a very important implication, presenting valuable change in the

mentality of Russian academic community: “national science” was considered as the consortium of Russian academics and institutions instead of its usual status of being a part of the notion of “Soviet state.” At the same time, “global academic network” was represented now by the colleagues-academics from abroad, as a replacement for the foreign governments from friendly realm of socialist countries. Academic internationalization in Russia moved from its usual pedestal of being inter-government policy to becoming inter-institutional and even inter-personal type of relations.

*International Funding: “Magic Wand” or “Brain Drain”?*

The most persuasive introduction of Western academic model into Russian higher education emerged through the formation of new types of academic institutions (Zernov, 2004). This innovation was considered a further development of Westernization in national academia and bore a positive meaning in the 1990s (Kablov, 2009). Dozens of non-government, for-profit higher educational institutions were formed only in Moscow; all were private, and established with the monetary help of foreign sponsors or as joint international ventures (Klikunov, 2001). The appearance of independent and for-profit universities in the capital of Russia, funded with foreign capital, was a blow to the traditional Soviet academic assembly. The first application of the “Western university model” in Russia was the formation of the Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 1992 (O sozdanii vysshei shkoly ekonomiki, 1993). This new university was established by a special order of the Russian federal administration as a non-governmental higher educational institution, organized as an international joint business venture. HSE was “fully corresponding to the world standards of modern business education”, and thus, expected to become a beacon for national business training (Yasin, 2005). Using the

European Union grant specially provided for the project, as part of their study program, HSE students could get practical training in prominent European business schools (Kuzminov, Radaev, Yakovlev, 2006). In the same year, Russian academician Gvishiani, together with his colleagues from the Academy of Sciences, formed a non-profit commercial partnership, called the International Center for Strategic Academic Innovations (Gvishiani, 2004). Using a grant from the British Royal Society, the Center established in Moscow an Institute of Economics, Politics and Law as a private international higher educational entity (Istoriya MIEPP, 2013). It was a pioneering project for Russia, introducing commercial higher education in the social sciences and humanities, and promoting the Western organization of studies in Russian higher education. Institute programming was based on individual study plans and a module system of classes, providing each student with an individualized curriculum. Such a teaching methodology was said to reflect “European academic standards” and was popularized in Russia as an educational innovation (Afanasev, 1999). Another good example of the role of internationalization in the delivery of Western academic traditions and innovations into Russian higher education during the 1990s was the formation of Moscow International University. This joint Russian-US project was agreed to by the Presidents of the USSR and of the USA in 1991. Funding for the university was also provided jointly by the governments of both countries. The first President of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin, became the first president of the newly established university in 1992 (Osnovateli MUM, 1991). A remarkable symbolic decision of the Russian government was to locate the International University in the building of the former CPSU Central Committee Party School (Popov, 2011). The first mayor of Moscow, G. Popov,

served as a leader of the university for a long time and formulated the mission statement of the institution to be focused on elite, international and business-related education (Popov, 2011). By the end of the 1990s, over 300 non-governmental academic institutions were established in Russia, and over a dozen of them occupied distinguished positions in the national rating of the top 100 universities (ANVUZ, 2013). Formation of strong and successful non-state sector in Russian higher education, having initially strong academic and organizational ties with global academia, provided good grounds for the final act of transformation of the Soviet higher education into a modern, business affiliated and research oriented academic construction. This had to be a government decision finalizing organizational reformation of Russian higher education on the basis of institutional autonomy and self-governance, and completing the Perestroika plan for de-Sovietization. However, Yeltsin's leadership didn't further organizational reformation of national academia to fully liberate it from the Soviet administrative cast. Instead, by the beginning of new millennium, Russian higher education represented an extraordinary composition of the Soviet type administrative organization and new, market oriented content of research and teaching objectives. Continuous promotion of internationalization as the prominent intention of the national academic reform sounded confusing for Russian scholars. On one hand, participation in the international academic programs was required by the federal authorities for the benefit of the state; on the other hand, international collaboration reflected personal academic aspirations. Many Russian academics, especially from the prominent universities in the capitals, observed participation in the joint international research programs as the best solution in the reality



of national economic turmoil, and worked more time abroad than in the home institutions (Alferov, 2012; Zaicev, 2009).

Shortly after the arrival of international openness to Russian academics, Russian authorities started to talk about the trouble of countrywide “brain drain”, and blamed the West for taking advantage of the Russian economic crisis (Avdeev, 2011; Gaponenko, Orlova, 2008). Russian media turned from cultivating positive excitement of “re-union with global academia” in the mass mentality of Russian population to portraying a gloomy picture of the Western plot for an “academic beheading” of Russia (Kireev, 2010; Shehovtsev, 2006; Pruss, 2006). Created in 1991, the Russian Centre for Science Research and Statistics publicized a study, produced in 1994 at the request of the federal government that explained the reasons for Russian scholars to “leave the homeland” and the results of the process (Gohberg, Mindely, Nekipelova, 1994). The publication had a lot of omissions, starting from the terminology. The authors failed to find a proper definition qualifying the process of the academic brain drain from Russia. Emigration was presented as a wrong term, on the grounds that Russian scholars mostly left the country temporarily. “Seeking a temporary job” was also considered as an inappropriate term, because the data used in the study showed that many Russian academics who left abroad, didn’t formally quit their employment in Russia. The conclusions of this and few other state-initiated publications of the time can be summed up as two major statements: a) the total number of Russian scientists who immigrated due to the new opportunities promoted by academic internationalization was quite small, being about 5,000 scholars per year or 0.5% of the total academic population of the country; b) the key reason for the academic immigration is the individual ambitions of the “non-returners”, not in the

hardships of life and work in Russia (Mindely, 2011). Later, through the decade of 1990s, more studies were conducted reflecting the issue of national brain drain in Russia and other opinions appeared that were more skeptical about national policies and provided more pessimistic data about the numbers of Russian academics and students who remained abroad after a study or research trip to a Western academic institution (Naumova, 1996; Agamova, Allahverdyan, 2007). It is quite impossible to find reliable data presenting the real impact of “brain drain” from Russia to the West during 1990s, but most of these later publications name the approximate total quantity as 50,000 Russian scholars who remained abroad (Imamutdinov, 2009). Considering the large number of Russian researchers who didn’t register in Russian consulates due to the absence of such requirements in Western states; and counting many Russian students who left Russia via different arrangements, but after having a study abroad experience, the overall number of about 100,000 Russians could be the accurate estimate of “academic immigration” from Russia during 1990s (Imamutdinov, 2009; Naumova, 1996). Many speculations about the reasons and results were presented in dozens of publications during the last decade (Agamova, Allahvedyan, 2007; Naumova, 1996; Nekipelova, 1998). At the same time, current Russian literature on the subject still does not present a clear definition of brain drain, which is usually explained as “a search for better research conditions or better salary outside home-country” (Shalmanov, 2006; Kireev, 2010). The authors seem to purposefully avoid an issue of immigration, as a sensitive political issue, and even there are several dozens of publications on the matter, they are presented as “personal opinions,” not as a scholarly discussion of an academic immigration from Russia (Zimina, 2008). It is important to distinguish a valuable difference between the

brain drain of the 1990s and similar processes that happened earlier in Soviet history. From the Bolshevik revolution until the 1960s, the key motive for academic immigration from Russia was the political confrontation of certain Russian academics with Soviet policy. During 1970s-1980s, economic hardship was added as another possible motive for immigration. The brain drain of 1990s, however, was principally related to the unfulfilled academic ambitions of those who left. Immigrants were not seeking political refuge, and didn't run from deadly poverty, but rather longed for academic prestige and personal recognition, wanting to be respected for knowledge and scholarly achievements both socially and materially. The brain drain from Russia of the 1990s displayed both: a) the thirst of Russian academics for personal standing and recognition, despite decades of ideology enforcing communal values; b) the perceived value of academic profession, regardless of the long-lasting state policy of diminishing intellectuals and favoring working-class professions (Smolentseva, 2011). The activities of international academic organizations in Russia in 1990s provide solid evidence that internationalization provoked social changes in Russian academia: Russian scholars embraced the values of academic freedom and demanded respect for academic profession (Sivak, Yudkevitch, 2013). The response of Russian authorities was expected to be organizational changes at the institutional level. The most popular discussion in Russian academic circles at the time was issues of "Academic Management in a Changing Society." The conclusion of many famous Russian scholars was that actual international integration and recognition would happen only after the organizational transformation of Russian higher education from a centralized and unified state system into a national network of autonomous and free academic institutions (Dneprov, 2011; Goldin, Zhuravlev, 2000). At the beginning of

new millennium, Russian academia hoped for soon and positive completion of Perestroika reforms in national higher education (Karabasov, Kozhitov, Livanov, Krishtul, 2003; Vodichev, 2000).

*Merger of Internationalization and Commercialization in Russian Academia*

National economic disorder of 1990s created a need for profound change in funding strategy of Russian academia and a demand to search for new sources of income. Remaining Soviet structure of exclusively state provision for national higher education with detailed budgeting delivered to each university in a uniformed manner strongly enforced financial bankruptcy of the academic network nationwide. From confiscatory monetary reform of 1991 that withdrew from circulation about 15 billion rubles of people's personal savings and until the 1998 financial default that collapsed ruble as a currency worldwide, most of Russian academics lived in the abyss of complete poverty (Sinelnikov, 1995; Bashkirova, Solovev, Dorofeev 2012). It was the time of survival for Russian academia, not the period of its progress. Such devastating economic situation influenced greatly Russian academic international policy during the 1990s, leading to a major shift in 1996: The National Educational Act adopted in 1992 was revised, and important articles were added to increase the commercialization of higher education “as the reflection of global academic tendency” (Borshchova, 2006; Gorohovatskaya, 2007; Panin, 2011a). Higher educational institutions in Russia received the legal right to undertake entrepreneurial activities that could lead to for-profit ventures (O vnesenii izmeneniy i dopolneniy v Zakon RF Ob obrazovanii, 1996). This was directly connected by government spokesmen and researchers with the inclusion of Russian higher education into the global academic network (Baidenko, 2010; Sherbak, 2007). From now

on, “commercialization” and “internationalization” became synonymous for Russian academics (Rozhdestvenskiy, 2009; Shevchenko, 2013; Vinokurova, Nikonova, 2010). Moreover, both, supporters of market reforms in Russian academia and critics, equally referred to “commercialization” as the major feature of “Westernization” of Russian higher education (Myzrova, 2011; Prohorov, 2012; Shishkin, 2004). It was a very controversial change for Russian people, who were accustomed to a free higher education provided by the state, and who associated monetary exchanges in academia with corruption - the “beastly grimace of imperialism”, according to decades of Soviet political propaganda (Borshova, Eremin, 2005; Idiatullin, 2006; Sevek, 2011). Two tiny linguistic corrections in the text of the Article One of the 1996 edition of the Educational Act actually revoked the Soviet mandate of free higher education: “state guarantees to the citizen of Russian Federation equality in accessibility and free of charge education **up to** the higher professional education level...free of charge higher education is provided **within** state educational standards on a competition basis” (O vnesenii izmeneniy i dopolneniy v Zakon RF Ob obrazovanii, 1996).

At the same time, the federal government continued to control educational functions by leaving in the law statements allowing the provision of vocational training only within the unified state educational standards. This was the only legal way to receive a state-recognized qualification certificate. State universities were licensed to provide professional education by the state, and thus if a state higher educational institution charged any tuition fees that were now allowed by law, the profit was going to the state. Non-government universities had to “receive” a state license, which was further explained in the Act as the purchase of a permit from the state, together with other

mandatory payments in the format of annual fees and taxes that each non-government higher school had to submit during its state accreditation (Sherbak, 2010). Chapter 4 of a new edition of the Educational Act described the monetary basis of educational services provision in the country and directly stated: “activities of non-government academic institutions are regulated by the general legislation of Russian Federation related to the activities of commercial enterprises” (O vnesenii izmeneniy v Zakon RF Ob obrazovanii, 1996). Each higher educational institution, state or non-government, now had to have an institutional charter explaining the financial basis of its operation. Moreover, each student and his parents or guardians, acting as the student’s guarantors, had to sign a legal contract with the university as part of the enrollment process (Perevozchikova, 2012). The contract had a mandatory section, explicitly setting forth the monetary responsibilities of the “buyer of educational services from a provider” (Sovremennye problemy i innovacionnye perspektivy vuzov Rossii, 2010). International students had to sign such a contract as well; rectors signed on behalf of their universities (Shenderova, 2011b). Fund-raising became the driving force for the recruitment of foreign students (Bobylo, 2012; Slepukhin, 2005). Traditionally a political issue, under the umbrella of “friendly help of the USSR to the liberated nations of the Third World,” the international dimension of Russian academic activities now converted into a matter of income-making. International students and the activities of Russian academics abroad received a monetary value for the faculty and administrators of Russian higher educational institutions, as well as for bureaucrats at all levels of state power (Artemenko, Chubarov, 2010). “How much should be the tuition charge?” and “Who is getting the money?” became the key questions of Russian academia with relation to foreign students. The new market reality

completely up-ended the previously centralized and plan-driven organization of study-visits of the foreigners to Russia. Russian academics could now legally invite and even host foreign scholars or students on an individual basis. Russian universities had the lawful right to invite foreign students, trainees, practitioners and scholars without permission from federal authorities, and had no restrictions on the number of invited foreigners, or length, content and conditions of their educational visit in Russia. According to the amendments to the Educational Act made in 1996, any Russian academic institution could invite foreigners to come for study purposes, and the institutional administration could itself establish its tuition fees and the costs of other services provided to international students and scholars (Efimova, 2010; Kulikova, 2012b). International academic activities became the province of institutions in Russian academia, from initial communications with potential academic partners abroad to the execution of academic activities. Even the spending of funds received from foreign trainees became an executive decision made at the institutional level. At the same time, the International Department of the Ministry of Education had the only practical experience in managing the studies and daily life of foreign students, and was the only Russian authority with well-established connections to foreign state authorities and educational institutions. Also, inside the country, the federal ministry was the only structure that had working relations with other state establishments involved in the provision of study visits for foreigners. Student visas, medical services, accommodation and student stipends, Russian IDs and permits, and many other issues which are the daily business of International Students Offices in universities worldwide, were performed at the federal level in the Soviet Union. Outside of a few Russian universities selected to

host foreign students, such as the famous University of People's Friendship, other Russian universities simply never had an International Office, and most of Russian universities never had the experience of hosting a single foreign academic or student (Dmitriev, 2003; Slepukhin, 2004). This situation dramatically changed since mid-1990s, when three main channels of recruitment and hosting of international students appeared: a) foreigners invited to come with for study by individual Russian academics; b) foreigners enrolled directly in Russian universities; c) foreigners arriving in Russia via traditional inter-government connections, invited by the Foreign Relations Department of the Ministry of Education. These three streams were not equal in status, power or income; they often acted in parallel to each other, and, what is the most intriguing, - they were often in competition, conflicting with one another (Panfilova, Ashin, 2009). The practical outcome was a developing disorder in organization of studies and life of international students in Russia. The merger of internationalization and commercialization into one rapidly developing process was very confusing to both the academics and administrators of Russian universities. On one hand, internationalization meant the arrival of the great and long-awaited possibility of direct international academic contacts, even joint research and recruitment of foreign students, which promised new academic horizons. On the other hand, commercialization promised new means of obtaining hard currency, which sounded too good to be true for Russian scholars (Shenderova, 2011a). The sudden application of both programs, without any administrative preparation on the institutional level, and coinciding with serious budget reductions from the federal government, led to a loss of control over the routine managerial work with international students. "The export of higher education" was



heavily promoted by the state and was desired by Russian universities, as a source of international recognition and additional income, but at the institutional level there was a total lack of knowledge and expertise enabling provision of effective management of the study and living needs of international students (Artushina, Shutilin, 2008; Sevek, 2011). The commodification of Russian higher education raised an immediate need for administrative changes in national academia, and demanded a turn for professional business management in the field of academic internationalization. It seems that academic mobility was the cornerstone of the correlation between commercialization and internationalization in the practice of Russian academia. Soviet organization of Russian higher education could not adapt to such innovation and the conflict between state and institutional objectives of academic internationalization became inevitable. Government was interested for the market to help enlarging the state budget; while universities hoped to receive results of commercialization on the institutional level. Economic debacle of Russian state promoted business focus of academic internationalization in Russian higher education, which was associated with “Westernization” (Chudinov, 2012; Furman, Zadorozhnuk, 2004). This was the turning point in relation of the Russian authorities to the Westernization in national academia – new judgment of its role was allowed in Russian mass media: “we don’t need capitalism in national higher education” (Shalmanov, 2006). In fact, this was a call “Back to the USSR,” requesting political reverse and cancelation of Perestroika reforms. Academic internationalization was depicted exclusively as Westernization in some “pro-government publications,” presenting to the public not only criticism of academic reforms in Russia, but negative prospect for the national higher education, even its total collapse, if it continues following

the Western pattern of development (Popov, 2011). At the same time, federal authorities demanded enlargement of commercialization in Russian higher education and repeatedly voiced export of educational services as the key-objective of national academia (Chuhlomin, 2004).

*Higher Education for Foreigners: From Donation to Commodification*

Student mobility is the locomotive of internationalization (Altbach, 2004b; de Wit, 2009). Traveling to another country, students don't only receive education and vocational training in a specific field of knowledge, but integrate into another academic tradition, unfamiliar culture, and different communal mentality. This may be an especially challenging experience when the hosting country progresses through dramatic social transformations, as it was happening in Russia through the 1990s. Well organized and professionally managed international academic policy is of great importance in such vulnerable socio- economic conditions. Soviet organization for recruitment and education of foreigners was based on centralized administration and state military-like management structure. Division for International Affairs of the Party Central Committee dictated how many students and from which countries should be recruited, using its political criteria for selection (Chufarov, 1989). Ministry of International Affairs executed given directive through the Soviet Embassies and Soviet Cultural Centers abroad, acting in cooperation with local governments of selected countries on the basis of bilateral agreements for educational and cultural cooperation with the USSR (Voilenko, 1978; Galenskaya, 1982). Selected by Soviet state representations, and approved by the national government authorities candidates received visas and other documents providing them with an official status of “foreign students” for the period of stay in the Soviet Union. This was a special

prestige entitling foreign students in the USSR to a number of privileges: a) they were treated as formal guests of the Soviet state in the USSR; b) they were eligible to a better material subsidy than common Russian students; c) they had special care as representatives of friendly nations, and could rely on help of every Soviet citizen (Belov, 2000; Shevchenko, 2006). Foreign students usually traveled to the USSR in groups, and using Soviet funding. Upon arrival to the Soviet port of entry, they were met and chaperoned, provided with initial information and pocket money, and accommodated by the International Students Office of the Ministry of Education or by a host university under the supervision of the Ministry (Rozovskaya, 2010; Shiryaeva, 1980). Upon arriving to the host university, each foreign student received a student ID and a library card, free room and board in specially facilitated dormitories on campus, and free access to all university facilities. Every entrant was entitled to a monthly stipend, equal to an average salary of Soviet state employees, while foreign students were never charged for tuition or other services provided on campus. Foreigners in the USSR could use currency to buy goods and groceries in special shops of “Berezka” network, loaded with imported merchandize but restricted for the local population (Horoshevsky, 2006). Visiting students were divided into small groups, and each group was guided by a supervising person from the university international office, who spoke a foreign language known to the students, enabling communication and understanding (Dmitriev, 2002). Everything was also arranged to the last detail in terms of studies, including course materials, textbooks, and dictionaries; and each student had an academic tutor (Slepukhin, 2004). Foreign students in the USSR were complaining sometimes about being too much supervised, and having everything scheduled and prearranged for them in Soviet

universities, but never fret about absence of attention. The usual problem of foreign students in the USSR was lack of individual decision-making, minimum of freedom for personal mobility, and limitations for off campus activities and communications (Arefiev, 2004).

Everything changed during 1990s almost in the reverse mode. Foreign students had to do a lot of personal prep-work before deciding to study in Russia, having the need to solve a lot of organizational and financial issues individually. Recruitment process got very chaotic, as Soviet cultural centers were closing rapidly all over the world and less than 20% continued being active a decade after the beginning of Perestroika in 1985 (Slepukhin, 2004). Russian government representations abroad used old Soviet information packets for student recruitments not reflecting many changes that happened in Russia through 1990s (Otchet po samoobsledovaniu RUDN, 2009). At the same time, Russian academic institutions were trying to advertise themselves directly through their alumni in some countries and distributing positive information through new means of mass media, like Internet (Chernomorova, 2002; Zaretskaya, 2001b). Confusion was greatly influenced by different and often conflicting information about tuition fees and living costs. For example, using the usual inter-government channels, People's Friendship University, Moscow was suggesting to foreigners a six-year studying program with an outcome of a diploma of specialist in medicine; First Moscow State Medical University was offering the same qualification for 5 years of "intensive studies" including summer courses for 20% less expenses in living costs; and Volgograd State Medical University, offered the same degree issued by the same Russian Ministry of Medicine for only 4 years of studies and for half costs indicated by Moscow institutions with an

opportunity to take a mandatory residency course after the end of studies, in a home country (Frolov, Mahotin, 2004; Vitkovskaya, Trotsuk, 2005). At the same time, foreign students had to adapt to a new status while in Russia – just foreigners, no special privileges, no state provision and protection. In its instructions to Russian universities about servicing foreign students, Ministry of Education used a term, perfectly describing new position of foreign students in Russia as a “non-state income source” (O vysshem i poslevyuzovskom professionalnom obrazovanii, 1996).

The breakdown of the USSR into a number of independent states seriously complicated recruitment and education of foreign students in Russia. Former citizens of the Soviet Union now arrived and studied in Russian universities as foreigners (Kozyrev, 1995; Ushakin, 1992). Thousands of students who expected to be able studying free of charge in any higher educational institution of the huge Soviet Union, had to apply to Russian universities as foreigners starting in 1992, pay tuition and other expenses in hard currency, and face specific foreign restrictions while studying in Russia (Ledeneva, Tyuryukanova, 2005). Students from the former Soviet territories were classified as being from “nearby abroad,” unlike foreign students from other countries, who were now named as students from “faraway abroad” (Guseinov, 2004). However, from the administrative and monetary perspectives, there was no difference. All recruits from abroad had to spend same amount of time, effort and money to prepare required enrollment documents and receive Russian student visas; they were equally prohibited from employment in the student status while in Russia; and they had to abide by restrictive rules intended for foreigners, including prohibitions on transporting certain goods through the Russian border, and experiencing the hardships of exchanging national

currency into Russian rubles (Ledneva, Turukanov, 2005; Surinsky, 1997). Financial burden of higher education was similar for the majority of foreign students, as they arrived predominantly from rather impoverished nations, and didn't have any way of getting state educational credit or a bank loan at their home countries (Zhivotovskaya, 2001). Most of such students were coming from common kin and could not rely on family funding provision. The monetary realities of students from NIS countries were not better than the financial problems of the youngsters from the Third World countries. Average families in former Soviet territories, including Russia, had by mid-1990s a monthly income of less than 100 USD in local currencies (Shishikin, 2011; Soboleva, 2011). While being asked to pay tuition fees and fulfill academic and residential regulations as foreigners, students from the former Soviet territories were treated otherwise as normal Russian students without any special attention to their special needs (Kurlovich, 2012). Students who demanded consideration as foreigners were offered a year in a "preparatory course," and had to pay tuition and on-campus accommodation in advance, and become fully enrolled only after graduation from such course (Slepukhin, 2004). In fact most Russian universities requested applicants to sign a special statement upon the arrival, in which they refused a preparatory course, and confirmed their readiness to take classes in Russian, abide by institutional regulations, and pay for the whole academic year tuition in advance (Eletskiy, Kornienko, 2007).

Another burning problem for the foreign students in 1990s was the increasing corruption of university and local authorities. This included overcharging for accommodation and other services, separate fees for medical services outside of mandatory health insurance payments, and even hidden forms of extortion of bribery

undertaken by university authorities (Guriev, 2010; Pushkarenko, 2010). Ukrainian students at Moscow universities formed their own student union, and registered it in Russia as a “legal public organization” in order to lobby for the provision of medical services and on-campus accommodations for Ukrainian students that would equal those of the Russian students (Bartkov, 2011). After several years of lobbying, in 1999, they succeeded in obtaining upgraded conditions (Kurlovich, 2012). University administrators typically justified such harassment by requiring students present all documents in Russian language, even knew that all NIS states issued formal documentations exclusively in the native language since 1991; or to have additional classes to cope with curricula regulations in RF (Panin, 2011b; Rimskiy, 2002; Sadovnichiy, 2002). In the dormitories of several universities of the Volga region, students from Islamic countries were charged almost a double monthly price for accommodation on the grounds of “praying too loud, too early in the morning and playing ear-piercing national music all day” (Slepukhin, 2004). In fact, the usual reason for these actions was to obtain bribes (Denisova, Baranov, 2008).

Appearance of thousands of students from “nearby abroad” now being in the capacity of the foreign students and spread of foreign students from “faraway abroad” all over the country, caught most Russian universities quite unprepared. International offices had to be established in every higher school, not only due to the logic of common sense, but in accordance with the instruction of the Ministry of Education (*O razvitiu sotrudnichestva s zarubezhnymi stranami v oblasti obrazovaniya*, 1995). It was quite an impossible task to perform, as there were no professional administrators in Russian universities, knowledgeable how to deal with the specific issues of foreign students.

Mostly such offices were formed by mid 1990s out of local foreign language teachers and former employees of preparatory courses for university applicants (Slepukhin, 2004). Russian universities didn't have funds to sustain organization of new offices, didn't have means to train their personnel, and didn't possess any experience in adjusting recruits from different cultures and communities to the Russian realities (Dmitriev, 2003; Slepukhin, 2004). Neither local administrations nor provincial Russian universities were ready to work with the population of the cities of the host universities to create atmosphere of mutual understanding and cultural tolerance between the residents and the visitors. Soviet national minorities and cultural fraternities, who lived and studied side by side with the Russians for decades, now became foreigners (Zaretskaya, 2001). About half of international students were now coming to Russia from the former Soviet territories, as students from "nearby abroad". Students from "faraway abroad" were considered as actual "foreigners" from alien states, and were coming mostly from the countries of the Third World (Veryevkin, Karelov, 2006).

Federal authorities were insistent on the provision of needed conditions for the foreign students repeating about the importance of "export of the Russian higher education" (Makarcheva, 1998). Universities wanted to have as many foreign students as possible reflecting positively to the idea of making additional income and in currency in the turmoil of collapsed national economy. Former Soviet citizen and now foreign students wanted to come and get higher education in Russian universities (Gavrilov, Yuatsenko, 2012). All sides seem to be in the positive module towards the organization of international higher educational services. At the same time, host-universities didn't know how to arrange for the adequate and expected student services for the foreigners,



and arriving students didn't foresee any problems in the former 'fraternal Soviet Russia'. Russian academic administrators from the ministry to institutional levels did not recognize advent of a new reality and expected all students from former Soviet republics to know Russian language, recognize Russian legislation and follow it without any explanations, and respect Russian higher education, political realities, and living conditions (Pushkarenko, 2010; Shohov, 2010). The majority of foreign students were arriving to Russian universities from the countries of Asia and Africa, and the former Asian republics of the USSR (Smolentseva, 2004). They have experienced through 1990s a sudden and growing wave of radical *cultural chauvinism* of Russians, expressed in verbal harassment, complete negligence to their linguistic realities and national customs, even physical persecution (Ushakova, Gracianova, 2012).

The rapid turn from following the dogma of communism to worshipping the "golden calf" converted Russian academics into "currency hunters". There were many cases of unlawful demands for payments in hard currency by university administrators, local salesmen, and police harassment reported by the Russian press and student organizations in the decade after 1996 (Korruptcia v sfere obrazovania, 2008). The Ministry of Education even suggested that each Russian university, which host international students, should set a special institutional committee to monitor the "anti-corruption activities" in the institution, "reflecting response of Russian academia to the Convention on Combating Bribery adopted by OECD countries" (Oleinikova, 2013). At the same time, Russian federal authorities sharply determined export of higher education as the priority of national academia (Karpenko, 2008). New concentration was strongly supported with various publications addressing scholars and general public, and aimed to

prove that export of education is the proper and rightful path for modern Russia, considering its historical academic fame worldwide (Aleksandrov, 2010; Chuhlomin, 2004; Dudareva, 2010). Key-focus of international academic policy of the country was now understood as the practice of selling educational services to the world, while the key-task of Russian universities was in recruiting international students, starting from the countries of “nearby abroad” (Alexankov, 2008; Melnikova, 2002). This development looked like a positive market reality, where many buyers from all over the world shopped for educational services, and now should face a variety of Russian academic providers, willing to sell and competing with each other for customers. At the same time, Soviet people never used to purchase educational services, and Russian universities have never experienced selling educational services. New positions of “buyers” and “sellers” assumed by ex-Soviet individuals and institutions in a very short time were hardly understood by the members of the process on both sides. Market model of academia was unknown in Russia and its actual attainment brought chaos, where federal authorities couldn’t explain the practice of “academic services provision” to the institutions; institutional authorities didn’t know the practice of organization of international student services; and students didn’t comprehend fully their new status of being “customers” (Laiko, Saginova, Fruezer, 2010).

Following recommendations of the federal authorities, Russian universities tried to find their way out from the complex of sudden organizational difficulties associated with the arrival of academic commodification in a Soviet organizational model. First and quite typical for the Soviet administration reaction was the formation of the list of institutional regulations, prohibiting certain activities to the foreign students, and obliging them to

follow particular organizational pattern. And, as usual for Soviet times, it was based on the “unified set of rules” issued by the Ministry of Education (Rakhimov, 2009). Each group of foreign students (commonly about 10-15 students) had to elect a praepostor, who was obliged to report regularly to a teacher-curator, appointed by an International Office. Organizational and financial issues could not be discussed or solved outside of “Praepostor-Curator-Institutional International Office” established network (Slepukhin, 2004). Next suggestion of the Ministry of Education to the Russian universities followed the political course of Russian leadership and aimed to concentrate recruitment on the “Russian population” of the former Soviet republics, and use help of the institutional alumni, keeping connections with the Russian alma mater. Such approach was supposed to ensure selection of reliable and focused on studying in Russia “contingent of foreign students” (Arefiev, 2012; Fedorova, 2010). These measures certainly could not solve organizational and managerial issues around foreign students in new realities of market-driven Russia, but only confirmed the need for serious structural changes in Russian higher education, leading to its de-Sovietization.

*The Tempus Program – Institutional Internationalization in Russian Academia*

At the institutional level, the primary vehicle for academic internationalization in Russia was the EU Tempus-Tacis program. During 1990s Tempus involved over 200 Russian universities in different forms of international academic activities, promoting faculty and student mobility, integrating academic curricula, and forming mutual East-West academic informational space (Internatsionalizatsiya obrazovaniya v Rossii, 2010). The Tempus-Tacis program was launched in Russia in 1994. In twenty years, the Tempus program increased from 16 participating countries to 56 (Ten Years of the ETF, 2004).

The program was intended to help modernize the educational institutions and systems of Eastern Europe and former Soviet republics, and to create an open educational space for enhanced academic cooperation within the growing European Union and between EU and former USSR territories. It was also instrumental in promoting not only bilateral cooperation between individual countries, but also regional cooperation (McCabe, Ruffio, Heinamaki, 2011). Tempus was established on a philosophy of project-based intercultural exchange and cross-national transfer of knowledge and academic expertise. Organizationally, Tempus program was founded on a grass-roots initiative of European higher educational institutions for international cooperation. It reflected a bottom-up movement throughout Europe that aspired to create a common European academic space (Lorenz, 2006). Tempus has managed to adapt to changing political, economic, social and geographical contexts and address the needs of its stakeholders (Sleen, 2004). Cultural differences, diversity of academic traditions, and variety of teaching/research methodologies were considered positive challenges by Tempus program founders and participants. Stretching from Portugal to Mongolia and with more than 2200 higher education establishments involved, Tempus has constituted by the beginning of the XXI century the largest university network in the world's academic history (The Dynamics of Tempus in Higher Education, 1997). At the beginning, the Tempus program had a close relationship to the emerging agenda of all-European higher-educational cooperation, furthering European academic consolidation with the promotion of the idea of a future merger of Eastern and Western European countries into one European Union. In 1994, Tempus program extended and developed a Tacis sub-division, which aimed to promote the same agenda of construction of shared academic space with Russia and other former

Soviet republics (McCabe, Ruffio, Heinamaki, 2011). The course of Tempus-Tacis was to formulate a model of academic administration in a changing society applicable for Russia, in order to actualize the ideals of academic autonomy and academic freedoms; to release the constructive forces of Russian academia; and to complete the reformation of Russian higher education on the basis of political liberalization and market economy (Livanov, 2013a). The Tempus program managed to establish direct communication between European and Russian academic institutions, using the generous EU Parliament provision of about 100 million US dollars for the 1994-2000 time-period (McCabe, Ruffio, Heinamaki, 2011).

The outcome of the efforts was quite successful, as it provided organizational changes, hi-tech equipment, and academic transformations imperative for allowing integration of Russian higher education into the Joint European academic network on an institutional level. It was the only large and long-lasting international academic program initiated in the West that involved not only scholars, and students, but also administrators and other staff members of Russian higher educational establishments in mobility and other international activities. For the first time, librarians and book-keepers, staff members of planning and personnel, information and student services departments of Russian universities went abroad and experienced first-hand the European traditions of academic organization and management (Dmitirev, 2003; Slepukhin, 2004). The process of creating an integrated European academic space, also available to non-EU members of the Eurasian continent, was finalized through the Bologna process launched in 1999 (About the Bologna Process, 2007). The possibility of joining the Bologna declaration became a vital vehicle furthering internationalization in Russian higher education.

Russian federal authorities considered membership of Russia in Bologna Process as an important act of recognition of Russian academia as an equal partner by the West (Smirnov, 2004; Pursiainen, Medvedev, 2005). After experiencing advantages of Tempus program, Russian academic institutions and individual scholars also embraced the concept of academic internationalization progress in Russia in the mode “from Tempus to Bologna,” hoping to become its key-beneficiaries (Melvil, 2005).

*Joining Bologna: Completion or Beginning of Integration with Western Academia?*

A decade after the adoption of the New Educational Act, Russia joined Bologna Process. This was a grandiose event in the view of Russian government and Russian academics representing kind of a closure for the process of Westernization of Russian higher education. Knowing that such outcome was also set as the main goal for academic internationalization in 1992, it seems as a logical conclusion of the analysis of Russian academic international policy through 1990s. After adoption of Bologna Declaration in 1999, aimed to establish European Higher Education Area, Russian government expressed its great interest in joining the Bologna Process (Grebnev, 2004; Emikh, 2012). Russia became a member of Bologna Convention at the Berlin convention in 2003, energetically publicizing the event as the great accomplishment in the national mass media (Krainov, 2008). Discussions of the involvement of Russia’s academia in the Bologna Process illustrate the new and intricate standing of the internationalization process in Russian higher education. Kremlin observed affiliation of national higher education with Western academia within the Bologna framework as an important step towards improved recognition of Russia by Europe. It was considered as a valuable political task of “returning the rightful place of Russian higher education as a key-player

in global academia” (Smirnov, 2004). Russian statesmen from Ministry of Education and State Duma, presented importance of Russia’s participation in Bologna process as the path for dual recognition of Russian and EU academic degrees and educational standards, leading to serious improvement in export of academic services from Russia (Anisimova, Bobylev, Veselova, 2013). This clearly indicates that even though the Russian statesmen recognized “otherness” of the changed academic world, and confirmed need for Russia to act differently in its international academic affairs, they still considered national academia as a unified organism and all Russian universities represented a natural “togetherness” for the Russian state. For the Russian leadership, joining Bologna Declaration was a political act leading to the benefits for the state. At the same time, Russian academics advocating for participation of Russia in Bologna Process, saw in this cooperation a benefit for the academic profession on the institutional and individual levels (Smirnov, 2004; Efremov, 2005). Russian universities expressed firm togetherness in promoting integration of national academia into Bologna Process, wishing for Russian higher education to reach the status of “equal, recognized, and modern” in Europe and then worldwide, expecting the results to arrive not to the federal government or even national academic community, but to each university discretely. Lobbying for adoption of Bologna regulations in Russia, each Russian university wished for itself to become the beneficiary (Esenykin, 2005; Sakhovskiy, 2013). Supporting institutional initiative of participation in the Bologna Process, Russian scholars wished for the basic principles of EHEA to arrive to the Russian academic realities, hoping that “institutional autonomy, academic freedom and democratic principles will facilitate mobility, increase employability and strengthen attractiveness” not only in Europe, but in Russia as well

(Balmforth, 2011; Shadrikov, 2004). Different perspectives of national academics and federal authorities about Russia's joining the Bologna Process, well demonstrate the conflict of opinions about internationalization at the central and institutional levels of Russian academia. While Russian leadership considered Bologna declaration as an inter-government agreement, refusing to recognize the essence of Bologna Process as the consolidation of European academic institutions into one cooperative network, Russian universities wanted to join the European academic consortium, fully comprehending the collaborative spirit of Bologna association. Soviet administrative tradition of the Russian higher education management prevented Russian universities from full integration in the Bologna process, which is still observed by the Russian government as an international agreement between the states (Smirnov, 2004).

*Differentiation - an Emerging Institutional Objective of Internationalization*

Arrival of market realities in conjunction with unprecedented integration to the Western academia created new objectives for international policy of Russian higher education. Differentiation became the main label of Russian academia since 1990s. The very essence of Russian academia was promptly changing from a unified state system representing national eminence to a composition of diverse and separate institutions each longing for special position, particular mission and distinct recognition. By the beginning of the new millennium, academic internationalization in Russia moved from the status of a solid national policy, reflecting government interests to an institutional practice of daily matters. It was still supervised and directed from the federal level, but received a rather distinct local application. Academic mobility played the role of a “key-destroyer” of the settled Soviet principles of the top-down management for all international activities.



Russian universities stepped into the unknown world of market competition and academic distinction, where being different became not a sign of wrong-doing, punishable by the state, but an imperative emblem of modernity. Each university thrived for an institutional transformation, trying to get out from its Soviet past, become different from other universities, and receive new nationwide reputation. International standing became the major trump in the quest for glory and profit of every Russian university. Uniformity as the cornerstone of Soviet ideology was falling apart clearing the way to a new concept of “otherness” as a positive and beneficial challenge. However, deep-rooted concept of “uniformity,” well-established in Russian academia during the decades of Soviet regime, resisted to innovations and opposed to the notion of institutional internationalization. It was a critical change in the practice of Russian universities that incited a multitude of various issues, never existing prior to 1992 (Baidenko, 2010). Russian academia experienced a principal conversion of the conventional notion of “foreign” (Borisov, 2008; Slepukhin, 2004). For decades of Soviet Power, foreign publications were named nothing but “falsifications of bourgeois ideologists” and were kept in special “closed sections” of libraries. Now, almost in every field of science, including history, sociology and political science, foreign books became textbooks in Russian universities. Not only they were permitted for reading, but often they became a mandatory reading and even the only suggested reading for students. Previously, “foreign student” was an established term for the Soviet public mentality, related to a small, well distinguished number of aliens, secluded to several universities in a few, capital cities, where they’ve studied and resided (Popov, Zhukov, Pilipenko, 2007). Now, the term of a “foreign student” became applicable to thousands of people arriving to Russia mostly

from the former parts of the USSR, and spreading all over the country. Foreign students appeared as a reality for the common Russians, daily manifesting their presence in universities and public places.

Chaos and uncertainty dominated in the international affairs of Russian academia (Konstantinovsky, Verevkin, 2003). Sudden change of motive for inviting foreign students from a political to an economical one, and transition of the role of the decision-maker and host for the academic mobility from the state to academic institutions, created new distribution of roles in the practice of internationalization in Russia. Federal authorities kept all the controlling and supervising functions and still considered all national universities as subordinates. Through federal legislation and national government agencies, by controlling budget resources and international communication, Russian state could manipulate academic international policy on all levels, but the control over the daily management has been lost. Russian academia was not a replica of an army organization any more. Intervention of market naturally created competition, leading each Russian university to look for its different institutional niche and longing to get out from the unified togetherness towards institutional otherness (Tregubova, 2009; Firsova, Kurdumova, 2012). At the same time, global tendency for internationalization forced Russian universities to work together in order to produce a general positive image of Russian academia worldwide. Inter-institutional level of communication in Russian academia progressed quite rapidly, representing a domestic development towards academic togetherness (Ryabov, 2004). In this respect, progress of internationalization in Russian higher education was similar to the development of mimetic isomorphism in global academia. The very notion of “autonomous institution” was tested by the progress

of academic globalization, when a lot of copying from one academic institution to another is developing all over the world. This experience was quite new for Russian universities that used to follow the “organized pattern of replication national academic beacons” during the Soviet times (Golenkova, Gorshkov, 2012). Now, instead of following directives of central authorities and copying leading national universities, like MGU, Russian academic institutions rushed to copy various foreign universities, in fact, willing to copy foreign ways of “academic life.” In the global tendency of developing conflict between the traditional ideals of liberal arts education, promoting the notion of “autonomy” as a basic institutional value, and the modern trend of increased imitation between the universities worldwide, Russian academia has a rather unique place. The tendency of isomorphism in Russian higher education had not only an academic component, but economic and social ones, too. Russian universities didn’t try to be similar to each other or to their international partners only as academic institutions; they desired to have prestige of academic profession and corresponding financial and social benefits comparable to the Western universities. This was an interconnected development toward institutional resemblance internationally and institutional diversity domestically. In the reality of the exodus from the uniformity of the Soviet past to the diversity of the post-Soviet future this process seems to be a very progressive development for the Russian academia. Progress of institutional diversity became the major outcome and the key focus of academic internationalization for the Russian higher education at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Conclusion

The decade of 1990s was the time of great promise and great disillusion for the Russian higher education. It started with 1992 National Education Act suggesting legal grounds for academic autonomy and self-governance; institutional liberalism and income-making; international respect and partnership. However, commenced as continuation of Perestroika, transformation of Russian higher education remained in the mode of “ongoing reformation” through the decade of 1990s, and never arrived to the decisive resolution. I think it is reasonable to state that Perestroika reforms in Russian academia stopped around mid-1990s, after merger of internationalization and commercialization. The arrival of the market economy, the intervention of academic globalization leading to participation in the Bologna Process and direct inter-university cooperation converted Russian academia from a state establishment into a network of diverse universities. Preaching about values of internationalization and promoting its practical establishment in the national academia, Russian authorities created the greatest conflict for themselves: universities experienced benefits of global academic networking, and wanted real autonomy and self-governance, instead of declarations; while the state didn’t want to release control and disassemble Soviet administrative organization in higher education. The main step to “post-Soviet” organization of Russian higher education was yet to be made, and internationalization could serve as the “Archimedes lever” for Russian academia, capable to move it from the Soviet past to the global academic modernity.

## **Chapter 8: Conclusion**

### **Internationalization in Russian Higher Education - A Hundred Years of History**

Academics consider the whole world to be their natural habitat. Historically, they travel beyond national borders and communicate through cultural boundaries. Representing the practical application of this trend, internationalization is an organic component of modern academia. This includes student populations as well. Many university students today expect to be a national of one country, study in a university of another country, and work in various locations around the world. Academic internationalization is probably the most advanced practical implementation of the globalization process that drives economic, political and social developments in today's world.

This chapter is the conclusion of the present dissertation study, devoted to the progress of academic internationalization in Russia. The chapter summarizes the main deductions of the research, following its rationale. Studied intensely in the last two decades, the phenomenon of academic internationalization has not been examined equally throughout different countries and higher educational systems. Industrialized Western countries are represented well in the academic research of internationalization, but a number of nations outside the Western civilization lack deep analysis of their academic policies. Russia is a good example. First of all, data sources were classified in Russia for decades during the Soviet period, restricting scholars from producing intensive research in a comparative mode (Avrus, 2001). Secondly, international academic policy was only considered in relation to modern higher education, and analysis of the historical development of academic internationalization in Russia was never attempted (Slepukhin,

2004). Even now, after two decades of continuous policy of “Open Doors,” Russian higher education is understudied and its international academic policy is a quite unknown topic for the global academic community. Many scholars, who tried to address international issues of Russian higher education, complained about absence of studies specifically addressing Russian academic international policy, especially describing its development in the chronological manner. This dissertation research attempted to present internationalization progress in Russian higher education through its historical progression. Aimed to provide a comprehensive examination of the international academic policy in Russia, the study depicted major steps in the hundred years of its national higher education system development. Formerly classified archival materials and statistic data that became available to public just recently, even in the online format, are widely used in the dissertation. Soviet and post-Soviet periods in history of Russian academia are analyzed in the comparative mode leading to the key conclusion of the author about interconnection between these stages, and perpetuation of key notions of Soviet organization in the modern Russian higher education.

*Academic Internationalization During the Soviet Period*

Russian higher education has a very different historical trajectory comparing to the advancement of Western higher education systems. Formation of a Russian national system of higher education available to the general population of the country happened during the Soviet times, beginning it earnest in the 1930s. As a national system aimed to educate its citizenry, Russian higher education is less than a hundred years old, and originated as a Soviet organization. It did not result from the historical progress of Russian society, and did not root into the natural development of Russian economy,

unlike Western academic systems. Russian higher education was a product of the academic policy of the political leadership of the Soviet state. International academic policy of the Soviet state reflected, accordingly, the ideological postulates of the Communist Party of the USSR.

**Internationalization – an original part of the Soviet ideological doctrine.**

One of the major research questions of this study was to determine, whether academic internationalization arrived to the reality of Russian academia only recently or it has some historic legacy. Modern definition of the term, used in the study, explains internationalization as “a practical policy of academic institutions or national academic systems reflecting global changes” (Altbach, 2002c; DeWit, 2002; Knight, 2003). Analysis of the chronological development of Russian higher education system through the Soviet period of 1917-1991, given in chapters 3-5 of this research, provides evidence that academic internationalization has always been a part of the international policy of the Soviet state, starting from the dawn of the Bolshevik regime in early 20th century. At the same time, it didn't correspond completely to the modern definition of academic internationalization, but was a surrogate of internationalization in its full meaning. International policy of Soviet academia never reflected actual global changes, but always followed ideological doctrine of the state. This was the major contradiction of the Russian analog of academic internationalization with its Western pattern. The reason for such disparity is rooted into the origin of Soviet ideology. Soviet ideological dogma was based on the theoretical prediction of Marxism that world accumulation of capital invested into worldwide industrialization will bring capitalism to the stage of global economy, named by Lenin as “imperialism”. Out of this conceptual forecast, Russian

Marxists derived next supposition about inevitable advent of the World Revolution. After the arrival of the Bolsheviks to the political power in 1917, Soviets were building their plans for academic internationalism on the ideological basis, and were implementing academic internationalization as the reflection of the hypothetical expectation. Specific international academic policy was indeed introduced by the Soviets from the very beginning, and it was actually present through the whole period of Soviet regime. However, Soviet version of academic internationalization was a policy promoting an ideological aspiration, a policy reflecting the doctrine, not veracity. This key-conflict of Soviet ideology resulted in the growing gap between the reality of global developments and the Soviet academic international policy. Soviets interpreted global progression in a very dogmatic way, observing it as the materialization of Leninism. Communist Party ideology had a critical influence on the perspective of academic internationalization in Soviet Russia providing its sharp dogmatic connotation and making it very politicized.

**Internationalization as a tool of Soviet political statecraft.**

The key characteristic of academic internationalization in Russia during the Soviet period was its tight connection with the politics of the Soviet state. The global aspect of World Revolution in education was operationalized through internationalization. International emphasis was in the middle of the Bolshevik's academic reform started in Russia in 1917, and intended to become a worldwide transformation in the frame of World revolution (Lenin, 1918b). Results of my study suggest that the Bolsheviks had very clear understanding of the international purpose of an academic reform in Russia: Soviet higher education was established as a global pattern of “proper academia” for mandatory international distribution. This political objective remained unchanged through the entire



Soviet period (1917-1991). Every political task of Soviet leadership was accompanied by the formation of the practical goals for the national academic policy, while their execution was guided and controlled by the political structures of the Soviet state, under tight supervision of the Communist Party. Academic internationalization was continually a mission of the national government, reflecting general political strategy of the Soviet state. Soviet government dictated its political strategy top-down to the higher educational institutions and academics of the country in a centralized administrative manner. International academic policy was executed only through the central administration within the ministries and agencies of the federal level of the Soviet government. Having a central, political mission and aimed toward political objectives, academic internationalization in the USSR produced political outcomes. During the Soviet period, academic internationalization consequently reflected political needs of the state, from promotion of friendly relations with the industrial countries, to enforcement of the image of powerful and self-sufficient academic structure of the USSR, as the major superpower of the world. Even pure academic accomplishments, as establishment of new research and educational institutions, or scientific achievements, like launching a man into space, had compulsory political connotation, relating them to Soviet politics. The final destination of Soviet academic internationalization was always the same – global promotion of the Soviet order. Academic internationalization in Russia was probably an example of the most politicized state educational policy known in history.

**Academic internationalization as a vehicle of global Sovietization.**

Practice of international Sovietization was the climax of the Soviet style academic internationalization. Consolidation of the principles of Soviet academic international

policy into the concept of Sovietization happened by the end of 1930s, and was launched into practice after the completion of WWII. Academic Sovietization constituted not only promotion of the Soviet political goals into academic systems of other countries; it meant organizational change of national higher education models into the Soviet one, and introduction of major features of Soviet administration and curricula, completely transforming different academic systems into a replica of the Soviet academic model. Academic Sovietization didn't embrace cultural diversity through cross-national exchanges; it didn't promote different teaching methods and research techniques; it didn't pursue comparative analysis of various organizational models and higher educational management. It had a precise political task of the Soviet government to be focused on the delivery of the right Soviet academic model to the rest of the world. The policy of academic Sovietization was continuously executed during four decades of the Cold War era. Being an essential part of Soviet political establishment, Sovietization, as the Soviet style academic internationalization, collapsed together with the demise of the USSR by the 1990s.

*Academic Internationalization During the Post-Soviet Period*

Perestroika reforms produced a fundamental turn in the academic international policy of the Russian state in the 1990s. The collapse of the USSR and beginning of a new, post-Soviet epoch in Russian history brought the reality of openness to Russian society. The importance for Russian higher education to become part of global academia was the motto and driving issue of national educational reform during Perestroika. International academic mobility, research partnerships and exchange of teaching methods, use of foreign academic literature, and participation in the academic

international gatherings formed the new infrastructure of academic internationalization in Russia. Internationalization became a very real phenomenon in post-Soviet Russian higher education at all levels: federal, local, institutional and individual. Russian academic international policy progressed coherently from a political mission of global Sovietization to an educational agenda of learning the experience of global academia. Through the policy of “Open Doors,” Russian higher education received an opportunity to integrate in the global academic network. This initiated a dramatic conversion of objectives, activities, and outcomes of academic internationalization in Russia. Introduction of constant and direct communication of Russian academics with their foreign colleagues marked a significant and deep implementation of internationalization into Russian higher education, changing the very essence of national academia from being a servant of the state interests to becoming an equal partner of the global educational network. Evolution of internationalization in Russian higher education could serve as a good example of complexity and ambiguity of the conversion process from Soviet to Post-Soviet Society.

**Academic Internationalization in Russia Received a Western Connotation.**

Perestroika changed the priority of Russian academia from transforming the world academia into a global Soviet system of higher education, to reforming itself using organizational principles, research approaches and study programs of the developed Western academic systems. After decades of concentration on disseminating Soviet higher education worldwide, new Russian leadership led by Gorbachev, suggested to study Western academic culture and adopt Western principles of academic freedoms, institutional autonomy and self-governance. Being a very huge turn in the organization,

mission, principles and overall ideology for national academia, Perestroika reforms created a completely new prospect for Russian higher education and required great changes in national academic policy. In fact, Perestroika reforms in Russian academia brought a completely new notion of international academic policy – the incorporation of Russian higher education in the global academic network. Full state support was given to Russia's involvement into formal international agreements, like the Bologna Declaration, cross-national covenants establishing professional qualification verifications and promoting degree nostrification. Russian political and educational leadership indicated that recognition of national higher education as an equal partner in global academia was a matter of major importance. Academic freedom and institutional autonomy, unity of teaching and research, importance of international academic cooperation and mobility - these traditional academic values of Western universities were positively received and fully adopted by the academic community of Russian faculty and students. International interactions became usual not only for the national, but also for institutional and individual levels of Russian academia, representing the actual integration of Russian higher education into a more global academic network. Students and faculty, administration and staff of every university became active participants of internationalization in practice. Their opinions about institutional internationalization strategy and level of participation in its practical activities became a serious influence on the academic status and financial prosperity of a university. Obtaining recognition through international academic ranking; receiving salaries similar to the Western academics; having standards of academic environment equal to those in the Western

university became matters of concern and measurements of success among Russian academics.

**Internationalization became a priority of Russian educational policy.**

Internationalization as a major academic value and a synonym to the “Open Doors” policy in education was pronounced at the very dawn of Perestroika. In 1992, this statement became an introduction of the new National Educational Act. Integration of Russian higher education into global academic community was officially mandated as a priority and described as “liberalization” through introduction of academic freedoms, and “democratization” via provision of autonomy and self-governance to all universities nationwide. First time in national academic history, international activities became a reality for common Russian scholars and students. At the same time, the international academic policy of post-Soviet Russia became a “two-way street.” The original Soviet model of academic international interaction was concentrated on “inside-out” communication. This model now changed to a new pattern of academic internationalization focused on an “outside-in” process. Russian political and educational leadership alike prioritized the recognition of national higher education as an equal partner in global academia. The arrival of modern internationalization to Russian higher education in the 1990s awakened the academic population of Russia and consolidated it into an active social force, and promoted its incorporation into global academia. Internationalization found its main supporters in the grass-roots of the Russian academic community. The trajectory of academic internationalization in Russia changed from being exclusively the policy of Russian state to becoming predominantly a policy guided by Russian academics and academic institutions. Absolute state control over academic

internationalization, based on inter-government agreements, was lost to direct inter-institutional partnerships and the individual participation of Russian students and scholars in international academic research and study mobility. The major carrier for international academic policy was changed in Russia from the state government to the academic institutions. Accordingly, the aspirations of internationalization started to modify from state political benefits to educational outcomes valuable to the national academia.

**Academic internationalization became market-oriented.**

The national economic disorder of the 1990s created a need for profound change in funding strategies for Russian academia and added to the need for new sources of income. The introduction of market principles to Russian higher education was seen as a potential solution to long standing funding problems. The arrival of commercialization to Russian academia directly influenced the progress of internationalization. Beginning in the 1990s, international dimensions of Russian academic activities became a distinctly economic matter. “Commercialization” and “internationalization” rapidly became synonymous for Russian academics. Not only did tuition and non-government academic institutions become realities for Russian higher education, an important shift toward the domination of economic interests occurred in Russian international educational policy. The monetary benefit of internationalization became its fundamental value for both national academia and individual higher educational institutions. Russian universities received the legal right to undertake entrepreneurial activities, which was directly connected by government spokesmen with the inclusion of Russian higher education into the global academic network. Aspiration to become an equal member of the Bologna Process is a good example of the seriousness of Russia’s ambition to develop into a

valuable player on the global academic market. The commodification of Russian higher education created an immediate need for administrative changes in national academia, and demanded professional business management in the field of academic internationalization. Soviet elements in the organizational structure of Russian higher education could not adapt to such innovations and the conflict between state and institutional objectives for academic internationalization quickly became inevitable. The Russian government was interested in the academic sector to the extent that it could enlarge the national budget and further new policies of the state. Russian universities, in contrast, aspired to receive the economic results of commercialization at the institutional level in order to sustain the growth of academic progress.

**Academic internationalization became an institutional strategy for Russian universities.**

Even though academic internationalization in post-Soviet Russia kept the status of a national policy, created at the level of the federal government, it contained a growing institutional dimension. The institutional policy of internationalization became a daily reality in every Russian university. This created a diversity of interests of different parties involved, and variations in the understanding of internationalization reasons, means, and outcomes between individual institutions and the state. Excited about new possibilities for direct inter-institutional communications with foreign academic establishments, Russian academic institutions rushed into the formation of joint research ventures and cooperative study courses; establishment of dual-degree programs, and production of collective scholarly publications. Every Russian university faced the difficult task of forming its institutional mission, establishing its academic uniqueness and promoting its

scholarly research in the new realities of globalized academic network and commercialized national higher education, where intellectual product is a commodity.

*Future Prospects for Academic Internationalization in Russia*

Russian higher education entered the 21st century in a state of rapid transformation from a state uniformed system of vocational training, into a national university network. Universities were moving toward individual institutional missions and definite curricula specialization; incorporation of research into course studies; and direct collaboration with international academic establishments. Russian leadership pushed for international academic activities and demanded that national higher education occupy its rightful place among the leading global providers of academic services. However, continuation of the centralized administrative order in the management of national educational policy was creating a growing conflict with the progress of the institutional internationalization. Reflecting to the arrival of international activities on the institutional level, each Russian university had to work out its own strategy for academic internationalization, and fulfill directives of the Federal Ministry of Education simultaneously. Evident contradiction of these tasks produced two discussions ongoing in the modern Russian academia: A) does Westernization deliver progress and public good, or Russia should continue to march by its own path in higher education, launched during the Soviet times? B) Do Russian universities receive benefit from participating in the global academic network, and foreign for Russian academia activities, like competition for research application or world ratings? In the waterfall of opinions, expressed publically by Russian politicians, educators, journalists and voices from general public, two approaches are most apparent: political, that suggests positive uniqueness of Russian higher education, based on the



great achievements of Soviet academia (Kara-Murza, 2001); and educational, presenting Russia as the organic part of global higher education. Representatives of the first position discuss mostly politics and present academic issues in the frame of the general political position of Russia in the world (Gluharev, 2011; Sergeev, 2013). The focus of the argument is on the comparison of the previous status of the USSR in the world as a super-power, which was based at large on the global supremacy of Soviet academia (Pokazeev, 2005; Ufimcev, 2009). Supporters of such viewpoint form a large portion of general Russian public, longing to the familiar Soviet image of their country as the beacon of human progress. Politicians of all calibers and from many parties also sustain this position, using “future of Russian academia” as the matter for political manipulation with the public mentality. This division seems to be busy with politics not academia, and use academic issues only for political reasons. In fact, the debate suggests not consideration of the value of Westernization for Russian higher education, but the need for Russia’s participation in globalization at all. Soviet conversant image of “self-efficient nation” is very dear to a large part of common Russian population and to the politicians they support. Pro-Soviet political position of this division correlate with the anti-Western one in many issues, including the academic one, delivering national higher education back in the usual dimension of international policy of the state.

Russian educators discuss problems of Westernization and Russia’s participation in global academia as well, but usually from the professional point of view (Bulgakova, 2012; Dibrova, Kabanova, 2004; Agranovich, 2010). International academic policy and its benefits for national academia prevail in this discussion over the general issues of Russia’s position in the world (Kuzminov, Radaev, Yakovlev, Yasin, 2005). Most of

prominent Russian scholars and spokesmen of Russian universities agree about vital need for participation of national academia in global academic network. Moreover, the most profound and famous Russian universities endorse internationalization in their institutions to the point of forming special bodies of foreign experts to help with the promotion of international research and study collaboration. Good example is Moscow Higher School of Economics (HSE) that has several ongoing programs of the kind (Meshkova, 2010). Having its teaching concentration on business issues, HSE, nevertheless, was the first Russian university to create an Institute of Education, aimed to comparative study of current academic issues in the West and in Russia and research in the field of international higher education (Frumin, 2013). HSE Institute of Education participate in large OECD and BRIC international academic projects, representing not just its university, but Russian higher education as a whole (Yudkevich, 2013). Recently, HSE formed a special International Board of Experts, inviting famous professionals in higher education from all over the world. Even this was an institutional initiative, each session of the Board and recommendations of its members are events of nationwide magnitude for Russian academia (Zhelezov, Melikyan, 2012). This is a very good example of creative internationalization in Russian higher education, beneficial for domestic and international academics.

Other Russian universities also try to move away from viewing internationalization as strictly commercialization, and toward hiring foreign faculty and creating English-language programs. For example, St. Petersburg University, being traditionally the second grand university of Russia, participates in the current international *Artes Liberales* initiative and other, small-scale international academic exchanges that may prove very

interesting in the future (Kropachev, 2013). It seems that on the level of professional educators, Russian higher education has developments fully corresponding to the modern trends in global academia.

Russian federal authorities also tried to endorse modern tendencies in inter-institutional academic cooperation. However, typically, Russian statesmen execute federal decisions in the usual administrative manner. The most recent effort to promote institutional internationalization in Russian academia was performed in the format of the government directive, demanding improvement of international competitiveness of Russian universities. Federal Russian authorities declared participation in international academic rankings to be one of the major evaluation instruments in assessing the level of internationalization in Russian higher education. In May 2012, the President of Russia ordered that at least 5 Russian universities should rank among the top 100 universities of the world according to global academic rankings (O merah po realizacii gosudarstvennoi politiki v oblasti obrazovaniia i nauki, 2012). The Russian government formalized this decree in state order N 211 signed for mandatory execution in March 2013 under the title “Project 5-100” (O merah gosudarstvennoi podderzhki vedushih universitetov RF, 2013). The nationwide contest was announced among Russian universities and 54 schools were selected by September 2013 to compete during the final stage of the project. Leading Russian universities nominated for participation in the project, “due to their competitiveness with the major world recognized academic and research centers,” would receive special state funding and other federal support to be able to fulfill by 2020 the task posted by the Russian President (Livanov, 2013b). To ensure that the Russian universities would be successful, a Federal Board for the Improvement of Global

Competitiveness of Russian Academia was formed. Trying to follow global academic trends and implement the given order in the most egalitarian manner, Russian Ministry of Education invited leading world experts in higher education to participate in the work of the Board (Livanov, 2013b). The Prime-Minister of Russia supervises the work of the Board and provides needed organizational, financial and administrative aid. This effort is considered by the Russian government to be one of its most important current tasks (Medvedev, 2013). Fifteen universities should become finalists and receive additional funding and material provision. Russian universities that are ultimately included in the list of top 100 world universities by the leading worldwide academic ratings will receive a special status and funding directly from the administration of the Russian President (Livanov, 2013b). Political component is particular enforced by the Russian leadership in this national academic project: “having leading universities at the world level is the characteristic of the great power in the modern world. In line with other distinguished scientific achievements, like launching the first man in space, it should prove Russia as a rightful member of the scientific-industrial leadership of the planet, holding the intellectual potency of humanity” (Putin, 2012a). Russian academics of the old, Soviet school agree that the presence of Russian universities in the list of top 100 universities of the world has no specific value by itself, but it is an important signal to the international community that it is prestigious to do research and study in Russia (Sadovnichiy, 2013). At the same time, Russian educators, who are serious about importance of academic internationalization believe that important mission of the Russian finalists of the Project 5-100 will be to serve as example of excellence for the rest of national academia. They shall lead the new phase of reformation of Russian higher education to achieve its

strategic reorganization and qualitative improvement (Livanov, 2013). Project 5-100 should finalize the transformation of Russian academia into a modern and effective education system, completing the ongoing reform of Russian higher education and making it a valuable part of the global academic leadership. Aimed to bring new horizons and deliver academic modernity to Russian higher education recent efforts of Russian federal authorities at the same time address national academia and general public with the proposal to reinstate formal glory and leading global position of Russian scholarship (Medvedev, 2012a). It appears a somewhat confusing slogan, suggesting progressing to the future by returning to the academic achievements of the past. However, in light of famous statement of Russian President Putin, who named collapse of the USSR as the major geo-political catastrophic event of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, such a vision of the Russian political elite seems to be reasonable (Putin, 2005). It is quite remarkable that Russian political leadership seeks for academic advantage and research progress in the format: “Our Future is in the restoration of our glorious Past”. At the same time, the implementation of Project 5-100 is quite traditional and very Soviet in its organizational core. The President requested a certain achievement to be made by the national academia, establishing a deadline for its accomplishment; federal government immediately issued a state order, presenting an action strategy, aimed to fulfill the given order. A project budget was formed from state funds, and competition among national universities started within a month from the moment of declaration of the President’s idea. This represents the classical pattern of top-down, centralized directorial management. The goal of this administrative procedure, however, is to achieve leading positions in a modern global academia that is grounded in the merits of academic freedom and autonomy, diversity

and public good. There is an obvious conflict between the content and the organizational format of progressive international academic policy suggested by the Russian leadership.

Calls for recapturing a primary position in world academia and returning global fame to Russian higher education is constantly broadcasted as the key expectation of the Russian political establishment for national academia (Putin, 2012b). Unless it is a pure political declaration, having no practical purpose, such demand seems to be rather unrealistic, or at least premature. The Federal Education Act was adopted in 1992, and intended to reform Russian academia into a post-Soviet organization by the end of the century. Twenty years later, its last version with the title “New edition of the 1992 Educational Act” lasted from July 2007 until December 2012, when a new Law about Education in Russian Federation was adopted by the State Duma (Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federacii, 2012). In its preamble, the new National Educational Act refers to the last version of the 1992 Law as the “legislation basis constituting the core of the current legal act, aimed to further ongoing reform of education in Russia” (Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federacii, 2012). It seems that the transformation of Russian academia from Soviet to post-Soviet stage is not finished yet. The terminology of the new Educational Act 2012 confirms such conclusion, constituting a mixture of the vocabulary from the old Soviet legal acts and the transliteration of modern English definitions into Russian. For example, one section of the law affirms that any higher educational establishment in the country has rights, including self-governance and independence in execution of its educational, research, administrative and financial activities; the next section states that academic institutions are limited in their activities by the Federal legislation, by directives of the federal government, and should follow the instructions of

the Ministry of Education and of other Federal Agencies, acting as supervisors and inspectors of the practical activities of the national educational institutions (Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federacii, 2012). On one hand, the new Educational Act indicates that an academic institution should perform its activities on the basis of collegial academic traditions. The next sentence says that “administration of a higher educational establishment should combine methods of collective and directive management” (Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federacii, 2012, p. 23). The next paragraph of the law explains in detail the administrative functions of the “executive administrator” of a university (Rector) who is solely responsible for the overall institutional management in front of the Ministry, and should act as the single decision-maker of administrative matters; and is the only university employee, provided with the rights of a “credits disposer”, or in the other words, controller and spender of the institutional budget (Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federacii, 2012, p. 24). This combination of classical Soviet practices, like “one-man management” and references to the “principles of collegiality” traditional for global academia create the impression that the Russian political establishment is trying to create legal parameters for the national academia that would bear the format of the old organization and, thus, keep control largely in the hands of federal authorities, continuing the practice of Soviet centralization. At the same time, however, the structure would promote modernity in Russian higher education, presenting it as a valuable and equal partner for the global academia. Article 105 of the new Educational Act specifically explains goals of “international cooperation in the field of education” and names activities, falling into “international cooperation.” It suggests quite a remarkable combination between “aiming for broadening educational possibilities for

the citizens of Russian Federation through study abroad and other forms of academic internationalization” and “executing the request of the “federal organs of executive power” in the fields of education, research and international affairs, according to the national interests of Russian Federation” (Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federacii, 2012, p. 45).

It seems that international academic policy of current Russian leadership is trying to deliver a message to the Russian public that the cornerstones of national academic system are unshaken and inviolable. At the same time, the Russian government is attempting to convince the global academic community that despite of the peculiarities of its national organization and management methods, the Russian academic establishment stands solidly in line with the traditions of academic freedom and autonomy, furthers democratic reformation of the Russian higher education, and promotes European traditions of academic studies construction and research excellence. What principles and traditions will win in Russian academic international policy is the key question for the development of internationalization in Russian higher education. Looking at these policies, it seems that a) economic demands of the state are still in conflict with the social request of individuals; b) the uniform federal administrative structure may prevent the establishment of further institutional independence and self-governance; and c) a military-like discipline may thwart the progress of academic freedoms. This struggle between the old system of education and new academic tasks reflects in my opinion the general conflict between the traditional concept of Soviet academia as a “forge of qualified cadre,” producing a centralized state pool of trained personnel, and the prevailing modern concept of academia, as the backbone of a Knowledge Society. The



international policy of Russian higher education made a remarkable journey through a hundred years of history. Started as a division of the crusade for World Revolution, it converted into an element of global Sovietization and, finally, transformed into the subdivision of Perestroika reforms, promoting the merits of academic freedom and autonomy, cultural diversity and cross-national academic collaboration at the institutional level.

Internationalization may launch a new era for Russian higher education, indeed, making it part of global academia with no cultural boundaries or national borders. World academic history and modern experience of academic systems all over the world proves internationalization being the only rational policy protecting merits of academia and promoting its advancement. Key problem of the moment seems to be in the answer Russia will give in practice to the question: can Pandora go back to its box? Can individual academic spirit striving for personal academic advancement and research achievements go back to the unified reality of centralized administrative model of state higher education? As of now, Russian higher education is in the transition mode – it is not an old Soviet system any more, but it is also not a modern Western-like university system. Progress of internationalization created a deep conflict in Russian academia. Russian leadership tries hard to perpetuate Soviet academic model making it market oriented and economically profitable for the state at the same time. On the other side, intensive international communication of the last decades promotes formation of a critical mass of Russian educators longing for academic freedoms and values of liberal education. Where internationalization will sprint for Russia should not be only a national matter but a concern for the global academic community.

### **Closure Summary**

1. Academic internationalization was understood by the Soviets in the context of Marxism and was an essential part of the Soviet ideological doctrine.
2. During the Soviet period, academic internationalization was a tool of Soviet political statecraft and had political objectives.
3. During the Cold War period, academic internationalization was an important part of the USSR policy of global Sovietization and creation of the World System of Socialism.
4. Soviet style academic internationalization finished together with the collapse of the Soviet Union.
5. Academic Internationalization in Russia received a Western connotation during Perestroika.
6. According to the National Education Act, adopted in 1992, internationalization became a priority of Russian educational policy.
7. Academic internationalization became market-oriented in 1990s. It received economic objectives, which became dominant for Russian government and national academia.
8. By the end of the 1990s, academic internationalization became an institutional strategy for Russian universities. The institutional policy of internationalization became a daily reality in every Russian university.

### References:

- Aalto, P. (2011). *European Union and the Making of a Wider Northern Europe*. London: Routledge.
- About the Bologna Process*. (2007). Retrieved from: <http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/hogeronderwijs/bologna/about/>
- Abramov, A.M. (1995). *Pobeda ili nichya?* [Victory or Impasse]. Retrieved from: <http://www.rodsobr.narod.ru/95.htm>
- Adibekov, G.M. (2004). *Politburo - TsK RKP(b) – TsK VKP(b) i Komintern. 1919-1943. Dokumenty*. [Politburo, TsK RKP (b), VKP(b) and Comintern. 1919-1943. Documents]. Moscow: Rossiyskaya Politicheskaya enciklopediya.
- Afanasev, Yu.N. (1999). *Zapadnaya racionalisticheskaya tradicia. Ponyatie “gumanitarnost”*. *Russkaya universitetskaya tradicia*. [Western Rational Tradition. Definition of “humanitarian.” Russian University tradition]. Moscow: RGGU Press.
- Afanasev, Yu. N. (2000). *Mozhet li obrazovanie byt’ negumanitarnym?* [Can Education be Non-Humanitarian]. Moscow: RGGU.
- Afiani, V.Yu. (2005). *Apparat TsK KPSS i kultura. 1958-1964. Dokumenty*. [TsK CPSU Headquarters and Issues of Culture. 1958-64. Documents]. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Agamova, N.S., Allahverdyan, A.G. (2007). Utechka umov iz Rossii: prichiny i mashtaby. [Brain drain from Russia: reasons and magnitude]. *Rossiyskiy Himicheskyy Gurnal*, 51(3), 108-115.
- Agranovich, M.L. (2010). *Internacionalizatsiya vysshogo obrazovaniya: tendentsii, strategii, scenario budushego*. [Internationalization: Tendencies, Strategies, Scenarios for the Future]. Moscow: Logos.
- Aigner, J.S., Nelson, P., Stimpfl, J.R. (1992). Internationalizing the University: Making it Work. *International Education Forum*, 12(1), 49-59.
- Aksutin, Yu. (1989). *Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev. Materialy k biografii*. [N.S. Khrushchev. Materials to Biography]. Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Aleksandrov, Yu. L. (2010). Obrazovanie – osnova ekonomicheskogo razvitiya. [Education – Basis of Economic Development]. *Akkreditsatsiya v Obrazovanii*, 41, 32-34.
- Alexankov, A.M. (Ed.). (2008). *Marketing v mezhdunarodnoi deyatel’nosti vuza*. [Role of Marketing in University’s International Activities]. St. Petersburg: SPbPU Press.
- Alshanov R. (2010). *Partnerstvo vo imya razvitiya*. [Partnership for the Sake of Peace]. Alma-Aty: Turan Universitet Press.
- Altbach, P. G. (1998). *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.
- Altbach, P. G. (1999). The Logic of Mass Higher Education. *Tertiary Education and Management* 10, 107-124.
- Altbach, P. G. (2001). Academic Freedom: International Realities and Challenges. *Higher Education*, 4, 205-219.

## Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia – References

- Altbach, P.G. (2002a). Perspectives on Internationalization Higher Education. *International Higher Education*, 27, 6-8.
- Altbach, P.G. (2002b). Knowledge and Education as International Commodities: The Collapse of the Common Good. *Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education*, 22, 55-60.
- Altbach P. G. (2002c). Centers and Peripheries in the Academic Profession: The Special Challenges of Developing Countries. In P.G. Altbach (Ed.), *The Decline of Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing and Middle-Income Countries*. New York, NY: Palgrave Publishers.
- Altbach, P. G. (2004a). Globalization and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal World. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 10(1), 3-25.
- Altbach, P.G. (2004b). Higher Education Crosses Borders. *Change*, 36, 18-25.
- Altbach, P.G. (2006). *International Higher Education: Reflections on Policy and Practice*. Chestnut Hill, MA: CIHE.
- Altbach, P.G. (2007a). Peripheries and Centres: Research Universities in Developing Countries. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 19 (2), 1-23.
- Altbach, P.G. (2007b). *Tradition and Transition: The International Imperative in Higher Education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Altbach, P.G. (2010). The Realities of Mass Higher Education in a Globalized World. In D. B., Johnstone (Ed.), *Higher Education in a Global Society* (pp. 25-41). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Altbach, P.G. (2013). *The International Imperative in Higher Education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Altbach P.G, Knight J. (2007). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Motivations and Realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 290-305.
- Altbach P.G, Reisberg L., Rumbley, L. (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution*. Chestnut Hill, MA: CIHE.
- Altbach, P. G., Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and Exchanges in a Globalized University. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 5(1), 5-25.
- Altbach, P. G., Uphoff, N.T. (1973). *The Student Internationals*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press.
- Andreev, A.Yu. (1998). Iz istorii Rossiyskikh Universitetov. [History of Russian Universities]. Moscow: MGU Press.
- Andreev, D.A. (2007). Proletarizatsiya sovsotskoy vysshei shkoly v 1921-1925 gody. [Proletarianization of the Soviet Higher Education in 1921-1925]. *Izvestiya RGPU*, 18(44), 22-25.
- Androsova, D.N. (2011). Obuchenie ideologicheskimi disciplinami inostrannykh studentov v sovetskikh vuzakh v period "ottepeli": problemy vospriyatiya, organizatsii, soderzhaniya. [The Process of Studying of the ideological Courses by the Foreign Students in the Soviet Higher Educational Institutions during the "Thaw" Period: Problems, Organization and Framework]. *Vestnik TvGU*, 3, 115-122.
- Androsova, D.N. (2012). *Obuchenie inostrannykh studentov v SSSR v seredine 1950-h – 1960-h godah*.

- [Education of Foreign Students in the USSR: mid-1950s – 1960s]. Retrieved from: <http://cheloveknauka.com/obuchenie-inostrannyh-studentov-v-sssr-v-seredine-1950-h-1960-h-gg>
- Anfimov, A.M., Korelin, A.P. (Eds.). (1995). *Rossia za 1913 god. Statistiko-dokumentalni spravochnik*. [Russia in 1913. Collection of Statistics]. St.Petersburg: RBITTC-Blits.
- Anisimova, A.N., Bobylev, V.N., Veselova, E.A. (2013). K realizacii urovnevoi sistemy vysshego obrazovania. [Implementation of the Multi-Level System of Higher Education]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 4, 100-106.
- Antonov-Ovseenko, V.A. (1957). *V semnadcatom godu*. [In the Year of 1917]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Apor, B., Apor, P., Rees, E. A. (Eds.). (2008). *The Sovietization of Eastern Europe: New Perspectives on the Postwar Period*. Washington, D.C.: New Academia Publishing, LLC.
- Applebaum, A. (2012). *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Arbuzkin, A.M., Muramete, O. F. (1979). *Principy pravovogo regulirovaniya prebyvaniya v SSSR inostrancev*. [Presence of Foreigners in the USSR: Principles of Legal Regulation]. Moscow: VNII MVD SSSR.
- Arefiev, A.L. (2003). Zarubegnie stagirovki: sociologicheskii analiz. [Research and Study Trips in Abroad: Sociological Analysis]. *Vishsee Obrazovanie Segodnya*, 5, 92-106.
- Arefiev, A.L. (2004). *Podgotovka kadrov vysshei kvalifikacii dlya zarubezhnykh stran*. [Preparation of Highly Qualified Professional Manpower for the Foreign Countries]. Moscow: TsSP Press.
- Arefiev, A.L. (2008). Mezhdunarodny rynek obrazovatelnykh uslug i rossiiskie vuzy. [International Market of Educational Services and Russian Universities]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 2, 144-157.
- Arefiev, A.L. (2012). *Inostrannye studenty v rossiiskikh vuzakh*. [International Students in Russian Universities]. Retrieved from: <http://demoscope.ru/weekly/2013/0571/analit02.php>
- Arefyev, A. L., Dmitirev, N. M., Sheregi, F. E. (2002). Rossiiskie vzyy i mezhdunarodniy runok obrazovatelnykh uslug. [Russian Universities and International Market of Educational Services]. In *Nauchno-pedagogicheskii potential i export obrazovatelnykh uslug rossiiskikh vuzov: sociologicheskii analiz*. (pp.9-28). Moscow: Tsentr socialnogo prognozirovaniya.
- Arefieva, I.G. (Ed.). (1995). *Tragicheskie sudby: repressirovannye uchenye Akademii nauk SSSR*. [Tragic fate: purged members of the USSR Academy of Sciences]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Arkadiyev, A.G., Krivosheev, V. F. (2012). E.D. Dneprov- iniciator i organizator obrazovatelnoi reformy 1992 goda. [E.D. Dneprov – Initiator and Promoter of the 1992 Educational Reform]. In E.D. Dneprov (Ed.), *Vehi obrazovatelnoi politiki. Izbrannye statyi i materialy, 1987-2012* (pp. 531-540). Moscow: Marios.
- Arseniev, D.G. (2003). *Socialno-psihologicheskie i fiziologicheskie problemy adaptatsii inostrannykh studentov*. [Social, Psychological and Physiological Problems of Adaptation for the Foreign Students in Russia]. St. Pteresburg: SPbGTU.
- Artamonova, Yu. D., Blinova, K.A., Demchuk, A.L. (2011). Sovmestnye obrazovatelnye programmy: sostoyanie, problem, perspektivy. [Joint Educational Programs: status, problems, prospects.]. *Vestnik*

*Vysshei Shkoly*, 5, 74-80.

Artemenko, N., Chubarov, I. (2010). *Krizis universitetskogo obrazovania v Rossii: prichiny i posledstvia*. [Crisis of University Education in Russia: Reasons and Results]. Retrieved from: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2011/110/ar54.html>

Artushina, I.A., Shutilin, V.A. (2008). Globalnye reitingi na povestke dnya. [Global ranking is he immediate agenda]. *Voprosy obrazovania*, 2, 240-259.

Arum, S., Van de Water, J. (1992). The Need for a Definition of International Education in U.S. Universities. In: C. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education* (pp.191-203). Carbondale, IL: AIEA.

Arutjunyan, G. (2010). *Raspad systemy SSSR – nekotorye prichiny i posledstviya*. [The USSR's Disintegration - Some Reasons and Results]. Erevan: Noravank.

Arzhanova, I.V. (2010). *Stsenarii razvitiya internatsionalizatsii vysshego obrazovaniya v Rossii*. [Scenarios of Internationalization's Development in Russian Higher Education]. Retrieved from <http://www.gosbook.ru/node/39389>

Arzhenovskiy, S.V. (2002). *Upravlenie universitetskimi kompleksami: matematicheskie modeli i metody*. [Management of university complexes: methodology and math modeling]. Rostov-na-Donu: SKNTC VSH.

Ashby, E. (1947). *Scientist in Russia*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Asmolov, A.G., Yagodin, G.A. (1992). Obrazovanie kak rasshirenie vozmozhnistei razvitiya lichnosti. [Education as a Mean of Broadening Personal Development for a Student]. *Voprosy Psihologii*, 1, 6-13. *Assotciatsiya negosudarstvennyh vuzov Rossii (ANVUZ)*. [Association of Non-State Higher Educational Institutions of Russia]. (2013). Retrieved from: [http://anvuz.ru/\\_Org/hist.php](http://anvuz.ru/_Org/hist.php)

Astafyev, Yu. U., Shubkin, V. N. (1996). Sociologia obrazovania v Rossii. [Sociology of Education in Russia]. *Mir Rossii*, 3, 161- 176.

Astakhova, E.V. (2011). Akademicheskaya mobilnost – vazhniy factor obrazovatelnoi evrointegratsii. [Academic Mobility – an Important Factor of Educational Cross-European Integration]. *Vysshhee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 1, 156-158.

Avdeev, N.F. (Ed.). (2011). *Vysshaya shkola v usloviakh globalizatsii*. [Higher Education in the Conditions of Globalization]. Moscow: MGIU Press.

Avdulov, A.N., Kulkin, A.M. (2001). Protsess instiutalizatsii nauki v Rossii i ego osobennosti. [Science in Russia: Specifics of the Process of its Organization]. *Vestnik RFFI*, 4, 24-47.

Avis, G. (1983). Access to Higher Education in the Soviet Union. In J.J. Tomiak (Ed.), *Soviet Education in the 1980s*. (pp.199-239). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Avis, G. (Ed.). (1987). *The Making of the Soviet Citizen: Character Formation and Civic Training in Soviet Education*. London: Croom Helm.

Avis, G. (1990). The Soviet Higher Education Reform: Proposals and Reactions. *Comparative Education*, 26(1), 5-12.

Avrus, A.I. (2001). *Istoriya rossiskih universitetov: Ocherki*. [Essays on the History of Russian

Universities]. Moscow: MION.

Baabar. (2010). *Istoria Mongolii: ot mirovogo gospodstva do sovetskogo satellita*. [History of Mongolia: from World Dominance to Soviet Satellite]. Kazan: Tatarskoe knizhnoe izdatelstvo.

Babel, I.I. (1936). Konarmia. [Red Cavalry]. In I.I. Babel, *Izbrannye rasskazy* (pp.1-67). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Ogonek.

Babitskiy, A.G. (2009). *Mezhdunarodnye aspekty Grazhdanskoi voiny v Ispanii (1936-1939) v kontekste vneshnei politiki Germanii i Italii*. [International Aspects of Civil War in Spain (1936-1939) in the context of German and Italian international policies]. Tambov: Izdatelstvo TGU.

Baichun, C., Fan, Y., Tszuchun, C., Lun, C. (2010). *Peredacha tehnologij iz Sovetskogo Soiuz a v Kitaj, 1949-1966*. [Delivery of Technologies from the USSR to China, 1949-1966]. St.-Petersburg: Nestor-Istoria Press.

Baidenko, V.I. (1999a). *Obrazovatelnyy standart: opyt sistemnogo issledovaniya*. [Educational Standard: Experience of Systematic Study]. Nizhniy Novgorod: NGU im. Mudrogo.

Baidenko, V.I. (1999b). *Standarty v nepreryvnom obrazovanii: konceptualnie, teoreticheskie i metodologicheskie problemy*. [Quality Standards in Continuous Education: Conceptual, Theoretical, and Methodological Problems]. Moscow: ICPKPS.

Baidenko, V.I. (2004). *Bolonskiy Process: kurs lekcii*. [Bologna Process: lecture course]. Moscow: Logos.

Baidenko, V. I. (Ed.). (2010). *Osnovnye tendencii razvitiya vysshego obrazovaniya: globalnye i bolonskie izmereniya*. [Main Tendencies in Development of Higher Education: Global and Bologna Changes]. Moscow: Issledovatskiy tsentr promlem kachestva podgotovki specialistov.

Bailes, K. (1978). *Technology and Society under Lenin and Stalin: Origins of Soviet Technical Intelligentsia, 1917-1941*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bain, O. (2003). *University Autonomy in the Russian Federation Since Perestroika*. New York, NY: Routledge Chapman & Hall.

Bainev, V.F. (2002). Problemy integracii obrazovaniya stran-uchastnic SNG i Zapadnoi Evropy. [Problems of Educational Integration between NIS and EU countries]. *Integraciya Obrazovaniya*, 1, 4-9.

Bakunin, M. (1992). On Education. In: *The Basic Bakunin Writings: 1869-1871*, (pp.111-126). NY: Prometheus Books. (Original work published 1869).

Balmforth, T. (2011). *Russian Universities Are Struggling to Adapt to the Bologna Process*. Retrieved from: [http://russiaprofile.org/special\\_report/33765.html](http://russiaprofile.org/special_report/33765.html)

Balyhin, G.A. (2010). *K voprosu o sovremennom sostoyanii avtonomii vuzov Rossii*. [To the Current Status of Autonomy Issue for Russian Universities]. Retrieved from: <http://www.almavest.ru/ru/favorite/2010/06/23/158/>

Balzer, H., Gilbert, L. (2011). Civil Society. In: G.Gill, J. Young (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Russian Politics & Society* (pp.364-374). New York, NY: Routledge.

Barblan, A. (2002). *Academic Cooperation and Mobility in Europe: How it is, How it Should Be*. Retrieved from: [http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/CEPES\\_30thAn.1069322899147.pdf](http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/CEPES_30thAn.1069322899147.pdf)

Barkan, M. Sh., Shuvalov, Yu.V. , Dompalm, E.I. (2001). Perspektivy podgotovki kadrov vysshei kvalifikacii v svete integracii vuzovskoi i fundamentalnoi nauki. [Prospects for training of highly-qualified professional manpower in light of integration between university studies and fundamental research]. In: *Modernizacia Rossii na rubezhe vekov* (pp. 85-87). St.Petersburg: SPbGU Press.

Bartkov, V. (2011). *Yak borotitsya z porushennyami v rosiyskikh vuzah*. [How it is Possible to Fight with the Violations in Russian Universities]. Kiev: Institut Gorchenina.

Bashkirova, V., Solovyev, A., Dorofeev, V. (2012). *Geroi 90-h. Lyudi i dengi. Noveyshaya istoria kapitalizma v Rossii*. [Heroes of 1990s: People and Money. Modern History of Capitalism in Russia]. Moscow: Alpina Press.

Bastrakova, M.S. (1973). *Stanovlenie sovetskoj sistemy organizacii nauki. 1917-1922*. [Formation of the Soviet Organization of Science, 1917-1922] Moscow: Nauka.

Batsaihan, B. (2004). *Teoria i praktika stanovleniya i razvitiya pedagogicheskogo obrazovaniya v Mongolii v XX veke*. [Theory and Practice of the Formation and Development of Pedagogical Education in Mongolia through the XX century]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/teoriya-i-praktika-stanovleniya-i-razvitiya-pedagogicheskogo-obrazovaniya-v-mongolii-v-xx-ve>

Batsaihan, Zh. (2012). *Irkutskie vuzy – kuznitsa mongolskikh kadrov*. [Irkutsk higher educational establishments as the blacksmith of Mongolian professional manpower]. Retrieved from: [http://mongolpred.irkobl.ru/sites/mongolpred/news/news\\_mon/detail.php?ID=253685](http://mongolpred.irkobl.ru/sites/mongolpred/news/news_mon/detail.php?ID=253685)

Baudrillard, J. (1981). *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. St. Louis, MO: Telos Press Ltd.

Bazhanov, B. G. (1992). *Vospominaniya byvshego sekretarya Stalina*. [Memoirs of the Former Stalin's Secretary]. St. Petersburg: Vsemirnoe slovo.

Bebel, A. (1910). *Woman and Socialism*. Retrieved from: <http://marxists.anu.edu.au/archive/bebel/1879/woman-socialism/index.htm>

Becker, A., Horelick, A. (1989). *Managing U.S. - Soviet Relations in the 1990 s*. Santa-Monica, CA: RAND Co.

Belaya kniga Rossiyskogo obrazovaniya. [White book of Russian Education]. (2000). Moscow: MESI Press.

Belov, V.A. (2000). *Podgotovka kadrov dlya zarubezhnykh stran v sovetskikh vuzakh: vtoraya polovina 60-h – konec 80-h godov*. [Soviet Universities Training Professional Manpower for the Foreign Countries: Second Half of 1960s – End of 1980s]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/podgotovka-kadrov-dlya-zarubezhnykh-stran-v-sovetskikh-vuzakh-vtoraya-polovina-60-kh-konets-#ixzz2EiAs0gAb>

Bernstein, T.P., Hua-Yu Li. (Eds.). (2010). *China Learns from the Soviet Union, 1949–Present*. Plymouth: Lexington Books.

Besancon, A. (1974). *Education et Societe en Russie*. [Education and Society in Russia]. Paris: Mouton Publishers.

Bespalko, V. P. (1996). The Problem of Educational Standards in the United States and Russia. *Russian*



*Education and Society*, 38(1), 28-41.

Bezborodov, A.B. (1997). *Vlast i nauchno-tehnicheskaya politika v SSSR serediny 50-serediny 70-h godov*. [Political Power and Scientific-Technical Policy in the USSR in the mid-1950s - mid-1970s]. Moscow: Mosgorarhiv.

Bezymensky, A. I. (Ed.). (1924). *Revolucia na marshe*. [Revolution on March]. Moscow: Molodaya Gvardia.

Bo Yibo. (1991). *Vospominania o nekotorykh vazhneyshih resheniyah i sobyitiyah*. [Memories About Some Important Events and Decisions]. Pekin: Chgungo Danieschi Chubansche.

Bobylo, A. (2012). *Sovremennye tendencii razvitiya vysshego obrazovaniya i ugrozy nationalnoi bezopasnosti Rossii*. [Modern tendencies in Development of Higher Education and Russian National Problems]. Retrieved from: <http://ifl.wl.dvfu.ru/8452>

Bocharova, Z.S. (2005). Organizatsionno-obrazovatelnye voprosy pravovoy osnovy i istoricheskii opyt 20-30 godov 20 veka. [Organization of education in the Russian communities abroad: legal basis and historical experience of 1920-30s]. *Pravo i obrazovanie*, 5, 190-203.

Bodrova, E.V., Nikitina, S.B. (2009). Krizis sistemy obrazovaniya. Poisk novoi paradigmy obrazovaniya na rubezhe 20-21 vekov. [Crisis of Educational System. Search for New Paradigm of Education on the Brink Between 20th and 21st Centuries]. Retrieved from: <http://www.mosgu.ru/nauchnaya/publications/2009/professor.ru/Bodrova&Nikitina.pdf>

Boguslavsky, M. M., Lazarev, L.V., Marysheva, N. I. (1981). *Inostrantsy v SSSR: Pravovoe polozhenie*. [Foreigners in the USSR: Legal Status]. Moscow: Progress.

Bolotina, E., Dergachev, A., Charskaya, L. (2009). *Otdel vysshikh uchebnykh zavedenii TsK KPSS 1953-1966. Spravochnik dokumentov*. [Department for Higher Education and Science, TsK CPSU 1953-1966]. Moscow: Rossiiskaya politicheskaya enciklopediya.

Bolshakova, K.G. (Ed.). (1990). *Sbornik materialov i dokumentov AN SSSR, 1917-1930 gg.* [Collection of Materials and Documents of the USSR Academy of Sciences]. Leningrad: Nauka.

Bonch-Bruevich, V. D. (1930). *Na boevykh postakh Fevral'skoi i Oktyabr'skoi revolyutsii*. [On the fighting posts of February and October 1917 revolutions]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Federatsiya.

Bond, S. (2006). *Transforming the Culture of Learning: Evoking the International Dimension in Canadian University Curriculum*. Retrieved from <http://www.yorku.ca/yorkint/global/archive/conference/canada/papers/Sheryl-Bond.pdf>

Bondarenko, N., Vetrov, Yu. (2001). Obrazovatel'naya strategiya: voprosy i problemy. [Educational Strategy: questions and problems]. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 3, 15-24.

Boobbyer, P. (2000). *The Stalin Era*. London: Routledge.

Borshchova, N.L. (2006). *Rol gosudarstva v razvitiy kommercializatsii vysshego obrazovaniya v Rossii*. [Role of the State in the Progress of Commercialization of Higher education in Russia]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/rol-gosudarstva-v-razvitiy-kommertsializatsii-vysshego-obrazovaniya-v-rossii>

Borshchova, N.L., Eremin, V.V. (2005). Osobennosti processa kommercializatsii vysshego obrazovaniya v

- Rossii. [Specifics of the Process of Commercialization of Higher Education in Russia]. *Vestnik TPGU*, 5(49), 92-96.
- Borisov, V. M. (2008). *Vysshaya shkola Rossiiskoi Federatsii v usloviakh sistemnykh reform (1984-1999)*. [Higher Education of Russian Federation in the conditions of systematic reformation, 1984-1999]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/vysshaya-shkola-rossiiskoi-federatsii-v-usloviyakh-sistemnykh-reform-1984-1999-gg>
- Borisov, O.B., Koloskov, B.G. (1980). *Sovetsko-kitaiskie otnosheniya (1945-1980)*. [Soviet-Chinese Relations in 1945-1980s]. Moscow: Mysl.
- Brickman, W.J., Zepper. (1992). *Russian and Soviet Education, 1732-1988: A Multilingual Annotated Bibliography*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brown, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Contemporary Russian Politics. A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, A. (2009). *The Rise and Fall of Communism*. New York, NY: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Brzezinski, Z. (1967). *The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bubnov, A.S. (1931). O kulturnykh zadachah Sovetskoï shkoly. [About Cultural Tasks of Soviet Education]. In A.S. Bubnov. *Collection of Articles and Speeches about Education* (pp. 370-372). Moscow: APN RSFSR.
- Bubnov, A. S. (1959). O sisteme narodnogo obrazovaniya. [About People's Education System]. In A.S. Bubnov. *Statyi i rechi o narodnom obrazovanii* (pp. 40-71). Moscow: APN RSFSR. (Original work published 1929).
- Bugaenko, P.A. (1967). *Lunacharskiy i literaturnoe dvizhenie 20-h godov*. [Lunacharsky and development of literature in 1920s]. Saratov: SGU Press.
- Bukharin, N. I. (1924). *O mirovoi revolutschii, nashei strane, culture i prochem (otvet akademiku I.Pavlovu)*. [On World Revolution, Our Country, Culture and More (Response to Academician Pavlov, I.)] Leningrad: Gosizdat Press.
- Bulgakova, N. (2012). *K nashei nische. Internacionalizatsiya obrazovaniya pomoget Rossii zanyat dostoinoe mesto v mire*. [To our niche. Internationalization of Education will help Russia to Occupy Respectable Place in the World]. Retrieved from: <http://www.poisknews.ru/theme/edu/3682>.
- Bulleten rassekrechennykh dokumentov federalnih gosudarstvennykh arkhivov, Vypusk 5*. [Bulletin of Declassified Documents from Russian Federal State Archives. Issue 5]. (2004). Retrieved from: <http://rusarchives.ru/secret/bul5/index.shtml>
- Burn, B.B., Smuckler, R.H. (1995). *A Research Agenda for the Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States*. Carbondale, IL: AIEA
- Butyagin, A., Saltanov, U. (1957). *Universitetskoe obrazovanie v SSSR*. [University education in the USSR]. Moscow: MGU Press.
- Carnoy, M. (1999). *Globalization and Educational Reform What Planners Need to Know*. Paris: UNESCO-IIEP.

- Carnoy, M. (2005). Globalization, Educational Trends and the Open Society. In *Education and Open Society: A Critical Look at New Perspectives and Demands*. Budapest: OSI.
- Chamberlin, W.H. (1930). *Soviet Russia: A Living Record and A History*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Chanbarisov, Sh.B. (1988). *Formirovanie sovetskoi universitetskoi sistemy*. [Formation of the Soviet university system]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Chernomorova, T.V. (2001). Globalizacia obrazovaniya: rol mezhdunarodnyh organizatsii. [Globalization in Education: the Role of International Organizations]. In *Globalizatsia i obrazovanie: sbornik obzorov* (pp. 115-142). Moscow: INION RAN.
- Chernomorova, T. V. (2002). Mezhdunarodnye organizatsii i globalizatsiya obrazovaniya. [International Organizations and Globalization of Education]. *Ekonomika Obrazovaniya*, 1, 44-59.
- Chernyshov, S. (2007). *Rossiia suverennaya: kak zarabotat vmeste so stranoy*. [Sovereign Russia: How It Is Possible to Make a Profit Together with the Country]. Moscow: Evropa.
- Chertok, B.E. (2007). Pervyi iskusstvennyi sputnik Zemli. [The First Artificial Earth Satellite]. In *Pervaya kosmicheskaya* (pp.12-23). Moscow: IKI RAN.
- Chertoprud, S.V. (2002). *Nauchno-tehicheskaya razvedka ot Lenina do Gorbacheva*. [Academic and Technical Intelligence from Lenin to Gorbachev]. Moscow: OLMA-Press.
- Chesnova, L.V. (1999). Nauka i vlast v Sovetskoi Rossii v 1918-nachale 30-h godov. [Science and Power in Soviet Russia, 1918-1930s] In *IJET RAN. Godichnaya nauchnaya konferentsia* (pp. 279-282). Moscow: Press IJET RAN.
- Chichkin, A. (2009). *Kitai vzyal u nas samoe luchshee. Osobennosti kitaiskoi politiki i ekonomiki*. [China took from us the very best. Specifics of Chinese politics and economy]. Retrieved from: <http://www.stoletie.ru/print.php?ID=39573>
- Chistohvalov, V. (2004). Kreditnie edinicy vkhodyat v rossiyskuu visshuju shkolu. [Credit Units are Entering Russian Higher Education]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 4, 26-37.
- Chistohvalov, V. N., Filippov, V.M. (2009). Mezhdunarodnoe sotrudnichestvo professorsko-prepodavatel'skikh kolektivov v rossiiskih vuzakh. Uchastie v programme TEMPUS. [International Cooperation of the Russian Universities Teachers: Participation in the Tempus Program]. *Vestnik RUDN*, 6, 5-15.
- Chizhevsky, A.L. (1974). *Vsya zhizn*. [The Whole Life]. Moscow: Sovetskaya Rossia.
- Chudinov, V.A. (2012). *Problemy vesternizatsii rossiiskoi gumanitarnoi nauki*. [Problems of Westernization in Russian Liberal Sciences]. Retrieved from: [http://old.rguts.ru/electronic\\_journal/number42/contents](http://old.rguts.ru/electronic_journal/number42/contents)
- Chudnov, V.P. (1993). *Rossiyskoe obrazovanie: instoriya i sovremennoe sostoyanie* [Russian Education: History and Modern Standing]. Moscow: IRYAP
- Chufarov, V. G. (Ed.) (1989). *Istoricheskiy opyt partiinogo rukovodstva vysshey shkoly*. [Historical Experience of the Party Supervision of Higher Education]. Sverdlovsk: UGU.
- Chuev, F. I. (2002). *Molotov: Poluderkhavyi vlastelin*. [Molotov: Semi-Sovereign Ruler]. Moscow: Olma-

Press.

Chuhlomin, V.D. (2004). *O strategii vyhoda obrazovatel'nogo uchrezhdenia na vneshniy rynok*. [About a University Strategy of Emerging at the International Educational Market]. Retrieved from: <http://www.mavriz.ru/articles/2004/4/3403.html>

Chuntulov, V. T. (1987). *Ekonomicheskaya istoria SSSR*. [Economic History of the USSR]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.

Churakov, D.O. (2011). Vyhod SSSR iz mezhdunarodnoi izolyatsii. [Withdrawal of the USSR from International Blockade]. In D.O.Churakov, *Stanovlenie sovet'skoi politicheskoi systemy: 1917-1941 gody*. Moscow: MPGU.

Churchill, W. L. S. (1986). *The Second World War*. Boston: Mariner Books.

Chutkerashvili, E.V. (1968). *Kadry dlya nauki (Spetsialisty vysshey kvalifikatsii v SSSR i kapitalisticheskikh stranah)*. [Training Cadre for Science (Specialists with the Highest Qualification in the USSR and in the Capitalistic Countries)]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.

Cohn, R. (2013). *Yagodin Gennady Alekseevich*. Moscow: VSD.

Cole, M. (2007). *Marxism and Educational Theory: Origins and Issues*. London: Routledge.

Connelly, J. (2000). *Captive University: The Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education, 1945-1956*. Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Press.

Coumel, L. (2006). L'appareil du parti et la réforme scolaire de 1958. Un cas d'opposition à Khrouchtchev. [Party Leadership and the Educational Reform of 1958. The Case of Opposition to Khrushchev]. *Cahiers du Monde Russe*, 1 (47), 73-194.

Counts, G. S. (1957). *The Challenge of Soviet Education*. NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Cousins, N. (1953). *Who Speaks for Man?* New York, NY: Macmillan.

Crowther, J.G. (1930). *Science in Soviet Russia*. London: Williams & Norgate Ltd.

*Cultural relations, exchanges for 1989-1991: program of cooperation between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, signed at Moscow May 31, 1988*. (1993). Washington, D.C.

Cunningham, S., Ryan, Y., Stedman, L., Tapsall, S., Bagdon, K., Flew, T., Coaldrake, P. (2000). *The Business of Borderless Education*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Currie, J., Newson, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Currie, J. (2003). Understanding the impact of globalisation on universities. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 17, 16 - 23.

Currie, J., DeAngelis, R., de Boer, H., Huisman, J., Lacotte, C. (2003). *Globalizing Practices and University Responses: European and Anglo-American Differences*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Dahlman, C., Andersson, T. (2000). *Korea and the Knowledge-Based Economy: Making the Transition*.

Washington, D.C.: World Bank-OECD.

Danilov, I.P., Senikov V.I. (2002). Universitetskiy kompleks kak bazovaya struktura innovacionnoi deyatel'nosti v regione. [University Complex as a Basic Structure for the Innovation Activities in a Region]. *Izvestiya Rossiiskoi Akademii Obrazovaniya*, 1, 125-133.

Danilov, S.Yu. (2004). *Grazhdanskaya voyna v Ispanii (1936-1939)*. [Civil War in Spain, 1936-1939]. Moscow: Veche.

Danilova, I. S. (2007). *Stanovlenie i razvitie mongolovednykh issledovaniy v Buryatii s XIX v. po 1911 g.* [Formation and Development of Mongolian Studies in Buryatia]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/stanovlenie-i-razvitie-mongolovednykh-issledovaniy-v-buryatii-s-xix-v-po-1911-g>

Danilovich, A.V. (2012). V poiskah sobstvennoi modeli razvitiya: reforma vysshego obrazovaniya na postsovet'skom prostranstve. [In Search of an Individual Development Model: Higher Education Reform in the Post-Soviet Space]. *Alma mater: Vestnik vysshey shkoly*, 12, 9-14.

David-Fox, M. (1997). *Revolution of the Mind: Higher Learning Among the Bolsheviks, 1918-1929*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

David-Fox, M., Peteri, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers, and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Davidson, A.B., Mazov, S.V. (1999). *Rossiya i Afrika. Dokumenty i materialy*. [Russia and Africa. Documents and Materials]. Moscow: IVI RAN.

Davidson, A., Mazov, S., Tsyarkin, G. (2002). *SSSR i Afrika. 1918-1960. Dokumentirovannaya istoriya vzaimootnosheniy*. [The USSR and Africa. 1918-1960: The Documented History of Relations]. Moscow: IVI RAN.

Davies, T. J. (1992). Developing a Strategy for Internationalization in Universities: towards a conceptual framework. In C. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education* (pp.177-190). Carbondale, IL: AIEA.

Davis, T. J. (2000). Developing Web-based Science Lessons Using TrackStar. In *PEER Presentations* (pp.12-27). Dallas: TAMU Press.

Davies, S., Harris, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Stalin: A New History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, R.W., Harrison, M., Wheatcroft, S.G. (1994). *The Economic Transformation of the Soviet Union, 1913-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davydov, Yu.S. (1997). Visshee obrazovanie: sostoyaniye, problemy, resheniya. [Higher Education: Status, Problems, Decisions]. *Pedagogika*, 2, 61-67.

De Greve, J. (2010). Internationalisation: the way forward. In *The Multilingual Challenge: the next generation CEL/ELC Forum Speeches and Statements* (pp.16-21). Berlin: Freie Universität.

De Wit, H. (1999). Changing Rationales for the Internationalization of Higher Education. *International Higher Education*, 15, 2-3.

De Wit, H. (2000). *Changing Rationales for the Internationalization of Higher Education*. Bucharest, Romania: UNESCO/CEPES.

De Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport: Greenwood.

De Wit, H. (2005). European Integration in Higher Education: The Bologna process Towards a European Higher Education Area. In P.G.Altbach, J.F.Forest (Eds.), *International Handbook of Higher Education* (pp.461-482). Dordrecht: Springer.

De Wit, H. (2009). *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe. A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

De Wit, H. (2011). *Trends, Issues and Challenges in Internationalisation of Higher Education*. Amsterdam: Hogeschool van Amsterdam.

De Wit, H., Callan, H. (1995). Internationalisation of Higher Education in Europe. In H. De Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for Internationalization of Higher Education. A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States* (pp. 67-98). Amsterdam: EAIE.

DeWitt, N. (1955). *Soviet Professional Manpower. Its Education, Training, and Supply*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

DeWitt, N. (1961). *Education and Professional Employment in the U.S.S.R.* Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

Deaver, M. V. (2001). *Democratizing Russian Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-82473408/democratizing-russian-higher-education>

Deklaratsiya prav narodov Rossii, 2(15) noyabrya 1917g. [Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia, 2(15) November, 1917]. (1957). In *Dekrety Sovetskoi Vlasti, Vol.1* (pp. 39-41). Moscow: Gosizdat Polit. Literatury.

Deklaratsiya prav trudyashegosya i expluatiруемого naroda, 3(16) yanvary 1918g. [Declaration of Rights of the Working and Exploited People, 3(16) January, 1918]. (1957). In *Dekrety Sovetskoi Vlasti, Vol.1* (pp. 314-322). Moscow: Gosizdat Polit. Literatury.

Dekret ob uchrezhdenii gosudarstvennoi komissii po prosvesheniю, 9 (22) noyabrya 1918 g. [Decree on the Establishment of the State Commission for Enlightenment, November 9 (22), 1918]. (1957). In *Dekrety Sovetskoi Vlasti, Vol.1* (pp. 59-62). Moscow: Gosizdat Polit. Literatury.

Dekret VTCIK i SNK ob unichtogenii sosloviy i grazhdanskikh chinov, 11(24) noyabrya 1917g. [Decree on the cancelation of social hierarchy and civic ranks, 11(24) November, 1917]. (1957). In *Dekrety Sovetskoi Vlasti, Vol.1* (pp. 71-72). Moscow: Gosizdat Polit. Literatury.

Delgerzhav, M. (2007). *Modernizatsia sistemy povysheniya kvalifikatsii pedagogicheskikh kadrov v Mongolii*. [Modernization of the vocational training system for professional educators in Mongolia]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/modernizatsiya-sistemy-povysheniya-kvalifikatsii-pedagogicheskikh-kadrov-v-mongolii>

Demberel, E. (2011). *Evolucia sistemy obrazovaniya v Mongolii*. [Evolution of Education System in Mongolia]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/evolyutsiya-sistemy-obrazovaniya-v-mongolii>

Demidova, E.I. (2007). *Stanovlenie i razvitie sovetskoi vysshei shkoly v 1920-1930 gg.* [Formation and

Development of Soviet Higher Education in 1920-30s]. Saratov: Izdatelstvo SGU.

Denisova, A.V., Baranov, K.A. (2008). *Problemy inostrannykh studentov v Rossii: rezultaty issledovaniya v ramkakh programmy "Zashchita prav inostrannykh studentov v RF"*. [Problems of international students in Russia: results of the study in the frame of the Program "Protection of Foreign Students Rights in Russian Federatio"]. Voronezh: Proflit.

Derzhavin N. S. (1923). *Vysshaya shkola i revoliuciya*. [Higher Education and Revolution]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR.

Dewey, J. (1897). *My Pedagogic Creed*. Retrieved from: <https://archive.org/details/mypedagogiccree00dewegoog>

Dezhina, I.G. (2002). "Utechka umov" iz postsovetskoi Rossii: evoljucija yavleniya i ego otsenok. [Brain Drain from Post-Soviet Russia: Evolution of the Phenomenon and its Evaluation]. *Naukovedenie*, 3, 25-56.

Dezhina, I.G. (2005). *Vklad mezhdunarodnykh organizatcii i fondov v reaormirovanie nauki v Rossii*. [Impact of International Organizations and Foundations on Reforms in Russian Science]. Moscow: IEPP Press.

Dgakipova, C.S. (1991). *Universitetskoe obrazovanie: vchera, segodnya, zavtra*. [University Education: yesterday, today, tomorrow]. Bishkek: KGU Press.

Dibrova, M.I., Kabanova, M.N. (2004). Izmeneniya v structure vuza kak sledstvie internacionalizacii obrazovaniya. [Changes in Academic Structure as the Result of Internationalization in Education]. *Universitetskoe obrazovanie*, 2(30), 58-60.

*Direktivy VKP (b) i postanovleniya sovetского pravitelstva o narodnom obrazovanii. Sbornik dokumentov 1917-1947*. [Directives of VKP (b) and decisions of Soviet Government About People's Education. Collection of Documents, 1917-1947]. (1947). Moscow: APN RSFSR.

Dmitriev, N.M. (2002). *Vyssee obrazovanie: aspekty mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva*. [Higher Education: Aspects of International Cooperation]. In: *Mezhdunarodnoe sotrudnichestvo kak factor modernizacii vysshego obrazovaniya v Povolzhskom regione* (pp.6-17). Saratov: SGTU Press.

Dmitriev, N.M. (2003a). *Exportnyi potencial rossiyskikh vuzov*. [Export potential of Russian universities]. Moscow: Vyssee obrazovanie.

Dmitriev, N.M. (2003b). *Obrazovatelnye uslugi – vysokodohodnaya otrasl ekonomiki*. [Educational Services – Highly Profitable Branch of Economy]. *Vestnik Rossiyskoi Akademii Nauk*, 73(2), 104-109.

Dneprov, E.D. (1992). *Razvitie obrazovaniya v Rossii*. [Development of Education in Russia]. Moscow: Ministerstvo obrazovaniya Press.

Dneprov, E.D. (2006). *Mezhdunarodnoe sotrudnichestvo kak factor reformirovaniya rossiyskogo obrazovaniya*. [International cooperation as a Component of Russian Education Reformation]. Moscow: Evrika.

Dneprov, E. D. (2011). *Noveishaya politicheskaya istoria rossiiskogo obrazovaniya: opyt i uroki*. [Modern Political History of Russian Education: Experience and Lessons]. Moscow: Marios.

Dobbins, M., Knill, C. (2009). Higher Education Policies in Central and Eastern Europe: Convergence toward a Common Model? *Governance*, 22(3), 397–430.

- Dorofeev, G.V. (2010). *Khrushchev: intrigi, predatelstvo, vlast.* [Khrushchev. Intrigues. Treason. Power]. Moscow: Mozaika-Sintez.
- Dokumenty Gosobrazovanie SSSR: Programma "Obshestvennoe Mnenie".* [Documents of the USSR State Committee for Education: "Public Opinion" Program]. (1990). Retrieved from: <http://www.sovso.ru/docum.html>
- Dokumenty vneshnepoliticheskoi komissii TSK VKP (b) za 1949-1953 gody, hranyashiesya v RGASPI.* [Documents of TsK VKP (b) Central Commission for International Affairs, 1949-1953 from Archive RGASPI]. Retrieved from: <http://www.rusarchives.ru/secret/bul7/vnesh.shtml>
- Dovejko, A.B. (2011). *Otnoshenie prepodavatelei visshei shkoly k negosudarstvennym vuzam.* [The attitude of university teachers to non-state higher educational institutions]. Retrieved from: <http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/2012/03/02/1269107106/Doveiko.pdf>.
- Drobizhev, V.Z. (1966). *Glavnyi shtab socialisticheskoi promyshlennosti. Ocherki istorii VSNH, 1917-1932.* [Headquarters of Socialist Industry. Essays on the History of VSNH, 1917-1932]. Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Dudareva, N.A. (2010). Internationalizatsia rossiiskoi sistemy vysshego obrazovaniya: export obrazovatelnykh uslug. [Internationalization of Russian Higher Education System: Export of Educational Services]. *Vestnik IGEU, 1*, 1-5.
- Duncan, J.S., Pravda, A. (Eds.). (1990). *Soviet-British Relations since the 1970s.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dvadsat let sovetskoi vlasti. Statisticheskii sbornik.* [20 years of Soviet Power]. (1937). Moscow: Partizdat TsK VKP (b).
- Dvadsat shestoi syezd KPSS. Stenograficheskiy otchet.* [26th CPSU Congress. Stenographic Report]. (1981). Moscow: Politizdat.
- Dvadsat vtoroi syezd KPSS. Stenograficheskiy otchet.* [XXII CPSU Congress. Stenographic Report]. (1961). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Dyatlov, S.A. (1995). *Ekonomika obrazovaniya v usloviyah perekhodnogo perioda.* [Economics of Education in the conditions of transformation period]. St.Petersburg: SPBUEF Press.
- Ebuchi, K. (1989). *Foreign Students and Internationalization of Higher Education: Proceedings of OECD/Japan Seminar on Higher Education and the Flow of Foreign Students.* Hiroshima: Hiroshima University.
- Edding, F. (1958). *Internationale Tendenzen in der Entwicklung der Ausgaben für Schulen und Hochschulen.* [International Tendencies in Secondary and Higher Education]. Kiel: Kieler Studien Froese.
- Efimova, E.M. (2010). Vysshee obrazovanie na rynke obrazovatelnykh uslug kak obyekt dlya ekonomicheskogo analiza. [Higher Education on the Market of Educational Services as an Object for Economic Analysis]. *Armia i obshchestvo, 3*, 35-40.
- Efremov, A.P. (2005). Bolonskiy Process - Vyzov ili Tehnologiya? [Bologna Process – Challenge or Technology]. *Voprosy Obrazovaniya, 4*, 23-31.



- Egorov N. (1968). Sovetskiy Universitet. [Soviet University]. *Vestnik Visshey Shkoly*, 3, 23-32.
- Ehrenburg, I.G. (1961). Ottepel. [Thaw]. In I. G. Ehrenburg, *Gody, lyudi, zhizn*, Vol.2 (pp.1-16). Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya Literatura.
- Eklof, B., Holmes, L.E., Kaplan, V. (Eds). (2005). *Educational Reform in Post-Soviet Russia: Legacies and Prospects*. New York: Frank Cass.
- Eletskiy, N. D., Kornienko, O.V. (2007). Mehanizmy korrupcii v vuzah Rossii. [Mechanisms of Corruption in Russian Universities]. In *Gosudarstvennaya politika protivodeistvia korrupcii i tenevoi ekonomiki v Rossii* (pp. 724-732). Moscow: Nauchnyi expert.
- Elkina, A.S. (2008). Internatsionalizatsiya obrazovatelnoi deyatel'nosti rossiyskikh vuzov v sovremennykh usloviyakh. [Academic Internationalization of Russian Universities in Modern Realities]. *Vestnik VGU*, 1, 171-176.
- Elutin, V.P. (1959). *Vysshey shkola strany socializma*. [Higher Education of the Socialist Country]. Moscow: Prosveshenie.
- Elutin, V.P. (Ed.). (1967). *50 let vysshei shokle SSSR (1917–1967)*. [50 years of Higher Education in the USSR]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Elutin, V.P. (1980). *Vysshey shkola obschestva razvitoogo sotchializma*. [Higher Education of the Society of Developed Socialism.] Moscow: Nauka.
- Emerson, M. (2005). *EU-Russia – Four Common Spaces and the Proliferation of the Fuzzy*. Retrieved from: [www.ceeol.com/aspx/getdocument.aspx?logid=5&id=7db6de7dd6f74fd7b33bcae3032d4c1d](http://www.ceeol.com/aspx/getdocument.aspx?logid=5&id=7db6de7dd6f74fd7b33bcae3032d4c1d)
- Emikh, N. A. (2012). Internationalizatsiya vysshego obrazovaniya i Bolonskiy protsess: problema sohraneniya natsionalnoi identichnosti. [Internationalization of higher education and the Bologna process: issue of national identity preservation]. *Istoricheskaya i sotsialno-obrazovatel'naya muzh*, 4, 216-220.
- Enders, J. (2004). Higher education, internationalisation, and the nation-state: Recent developments and challenges to governance theory. *Higher Education*, 47(3), 361-382.
- Engels, F. (1847). Printsipy kommunizma. [The Principles of Communism]. In *MECW*, Vol. 4 (pp. 322-339). Moscow: Politizdat.
- Engels, F. (1878). Dialektika prirody. [On Dialectics]. In *MECW*, Vol. 20 (pp. 339-626). Moscow: Politizdat.
- Engels, F. (1880). Razvitiye sotsializma ot utopii k nauke. [Socialism: Utopian and Scientific]. In *MECW*, Vol. 19 (pp. 185-230). Moscow: Politizdat.
- English, R.D. (2000). *Russia and the Idea of the West: Gorbachev, Intellectuals, and the End of the Cold War*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Esakov, V.D. (1971). *Sovetskaya nauka v gody pervoi pyatiletki*. [Soviet Academia During First Five-Year Plan]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Esakov, V.D. (2000). *Dokumenty Politburo TsK kak istochnik po istorii akademii nauk*. [Documents of Politburo TsK as a Source on the History of Academy of Sciences]. Moscow: ROSSPEN.

- Esakov, V.D., Rubinin P.E. (2003). *Kapitsa, Kreml i nauka*. [Kapitsa, Kremlin and Science]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Esenykin, B.S. (2005). Bolonskiy process – standartizacia ili svobodnyi polet. [Bologna Process – Standardization or a Freedom Flight]. *Vysshee obrazovanie segodnya*, 5, 22-24.
- Evseeva, E.N. (2001a). Emigrantskaya i sovetskaya shkola 1920h godov. [Education of 1920s: Soviet and Immigrant]. *Novyi istoricheskii vestnik*. 3, 13-36.
- Evseeva, E.N. (2001b). Obyedinenie russkikh emigrantskikh studencheskikh organizatsii in 1921-1934. [Merger of Russian immigrant student organization in 1922-1934]. *Novyi Istoricheskii Vestnik*, 1(3), 3-21.
- Fadeev, A. A. (1926). Razgrom. [Defeat.]. In Fadeev A. A., *Sobranie sochineniy*, Vol.1 (pp. 34 -275). Moscow: Sovetskyi Pisatel.
- Fadeev, A. (1957). *Za 30 let. Avtorskiy sbornik*. [30 years of writing, author's collection]. Moscow: Sovetskyi Pisatel.
- Fadeev, N. V. (1974). *Sovet Ekonomicheskoi Vzaimopomoshchi*. [The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance]. Moscow: Ekonomika.
- Fedorov, A.V. (2000). Stanovlenie professionalnogo obrazovaniya v Rossii i zarubezhnykh stranah v 20 veke. [Establishment of Vocational Education in Russia and in Foreign Countries in the 20th century]. *Innovatsii v obrazovanii*, 3, 18-24.
- Fedorova, E.P. (2010). Inostrannye studenty v rossiiskom vuze. [Foreign Students in Russian Universities]. In *Obrazovanie, nauka i modernizatsia* (pp.10-16). Moscow: NEA Press.
- Fedoseev, P. (1945). *Velikaya osvoboditelnaya missia Krasnoi Armii*. [Great Liberation Mission of Red Army]. Moscow: NKO Press.
- Fesykov, V. I., Kalashnikov, K. A., Golikov, V. I. (2004). *Sovetskaya Armia v gody "holodnoi voiny" (1945-1991)*. [Soviet Army During the Years of Cold War]. Tomsk: TGU Press.
- Feuchtwanger, L. (1937). *Moskva 1937*. [Moscow, 1937]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura Press.
- Filippov V.M. (1993). *Prakticheskiy opyt organizatsii i funkcionirovaniya VUZov v usloviyah rynochnoi ekonomiki*. [Practical experience of organization and administration of higher educational institutions in the realities of market economy]. Moscow: PAIMS.
- Fillipov, V.M. (Ed.). (1994). *Masshtaby, struktura i formy akademicheskoy mobilnosti*. [Magnitude, Structure and Forms of Academic Mobility]. Moscow: RUDN Press.
- Filippov V.M. (2000). Rossiyskoe obrazovanie: sostoyanie, problemy, perspektivy. [Russian Education: Status, Problems, Prospects]. *Narodnoe Obrazovanie*, 2, 42-51.
- Filippov, V.M. (2001). Visshaya shkola Rossii pered vizovami XXI veka. [Russian Higher Education Facing Challenges of the 21 Century]. *Visshee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 1, 5-15.
- Filippov, V.M. (2003). *Modernizatsiya rossiyskogo obrazovaniya*. [Modernization of Russian Education]. Moscow: Prosveshenie.
- Filippov, V.M., Chistohvalov, V.N. (2003). Rossiyskoe visshye obrazovanie na puti peremen. [Russian

Higher Education on Transformation Path]. *Vestnik RUDN*, 2, 7-20.

Filippov V.M., Krasnova G.A. (2010). Upravlenie processom internacionalizatsii v vuze: opyt Rossiiskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. [The management of the processes of internationalization of higher education: experience of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia]. *Universitetskoe upravlenie: praktika i analiz*, 3, 12-15.

Fionova, L.K. (2006). *Nauka mertvaya i nauka zhivaya*. [Science Dead and Science Alive]. Retrieved from <http://old.za-nauku.ru/?mode=text&id=1011>

Firsova, S.P., Kurdumova, M.N. (2012). Strategicheskie napravleniya effektivnogo mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva sovremennogo tehnikeskogo universiteta. [Strategic Directions for International Cooperation of a Modern Technical University]. *Fundamentalnye Issledovaniya*, 6(2), 309-313.

Fitzpatrick, S. (1970). *The Commissariat of Enlightenment. Soviet Organization of Education and the Arts under Lunacharsky, 1917-1921*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foderaro, S. (1976). *Independent Africa*. Toronto: Macmillan.

Froese L., Haas R., Anweiler O. (1961). *Bildungswettlauf zwischen West und Ost*. [Race in Education between West and East]. Freiburg: Herder KG.

Frolov, A.V. (2011). Vliyaniye mirovogo ekonomicheskogo krizisa 2008-2009 gg. na vysshee obrazovanie i ego globalizatsiyu. [Influence of the world economic crisis of 2008-2009 on higher education and its globalization]. *Alma Mater (Vestnik vysshei shkoly)*, 3, 67-73.

Frolov, Yu. V., Mahotin, D.A. (2004). Kompetentnostnaya model kak osnova ocenki kachestva podgotovki specialistov. [Competence of Graduates as the Basis for Education Quality Evaluation]. *Vysshee obrazovanie segodnya*, 8, 34-41.

Froumin, I. D. (2011). Eastablishing a New Research University: The Higher School of Economics, the Russian Federation. In P.G. Altbach, J. Salmi (Eds.), *The Road to Academic Excellence: The Making of World-Class Research Universities* (pp. 293-322). Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Froumin, I.D. (2013). *Institut obrazovaniya Vysshei Shkoly ekonomiki*. [Institute of Education at Higher School of Economics]. Retrieved from: <http://ioe.hse.ru/obrashenie>

Furman, D., Zadorozhnuk, E. (2004). Prityazhenie Baltii. Baltiyskie russkie i baltiyskie kultury. [Attraction of Baltic Region: Baltic Russians and Baltic Culture]. *Mir Rossii*, 3, 98-130.

Fursenko, A.A. (2006 a). *Studencheskiy sekvestr*. [Reduction of Student Numbers Nationwide]. Retrieved from: <http://lenta.ru/articles/2006/05/22/fursenko/>

Fursenko, A.A. (Ed.) (2006b). *Prezidium TsK KPSS 1954-1964: chernovye zapisi zasedaniy, stenogrammy, postanovleniya*. [Presidium of TSK CPSU 1954-1964: Draft Protocols of Sessions, Stenographic Reports, Decisions]. Moscow: ROSSPEN.

Fursenko, A.A. (2006c). *Kriteriem otsenki deyatel'nosti vuzov Rossii dolzhna stat vostrebovannost vypusnikov*. [Criteria of the Success for the Russian Universities Should Become Request for its Graduates from National Industries]. Retrieved from <http://lenta.ru/articles/2006/05/22/fursenko/>

Fursenko, A. A. (2011). *Obrazovanie i modernizatsiya*. [Education and Modernization]. Retrieved from <http://echo.msk.ru/programs/dozor/645214-echo>

- Gagarinsky, A., Yatchishina, E. (2013). Ot sekretnoi laboratorii k nationalnomu issledovatel'skomu tsentru. [From a Secret Lab to the National Research Center]. *Nauka v Rossii. RAN*, 2, 59-68.
- Gaidar, Y.T., Pohl K.O. (1995). *Russian Reform /International Money*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gaidar, Y.T., Chubais, A. B. (2011). *Razvilki noveyshei istorii Rossii*. [Crossroads of Modern Russian History]. Moscow: OGI Press.
- Galagan, A. I. (2000). Integracionnie processy v oblasti vsshego obrazovaniya v stranah SNG. [Integration Processes in Higher Education between the NIS countries]. *Sotsialno-gumanitarnye znaniya*, 2, 208-222.
- Galaktionov, V. (2004). Megdunarodnaya praktika vzaumnogo priznaniya dokumentov ob obrazovanii i professional'nykh kvalifikatsiy. [International practice of mutual recognition of the educational and qualification certificates]. *Visshiee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 2, 28-40.
- Galenskaya, L. N. (1982). *Pravovoe polozhenie inostrancev v SSSR*. [Legal Status of Foreigners in the USSR]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
- Galkin, K.T. (1958). *Visshiee obrazovanie i podgotovka nauchnykh kadrov v SSSR*. [Higher education and training of scholars in the USSR]. Moscow: Sovetskaya nauka.
- Galushkina, M. (2004). *Export obrazovaniya*. [Export of education]. Retrieved from [http://expert.ru/expert/2004/28/28ex-mir\\_47747/](http://expert.ru/expert/2004/28/28ex-mir_47747/)
- Gaponenko, A.L., Orlova, T.M. (2008). *Upravlenie znaniyami. Kak prevratit znaniya v kapital*. [Management of Knowledge. How Knowledge Can be Converted into a Capital]. Moscow: Exmo.
- Gavrilov, K.A., Yuatsenko, E.B. (Eds.). (2012). *Uchebnaya migratsiya iz stran SNG i Baltii: potentsial i perspektivy dlya Rossii*. [Educational Migration from NIS and Baltic countries: Potency and Prospects for Russia]. Moscow: Nasledie Evrazii.
- Germanskaya sluzhba akademicheskikh obmenov. Moskovskoe predstavitel'stvo*. [German Academic Exchange Service. Moscow Representation Office]. (2013). Retrieved from: <http://www.daad.ru/>
- Gershenzon, S.M. (1996). Moskovskiy universitet. Dvadtchatye gody. [Moscow University. 1920s.]. *Priroda*, 2, 78-87.
- Gibianskii, L. Yu. (Ed.) (1995). *U istokov "sotsialisticheskogo sodruzhestva": SSSR i vostochno-evropeyskie strany v 1944-1949 g.g.* [At the source of "socialist commonwealth": the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe in 1944-1949]. Moscow: RAN Press.
- Gibianskii, L. Yu. (2003). Forsirovaniye sovetskoi blokovoii politiki. [Enforcement of the Soviet Bloc formation policy]. In *Kholodnaya voyna: 1945-1963 g.g. Istoricheskaya retrospektiva* (pp. 137-186). Moscow: Olma-Press.
- Gilmundinov, V.M. (2011). Modernizatsiya ekonomiki Rossii skvoz prizmu strukturnoi politiki. [Modernization of Russian Economy Through the Prism of Structural Policy]. In *Sotsialno-ekonomicheskaya modernizatsiya Rossii i stran SNG: 20 let na postsovetskom prostranstve* (pp. 131-133). Novosibirsk: Price-Kuryer Press.
- Gladkov, I.A. (1956). *Ot plana GOELRO k planu 6 pyatiletki*. [From GOELRO Plan to the 6th Five-year Plan]. Moscow: Gosizdat.

- Glagolev, V.S. (2005). *Afera s SOFE: istoriya odnoi ekonomicheskoy diskussii*. [Problem with SOFE Plan: History of One Economic Discussion]. Retrieved from: <http://www.whoiswho.ru/russian/Curnom/62005/sofe.htm>
- Glowka, D. (1987). The Unfinished Soviet Education System. In J. Dunstan (Ed.), *Soviet Education under Scrutiny* (pp. 11-31). Glasgow: Jordanhill College Press.
- Gokhberg, L. (1997). *Russian Research and Development: A Sectoral Analysis*. Retrieved from: <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=steep40.pdf&site=25>
- Gohberg, L. M., Mindely, L. E., Nekipelova, E. F. (1994). Emigracia uchenyh: problemy, realnye otsenki. [Immigration of Academics: Problems, Real Estimation]. In Zh. A. Zaionchkovskaya, *Migratsiya spetsialistov iz Rossii: prichiny, posledstviya, otsenki* (pp.3-18). Moscow: TsISN RAN.
- Goldgeier, J., McFaul, M. (2003). *Power and Purpose: U.S. Policy Toward Russia After the Cold War*. Washington, DC Brookings Institution Press.
- Goldin, V. I., Zhuravlev, P. S. (2000). *Vysshее obrazovanie i nauka v Rossii i v sovremennom mire*. [Higher Education and Science in Russia and I Modern World]. Arkhangelsk: PGU Press.
- Golenkova, Z. T. (2003). *Socialnaya stratifikatsiya obshchestva*. [Social Stratification of Society]. Moscow: Institut sociologii RAN.
- Gollancz, V. (1947). *Germany Revisited*. Retrieved from: <http://library.fes.de/fulltext/sozmit/1947-104-1org.pdf>
- Golubev, A.E. (2000). Universitet družby narodov: Uchrezhdenie. Start. Pervye shagi 1960-1965 g.g. [People's Friendship University: Establishment, Beginning, and The First Steps. 1960-1965]. In *RUDN 40 let. Istoria i sovremennost*. Moscow: RUDN Press.
- Golubev, L.V. (2004). Dobro pozhalovat ili postoronnim vhod vospreshen: k voprosu o zakrytosti mezhuvoennogo sovet'skogo obshchestva. [Welcome or Strangers are not Allowed: To the Issue of Closeness of the Soviet Society between the World Wars]. *Otechestvennaya Istoriya*, 4, 32-53.
- Gorbachev, M.S. (1988). *Perestroika i novoe myshlenie dlya nashei strany i dlya vsego mira*. [Perestroika and "New Thinking" for our country and for the world]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Gorbachev, M.S. (1990). *Izbrannyye rechi i statyi*. [Selected Speeches and Articles]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Gorbachev, M.S. (1993). *Gody trudnykh resheniy*. [Years of Difficult Decisions]. Moscow: Alfa-Print.
- Gorbachev, M.S. (1995). *Zhizn i reformy*. [Life and Reforms]. Moscow: Novosti.
- Gorbachev, M.S. (1998). *Razmyshleniya o proshlom i budushem*. [Thoughts about Past and Future]. Moscow: Terra.
- Gorbachev, M.S. (1999). *Kak eto bylo*. [How it was]. Moscow: Vagrius.
- Gorbachev, M.S. (2012). *Naedine s soboi*. [Alone with Myself]. Moscow: Grin Strit.
- Gorodetskiy, E.N. (1965). *Rozhdenie Sovetskogo gosudarstva, 1917-1918*. [Formation of Soviet State, 1917-1918]. Moscow: Nauka.

- Gorohovatskaya, N. V. (2007). Mezhdunarodnyi runok obrazovatelnyh uslug i nacionalnye strategii exporta obrazovaniya. [International Market of Educational Services and National Strategies for the Export of Education]. *Vestnik RGPU*, 9(47), 12-15.
- Graham, L. (1975). The Formation of Soviet Research Institutes: A Combination of Revolutionary Innovation and International Borrowing. *Social Studies of Science*, 5(3), 303-329.
- Graham, L. (1987). *Science, Philosophy, and Human Behavior in the Soviet Union*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Graham, L.R. (1993). *Science in Russia and the Soviet Union. A Short History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, T. E. (2002). *Russia's Decline and Uncertain Recovery*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- Graivoronskiy, V.V. (2007). *Reformy v sotcialnoi sfere Mongolii*. [Social Reforms in Mongolia]. Moscow: Institut Vostokovedeniya RAN.
- Gramsci, A. (2011). *Prison Notebooks*. NY: Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1971).
- Grebnev, L.S. (2004). Rossiya v Bolonskom protsesse: seredina bolshogo puti. [Russia in Bologna Process: In the Middle of a Great Path]. *Vyshee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 4, 3-17.
- Grechishkin, V.A. (1976). *Socializm i obrazovanie*. [Socialism and Education]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Grechko, A.A. (1976). *Gody voyny*. [Years of War]. Moscow: Voenizdat.
- Gribanova, V.V. (2009). *Afrikantsy v Rossii: obrazovanie, brak, sudba*. [Africans in Russia: Education, Marriage, Destiny]. Moscow: Institut Afriki RAN.
- Gribanova, V.V., Zherlitsina, N. A. (2008). Podgotovka studentov iz afrikanskih stran v vuzah Rossii. [Education of African students in Russian universities]. In *Afrika: kontinent i diaspora v poiskah sebya v 20 veke* (pp.58-70). Moscow: IVI RAN.
- Green F.M., Marmolejo, F., Egron-Polak, E. (2010). The Internationalization of Higher Education: Future Prospects. In D.K. Deardorff, H. De Wit, J. Heyl (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of Internaitonal Higher Education* (pp. 439-456). London: SAGE.
- Grigoriev, M.M. (1870). *Imperatorskiy Sankt-Peterburgskiy Universitet v pervie pyatdesyat let ego sushestvovaniya. Istoricheskaya zapiska*. [Imperial St. Petersburg University during the First Fifty Years since its Foundation. Historical Essay]. SPb: SPBU Press.
- Gunnarsson, M. (Ed). (2010). *International Research Cooperation in the Nordic Countries*. Oslo: Nordforsk.
- Guo Moruo. (1955). *Izbrannye Sochineniya*. [Selected Works]. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya Literatura.
- Guriev, S. (2009). *Mify ekonomiki: zabluzhdeniya i stereotypy, kotorye rasprostranyaut SMI i politiki*. [Myths of Economy: Misunderstandings and Stereotypes, Disseminated by Media and Politicians]. Moscow: Alpina Publisher.

- Guriev, S. (2010). *Korrupcia v vuzah*. [Corruption in Universities]. Retrieved from: <http://hbr-russia.ru/issue/61/2290/>
- Guseinov, G. (2004). *Sovetskie idiologemy v russkom diskurse 1990-h*. [Soviet Ideological Cliché in Russian language of 1990s]. Moscow: Tri Kvadrata Press.
- Gvishiani, J.M. (2004). *Mosty v budushchee*. [Bridges into Future]. Moscow: Editorial URSS.
- Gwyn, R., Slavova, P. (1997). *The Europeanization of European Universities: A view from the East*. UNESCO-CEPES.
- Hanin, G. I. (2002). Desyatiletie triumfa sovetskoi ekonomiki: gody pyatidesyatye. [The Decade of the Triumph of Soviet Economy: 1950s]. *Svobodnaya Mysl*, XXI (5), 23-36.
- Harari, M. (1989). *Internationalization of Higher Education: effecting institutional change in the curriculum and campus*. Long Beach, CA: CIE-CSU.
- Harper, S.N. (1929). *Civic Training in Soviet Russia*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Harrison, M. Davies, R.W. (1997). The Soviet Military-Economic Effort during the Second Five-Year Plan (1933-1937). *Europe-Asia Studies*, 49(3), 369-406.
- Hayes, D., Wynyard, R. (Eds.). (2002). *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Hazbulatov, R. (2012). *Pri pravitalstve Yeltsina pabotalo okolo 100 amerikanskih konsultantov*. [About 100 American Consultants worked with the Yeltsin's Government]. Retrieved from: <http://www.nakanune.ru/news/2012/11/19/22292425/>
- Hechinger, F. M. (1967). Education: Triumphs and Doubts. In H.E. Salisbury (Ed.), *The Soviet Union: The Fifty Years* (pp.131-165). New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Held, D., McGrew, A. (2003). *Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Heyneman, S. P. (1997). Russian Vocational and Technical Education in the Transition: Tradition, Adaptation, Unresolved Problems. *Institute for the Study of Russian Education Newsletter*, 6(1), 22-34.
- Hillegas, P., Milo B. (1915). Universities and Colleges. In F. M. Colby (Ed.), *The New International Year Book* (pp. 733-739). NY: Dodd, Mead and Company.
- Hisamutdinova, N.V (2007). Kak "otraslirovalas" vysshaya shkola na Dalnem Vostoke SSSR v 1930 gody. [How higher education was streamed by industrial departments on Far East in 1930s]. *Vysshhee obrazovanie segodnya*. 2007, 5, 74-77.
- Hoare J., Pares S. (1988). *Korea: An Introduction*. NY: Keegan Paul International.
- Holmes, B., Read, J., Voskresenskaya, N. (1995). *Russian Education: Tradition and Transition*. New York, NY: Garland.
- Horoshevsky, A. (2006). *Sto znamenityh simvolov sovetskoi epohi*. [A Hundred of Famous Symbols of Soviet Era]. Moscow: Folio Press.

- Hoteenkov, V.F. (1987). *Sistema upravleniya vuzami: 30e gody*. [System of Higher Education Administration: 1930s.]. *Vesnik Vysshei Shkoly*, 11, 19-28.
- Houser, G. M. (1989). *No One Can Stop the Rain: Glimpses of Africa's Liberation Struggle*. New York, NY: Pilgrim Press, 1989.
- Huang, F. (2003). Policy and Practice of Internationalization of Higher Education in China. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 7(3), 225-240.
- Hufner, K. (2003). Governance and Funding of Higher Education in Germany. *Higher Education in Europe*, 28(2), 145-163.
- Husband, W. B. (1991). Administrative "Perestroika" and Rewriting History: The dilemma of "Glasnost" in Soviet education. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 29(4), 7-16.
- Joint Soviet-United States Statement on the Summit Meeting in Geneva, November 21, 1985. In *The Public Papers of President Reagan*. Retrieved from: <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1984/112185a.htm>
- Idiatullin, A.V. (2006). *Razvitie vysshego obrazovaniya v kontekste istoricheskikh i sociokulturnykh processov na rubezhe XX-XXI v.v.* [Development of Higher Education in the context of Historical and Socio-Cultural Processes on the brink of 20th-21st centuries]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/razvitie-vysshego-obrazovaniya-v-kontekste-istoricheskikh-i-sotsiokulturnykh-protsesov-na-r>
- Ignatiev, P. (2001). Proekt reformy obrazovaniya v Rossii. [Draft of Education Reform in Russia]. In Yu. A. Glinka. *Odinnadsat let v Gosudarstvennoi Dume. 1906-1917. Dnevnik i vospominania*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (Original work published 1916).
- Imamutdinov, I.N. (Ed.). (2009). *Issledovanie rossiiskoi nauchno- tehnologicheskoi diaspory v razvitykh stranah: uslovia i vozmozhnosti vozvrashchenia nauchnykh kadrov i ispolzovanie potentsiala*. [Study of the Russian Academic-Technological Diaspora in Developed Countries: Conditions of and Possibilities for Return to Russia and Further Use of the Potency of this Professional Manpower in Russia]. Moscow: Innovacionnoe buro Expert.
- Industrializatsiya Sovetskogo Souza: Novye dokumenty. Novye fakty. Novye podhody*. [Industrialization in Soviet Union: New Documents, New Facts, New Methods]. (1999). Moscow: IRI RAN.
- International, mezhdunarodnyi proletarskiy gimn, 1918*. [International, Worldwide Anthem of the Proletarians, 1918]. Retrieved from: <http://bse.slovaronline.com/>
- Internatsionalizatsiya obrazovaniya v Rossii, vklad programmy Tempus*. [Internationalization of Education in Russia: Input of Tempus Program]. (2010). Retrieved from: <http://www.aspu.ru/nauka/>
- Iodko, O.V. (1988). *Dokumenty po istorii Akademii nauk SSSR. 1926-1934 gg.* [Documents on the History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1926-1934]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Ioffe, A.E. (1975). *Mezhdunarodnye svyazi sovetsoi nauki, tehniki, kultury. 1917-1932*. [International Connections of Soviet Science, Technology and Culture, 1917-1932]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Iovanovitch, M. (2001). Russkie bezhentsy na serbskoi zemle. [Russian refugees on Serbian soil]. *Rodina*, 3, 12-25.
- Istoriya AIESEC v Rossii*. [History of AIESEC in Russia]. (2013). Retrieved from:



<http://www.aiesec.ru/about/aiesec-russia-history>

*Istoriya MIEPP*. [History of Moscow Institute of Economics, Politics, and Law]. (2013). Retrieved from: <http://www.miepl.ru/oficialnye-dokumenty.html>

*Istoriya obucheniya inostrannykh studentov v Rossii. Inostrannye studenty v Rossii: 1950-1990gody*. [History of Education of the Foreign Students in Russia. Foreign Students in Russia: 1950s-1990s]. Retrieved from <http://ru.education.mon.gov.ru/articles/2>

Ivanov, A.E. (1991). *Vysshaya Shkola Rossii v konce XIX – nachale XX veka*. [Higher Education in Russia at the end of XIX – beginning of XX centuries]. Moscow; Prosveshenie Press.

Ivanov, K.V. (2000). *Nauka posle Stalina: reforma Akademii 1954-1961 g.g.* [Science after Stalin: Reform of the USSR Academy of Sciences, 1954-1961]. Retrieved from: <http://vivovoco.rsl.ru/VV/PAPERS/HISTORY/POST.HTM>

Ivanova, I. S. (2005). *Sotsialno-ekonomicheskaya geografiya Zarubezhnoi Azii. Yugo-Vostochnaya Azia*. [Social-Economic Geography of Foreign Asia. South-East Asia]. Moscow: MGU Press.

Ivanova, L.V. (1980). *Formirovanie sovetskoi nauchnoi intelligentsii (1917-1927)*. [Formation of Soviet intelligentsia (1917-1927)]. Moscow: Nauka.

Ivanova, I. (2005). Realizatsiya Bolonskikh idei v Rossii: normativnye protivorechiya. [Realization of Bologna Ideas in Russia: legislative contradictions]. *Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie*, 3, 70-74.

Ivanovsky, Z.V. (2006). Vysshee obrazovanie v usloviyakh globalizatsii. [Higher Education in the Conditions of Globalization]. *Znanie. Ponimanie. Umenie*, 1, 109-114.

Jones, A. (Ed.). (1994). *Education and Society in the New Russia*. NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.

Johnson, M. S. (1998). Rethinking International Assistance for the Institutional and Professional Development of Post-Soviet Higher Education. *Education in Russia, the Independent States and Eastern Europe*, 16(2), 63-72.

Kablov, E. (2009). *Nauka kak otrasl ekonomiki*. [Science as a Branch of Economy]. Retrieved from: <http://www.nkj.ru/archive/articles/16516/>

Kaftanov, S.V. (1949). *Komsomol v borybe za peredovyuy nauku*. [Comsomol Fighting for Progressive Science]. Moscow: Pravda Press.

Kaftanov, S.V. (Ed.). (1952). *Narodnoe prosveshchenie i vysshee obrazovanie*. [People's Enlightenment and Higher Education]. Leningrad: AN SSSR Press.

Kaganovitch, L.M. (1935). *Pobeda metropolitena – pobeda socializma*. [Victory of Moscow Underground is a Victory of Socialism]. Retrieved from: [http://www.metro.ru/library/kak\\_my\\_stroili\\_metro/105/](http://www.metro.ru/library/kak_my_stroili_metro/105/)  
*Kak my stroili metro*. [How we were building the Moscow Underground]. (1935). Retrieved from: [http://www.metro.ru/library/kak\\_my\\_stroili\\_metro/](http://www.metro.ru/library/kak_my_stroili_metro/)

Kalabekov, I.G. (2007). *Rossiyskie reformy v tsifrah i faktah*. [Russian Reforms in Numbers and Facts]. Moscow: RUSAKI.

Kalinauckas, J. (1998). *EU Commission on Tempus developments. The Dynamics of Tempus in Higher Education. Conference Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.etf.eu.int>

- Kalynuk, A. (2012). *Sovetskaya vlast i obrazovanie v Zapadnoi Ukraine*. [Soviet Regime and Education in Western Ukraine]. Retrieved from: <http://www.vremia.ua/rubrics/ problemy/1741.php>
- Kalvermark, T., Van der Wende, M. (Eds.). (1997). *National Policies for the Internationalization of Higher Education in Europe*. Stockholm: National Agency for Higher Education.
- Kapitsa, P. L. (1994). *Vospominania, pisma, dokumenty*. [Memoirs, Letters, Documents]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Kapitsa, S. P. (2008). *Moi vospominaniya*. [My Memories]. Moscow: RPE.
- Kara-Murza, S. G. (2008). *Sovetskaya tsivilizatsiya ot nachala do nashih dney*. [Soviet Civilization: from the Beginning to Our Days]. Moscow: Algoritm Press.
- Karavaev, V. (2002). *Aisek: nam 5 let*. [AIESEC: we are 5 years old]. Omsk: AIESEC.
- Karabasov, Yu. S., Kozhitov, L.V., Livanov, D.V., Krishtul, A. Yu. (2003). Formirovanie innovatsionnogo universiteta v sisteme “Vuz-Nauka-Proizvodstvo-Rynok”. [Formation of an Innovative University in the System “University-Science-Industry-Market”]. *Vyshee Obrazovanie Segodnya*, 6, 13-19.
- Karlov, N.V. (1999). Reforma obrazovaniya. [Educational Reform]. *Vestnik RAN*, 69(2), 140-144.
- Karnauh, N.V., Min, H. (2011). Rossia i Kitai: istoricheskie aspekty sotrudnichestva. [Russia and China: Historical Aspects of Cooperation]. *Vektor nauki TGU*, 2(5), 234-237.
- Karpenko, M.P. (2008). Eksport rossiiskogo vysshego obrazovaniya. [Export of Russian Higher Education]. *Alma Mater*, 4, 35-36.
- Karpov, L. I., Severtsev, V. A. (Ed.). (1957). *Vysshaya shkola. Osnovnye postanovleniya, prikazy i instrukcii*. [Higher Education. Major Statements, Directives and Instructions]. Moscow: Sovetskaya nauka.
- Kasatkin, G.S. (2010). *K 75-letiu Moskovskogo metropolitena*. [To the 75th anniversary of Moscow Metro construction]. Retrieved from: <http://www.zdt-magazine.ru/publik/history/2010/05-10.htm>
- Kassow, S.D. (1989). *Students, Professors, and the State in Tsarist Russia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Katuntseva, N.M. (1977). *Opyt SSSR po podgotovke intelligentsii iz rabochih i krestyan*. [Experience of the USSR in training intellectual specialists from workers and peasants]. Moscow: Mysl Press.
- Kavelin, K.D. (1904). Nauka i universitety na Zapade i u nas. [Science and universities in the West and in our country.]. In K.D.Kavelin, *Sobranie sochinenii, Vol. 3* (pp. 5-240). St. Petersburg: Izdanie N. Glagoleva.
- Kellner, D. (2000). *Marxian Perspectives on Educational Philosophy: From Classical Marxism to Critical Pedagogy*. Retrieved from <http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/ essays/marxianperspectivesoneducation.pdf>
- Kerdivarenko, V.A. (1967). *Narodnoe obrazovanie v Moldavii za gody Sovetskoi vlasti*. [Public Education in Moldavia during the years of Soviet Regime]. Kishinev: Karpaty.
- Kerov, V. L. (2000). 8 avgusta i vsya ostavshayasa zhizn. [On the 8th of August and Through the Rest of

## Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia – References

- Life]. In *RUDN 40 let. Istoria i sovremennost* (p. 25). Moscow: RUDN Press.
- Kerr S. T. (1985). The Distant Puzzle: How Soviet Citizens Learn About the World. In E. Gumbert (Ed.), *A World of Strangers: International Education in the US, Russia, Britain, and India* (pp. 33-46). Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University Press.
- Kets de Vries, M., Florent-Treacy, E., Korotov, K., Shekshnia, S. (2004). *The New Russian Business Leaders*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Kheing, J. (2001). *Dzung Su Zousyan Lianmeng De Jiannan Licheng*. [Difficult way of China and the USSR to a Coalition]. Retrieved from: [http://www.nestorbook.ru/mod\\_cat/files/China.pdf](http://www.nestorbook.ru/mod_cat/files/China.pdf)
- Khromov, G. (2002). Rossiyskaya Akademia Nauk: istoria, mify i realnost. [Russian Academy of Sciences: history, myths and reality]. *Otechesvennyye Zapiski*, 7, 206-223.
- Khrushchev, N.S. (1962). *Kommunizm - mir i schastye narodov*. [Communism is Peace and Happiness of People]. Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura Gospress.
- Khrushchev, N.S. (1997). *Vospominania. Izbrannye fragmenty*. [Memories. Selected Fragments]. Moscow: Vagrius.
- Khrushchev, N.S. (1999). *Vremya. Ludi. Vlast. (Memuary)*. [Time. People. Power. (Memoirs)]. Moscow: Moskovskie Novosti.
- Khrushchev, S.N. (2010). *Nikita Khrushchev: Reformator*. [Nikita Khrushchev: Reformer]. Moscow: Vremya.
- Kim Il-sung. (1958). *Za stroitelstvo sotcialisticheskoi ekonomiki v nashei strane*. [Construction of Socialist Economy in Our Country]. Pyongyang: Publishing House for Literature in Foreign Languages.
- Kinelev, V.G. (Ed.). (1995). *Vyshee obrazovanie v Rossii: Ocherki istorii do 1917g*. [Higher Education in Russia: History Review up to 1917]. Moscow: NIIVO.
- King, R., Marginson, S. Naidoo, R. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Kireev, M. (2010). *Marode Forschung in Russland: Exodus des Wissens*. [Ailing Research in Russia: Exodus of Knowledge]. Retrieved from: <http://www.spiegel.de/wissenschaft/mensch/>
- Kisilev, A.F. (2003). Modernizatciya vishego obrazovaniya i kluchevie aspekty effektivnosti podgotovki specialistov. [Modernization of higher education and key-aspects of the efficient vocational training]. *Visshee obrazovanie segodnya*, 2, 3-8.
- Kisilev, K. (2010). *Chastnie vuzy Rossii otmelili dvadcatiletie*. [Private Universities of Russia Celebrated 20th Anniversary]. Retrieved from: [http://www.strf.ru/material.aspx?CatalogId=221&d\\_no=29338#.UqP45-LhOUM](http://www.strf.ru/material.aspx?CatalogId=221&d_no=29338#.UqP45-LhOUM)
- Kislitsyn, K. N. (2010). *Bolonskiy process kak projekt dlya Evropy i Rossii*. [The Bologna Process as a Project for Europe and Russia]. Retrieved from <http://www.zpu-journal.ru/e-zpu/2010/11/Kislitsyn/>
- Klasek, C. (1992). Inter-institutional Cooperation Guidelines and Agreements. In C. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education* (pp.108-128). Carbondale, IL: AIEA.

- Klikunov, N.D. (2001). *Diskriminacia negosudarstvennyh vuzov kak factor negativnogo vozdeistvia na effektivnost funkcionirovaniya sistemy vysshego obrazovaniya Rossii*. [Discrimination of Non-State Higher Educational Institutions as a Factor of Negative Impact on the Effectiveness of Russian Higher Education System]. Retrieved from: <http://old.mebik.ru/pages/klikunov/articles/art/discrim.pdf>
- Kline, G. L. (Ed.). (1957). *Soviet Education*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and Checkpoints*. Ottawa: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Knight, J. (1999). *A Time of Turbulence and Transformation for Internationalization*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Bureau for International Education.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33(6), 2-3.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization Remodeled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Knight, J. (2006). *Internationalization of Higher Education: New Directions, New Challenges*. Paris: International Association of Universities.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Internationalization of the Curriculum*. Retrieved from: [http://library.queensu.ca/webedu/grad/Internationalization\\_of\\_the\\_Curriculum.pdf](http://library.queensu.ca/webedu/grad/Internationalization_of_the_Curriculum.pdf)
- Knight, J. (2010). Internationalization: Reactor or Actor to the Competition Imperative? In L.Portnoi, V. Rust, S.Bagley (Eds.), *Higher Education, Policy, and the Global Competition Phenomenon* (pp. 205-219). Gordonsville: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knyazev, G. A., Koltsov, A.V. (1964). *Kratkiy ocherk istorii Akademii nauk SSSR*. [Short Essay on the History of the USSR Academy of Sciences]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Knyazev, E.A., Kluev A.K. (2008). Strukturnye preobrazovaniya v vysshei shkole Rossii: problem i perspektivy. [Structural transformations in Russian higher education: problems and prospects]. *Universitetskoe Upravlenie: praktika i analiz*, 5(57), 6-11.
- Kokarev, E., Birukova, L. (1999). Poisk novogo urovnya mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva. [Search for a New Level of International Cooperation]. *Mezhdunarodnoe sotrudnichestvo*, 1, 12-13.
- Kolchinskiy, E.I. (2003). Sovetizacia nauki v gody NEPa (1922-1927): poslerevolutsionnyi krizis i poisk form sotrudnichestva. [Sovietization of Academia in the years of NEP: after-revolutionary crisis and search for new forms of cooperation, 1922-1927]. In *Istoriko-sravnitelnye Ocherki* (pp. 440-549). St. Petersburg: STPU.
- Kolesov, M.S. (2011). Stalin i grazdanskaya voina v Ispanii. [Stalin and civil War in Spain]. *Vestnik SevNTU*, 123(3), 35-62.
- Komkov, G.D., Levshin, B.V., Semenov L.K. (1977). *Akademia nauk SSSR: kratkiy istoricheskiy ocherk*. [Academy of Sciences of the USSR: Short Historical Essay]. Moscow: Nauka press.
- Kondakov, A.M. (2001). Problemy razvitiya sistemy mezhdunarodnogo obrazovaniya. [System of International Education: Problems of development]. *Ekonomika Obrazovaniya*, 3, 35-37.

- Kondratiev, V.N. (1966). *Nikolai Nikolaevitch Semenov*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Konechny, P. (1999). *Builders and Deserters: Students, State and Community in Leningrad, 1917-1941*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Konferencia zagranichnyh sekcii RSDRP 1915 goda. [Conference of Foreign Sections of RSDRP]. (1954). In *KPSS v rezolutsiah i resheniah syezdov, konferencii i plenumov TcK. 1898-1953* (pp. 325-331). Moscow: Gosizd politicheskoi literatury.
- Konstantinov, N.A., Medynskiy, E.N., Shabaev, M.F. (1982). *Istoriya Pedagogiki*. [History of Education]. Moscow: Prosveshenie.
- Konstantinovskiy, D.L., Verevkin, K.P. (Eds.). (2003). *Obrazovanie i nauka v processe reform: sociologicheskii analiz*. [Education and science in the Process of Reforms: Sociological Analysis]. Moscow: TsCP.
- Konstitutciya RSFSR, prinyataya 5-m Vserossiyskim Siezdom Sovetov 10 iyulya 1918g.* [Constitution of RSFSR, adopted by the 5th All - Russian Congress of Soviets, July 10, 1918]. Retrieved from: <http://www.hist.msu.ru/ER/Text/cnst1918.htm>
- Konttinen, S., Tight, M. (2002). Institutional Models of Higher Education. In S. Konttinen (Ed.). *Dynamic Concept Analysis: Integrating Information in Conceptual Models* (pp. 107-129). Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Kopelevitch, U.H. (1997). K istorii sovetsko-germanskogo nauchnogo sotrudnichestva v 1926-1932 g.g. [About the history of Soviet-German academic cooperation in 1926-1932]. In *Materialy egegodnoi nauchnoi konferencii Instituta istorii estestvoznaniya i tehniki im. S. I. Vavilova* (pp. 153 -155). Moscow: Yanus.
- Koptiug, V.A. (2007). O reorganizatsii nauchnyh uchrezhdeniy i organizatsiy CO RAN [On the reorganization of academic establishments and units of the Siberian Sector of the Russian Academy of Sciences]. In V.D. Ermikov, N.A. Pritvits, O.V. Podojnitcina (Eds.), *Strategiya liderov, 1957-2007* (pp.318-336). Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Korol, A. (1957). *Soviet Education for Science and Technology*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Korrupcia v sfere obrazovaniya. [Corruption in the Field of Education]. (2008). In Sulakshin, S. S. (Ed.). *Gosudarstvennaya politika protivodeistviya korrupcii i tenevoi ekonomike v Rossii. Vol.1* (pp. 246-259). Moscow: Naychniy expert.
- Kortunov, A.V. (2010). Globalnoe upravlenie: mezhdunarodnye instituty, modeli, pravo. [Global Management: International Institutions, Models, Legislation]. In *Strategicheskie tsennosti i politicheskaya struktura Evro-Antlanticheskoi bezopasnosti* (pp.30-39). Moscow: MGIMO.
- Korzhihina, T.P. (1992). *Istoriya gosudarstvennyh uchrezhdeniy SSSR: Materialy k istochnikovedeniю i istorigrafii, 1917-1990gg.* [History of State Establishments of the USSR: Materials for Bibliography and Historiography]. Moscow: RGGU.
- Koshel, P.A. (2005). *SSSR. Vneshnaya politika v 1945-1985 g.g.: nachalo "Holodnoi voyny"*. [USSR. International Policy in 1945-85: Beginning of Cold War]. Moscow: OLMA-Press.
- Kotz, D., Weir, F. (2007). *Russia's Path from Gorbachev to Putin: The Demise of the Soviet System and the New Russia*. NY: Routledge.

- Kouptsov O., Tatur Y. (2001). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the Russian Federation*. Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES.
- Kozhevnikov, A.B. (1990). *Etapy nauchnoi politiki v SSSR (1917-1941)*. [Periods in the USSR Academic Policy (1917-1941)]. In: Vtoraya konferentsia po socialnoi istorii sovetskoi nauki. Tezisy. Moscow: Vyshsaya shkola.
- Kozhevnikov, A. B. (1993). Filantropiya Rokfelleri i sovetskaya nauka. [Rockefeller's Philanthropy and Soviet Academia]. *Voprosy istorii estestvoznaniya i tehniki*, 2, 80-111.
- Kozlov, B.I. (2000). Vklad Akademii nauk v industrializatsiu Rossii. [Input of the Academy of Sciences into Industrialization of Russia]. *Vestnik RAN*, 12, 1059–1068.
- Kozlov, V., Lokteva, O. (1997). Arhivnaya revoliutsia v Rossii (1991-1996). [Archival Revolution in Russia, 1991-1996]. *Svobodnaya mysl*, 1, 117-121.
- Kozlova, T., Puffer, S. (1994). Public and Private Business Schools in Russia: Problems and Prospects. *European Management Journal*, 12, 462-468.
- Kozyrev, A. (1995). *Preobrazhenie*. [Conversion]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
- Krainov, G.N. (2008). Bolonskiy protsess i problemy modernizatsii vysshego obrazovaniya v Rossii. [Bologna Process and Problems of Higher Education Modernization in Russia]. *Fundamentalnye issledovaniya*, 9, 76-78.
- Krapivina, N. S., Makeev, N.A. (2006). *Sovetskaya sistema prosvetsheniya: printchipy formirovaniya, osobennosti funkcionirovaniya, regionalnaya spetsifika (1917-1936). Istoricheskie i pravovye aspekty*. [Soviet System of Enlightenment: Organizational Principles, Administration Peculiarity, Regional Specifics]. St. Petersburg: Yuridicheskaya Literatura.
- Krasilnikov, S.A. (2007). *Repressivniy vektor nauki v vostochnykh regionalakh strany*. [Repressive vector of science in the Eastern regions of the country]. Retrieved from: [http://history.nsc.ru/kapital/project/person/26.html#en\\*](http://history.nsc.ru/kapital/project/person/26.html#en*)
- Kravec, T.P. (1967). *Ot Nyutona do Vavilova*. [From Newton to Vavilov]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Krivitsky, W.G. (2011). *In Stalin's Secret Service*. New York, NY: Enigma Books.
- Krivososov, Y. I. (2003). *Partiinoe regulirovanie mezhdunarodnykh nauchnykh svyazei*. [Party Control of International Academic Communication]. Moscow: Dipol-T Press.
- Kropotkin, P.A. (1979). *Velikaya Frantsuzskaya Revolutsia, 1789-1793*. [Great French Revolution, 1789-1793]. Moscow: Nauka. (Original work published 1909).
- Krupskaya, N.K. (1913). O postanovke narodnogo obrazovaniya v Severnoi Ameriky i Zapadnoi Evrope: k sozyvu I Vserossiiskogo syezda po narodnomu obrazovaniyu. [About Public Education in North America and Western Europe: to the Convocation of the First Congress on Public Education]. In Krupskaya, N.K. (1957), *Pedagogicheskie sochineniya, Vol.1* (pp. 201-208). Moscow: APN.
- Krupskaya, N.K. (1915). Narodnoe obrazovanie i demokratia. [People's Democracy and Socialism]. In *KNK, Vol.1* (pp. 249-350). Moscow: APN.

- Krupskaya, N.K. (1918a). Kak organizovat delo narodnogo obrazovaniya v strane. [How Public Education in the Country Should be Organized]. In *KNK, Vol. 10* (2) (pp. 37-41). Moscow: APN.
- Krupskaya, N. K. (1918b). K voprosu o socialisticheskoi shkole. [To the Issue of Socialist School]. In *KNK, Vol. 10*(2) (pp. 7-19). Moscow: APN.
- Krupskaya, N.K. (1918c). K voprosu ob organizacionnoi politiki narodnogo komissariata po prosveshcheniu. [To the Issue of Organizational Policy of People’s Commissariat on Enlightenment]. In *KNK, Vol. 10*(2) (pp.69-73). Moscow: APN.
- Kruhmaleva, O.V. (2001). Sovremennie tendencii v poluchenii obrazovatelnykh uslug. [Modern Conditions of Getting Educational Services]. *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya*, 9, 83-88.
- Krymskaya, A.S. (2011). K istorii nauchno-obrazovatelnykh obmenov mezhdru SSSR i USA v kontse 1950-h – 1960-e g.g. [To the History of Academic Exchanges between the USSR and the USA, end of 1950s – 1960s]. *Noveishaya istoria Rossii*, 2, 99-106.
- Kulikova, Yu.P. (2012a). Formy mezhvuzovskogo sotrudnichestva za rubezhom. [Versions of interinstitutional cooperation with foreign universities]. *Pedagogika*, 9, 109-112.
- Kulikova, Yu. P. (2012b). Zarubezhny opyt innovacionnogo razvitiya vysshey shkoly na osnove vuzovskogo vzaimodeistvia. [Foreign Experience of the Innovation Development of higher Education on the Basis of Inter-University Collaboration]. *Universitetskoe upravlenie: praktika i analiz*, 2, 67-71.
- Kumok, Y. N. (1978). *Karpinskiy A.P. Pervyy Prezident AN SSSR*. [Karpinsky, A.P. First President of the USSR Academy of Sciences]. Moscow: Molodaya gvardia.
- Kulturnye i nauchnye svyazi mezhdru SSSR i MNR*. (1981). [Cultural and Academic connections between the USSR and PRM]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
- Kuraev, A.V. (1990). *Reforma Obsheobrazovatelnoy Shkoly RSFSR 1958-1964 (sotsialno-ekonomicheskyy aspekt)*. [Educational Reform of 1958-1964 in RSFSR: Socio-Economic Aspect]. Saratov: Izdatelstvo SGU.
- Kurlovich, K. (2012). *Problemy studentov obsuzhdayut v Minske predstaviteli profsoyuzov Belarusi, Rossii i Ukrainy*. [Student Problems were Discussed in Minsk by the Representatives of Student Trade Unions of Belarus, Russia and Ukraine]. Retrieved from: [http://www.belta.by/ru/all\\_news/society/ Problemy-studentov-obsuzhdajut-v-Minske-predstaviteli-profsoyuzov-Belarusi-Rossii-i-Ukrainy\\_i\\_593230.html](http://www.belta.by/ru/all_news/society/Problemy-studentov-obsuzhdajut-v-Minske-predstaviteli-profsoyuzov-Belarusi-Rossii-i-Ukrainy_i_593230.html)
- Kurochkin, V.K. (2011). *Rossiiskoe obrazovanie: iz veka proshlogo v vek gryadustchii*. [Russian Education: From the Previous Century to the Future Century]. Samara: SIOTO.
- Kuzminov, Ya. I., Radayev, V.V., Yakovlev, A.A. (Eds). (2006). *Universitetskie innovatsii: opyt Vysshei shkoly ekonomiki*. [University Innovations: Experience of the Higher School Of Economics]. Moscow: GU VSHE.
- Kuzminov, Yu. I., Semenov, D.S., Frumin, I.D. (2013). Struktura vuzovskoi seti: ot sovetskogo k rossiiskomu master-plany. [Structure of Higher Education Network: from the Soviet to the Russian Master-Plan]. *Voprosy obrazovaniya*, 4, 8-69.
- Kuznetsov, V.I., Idlis, G.M. (2000). Vazhniy aspekt integratsii obrazovaniya i nauki. [An important aspect of integration of education and science]. *Vestnik RAN*, 70(12) (pp. 1073-1076).

- Ladyzhetc, N.S. (1992). *Universitetskoe obrazovanie: idealy, tseli, tcennostnie orientatsii*. [University Education: ideals, goals, values]. Izhevsk: UdGU.
- Lahtin, G.A. (1990). *Organizaciya sovetskoj nauki: istoriya i sovremennost*. [Organization of Soviet Science: history and Modernity]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Laiko, M.Yu., Saginova, O. V., Fruezer, D. (2010). *Vygod rossijskikh vuzov na mezhdunarodnyj runok obrazovatelnykh uslug*. [Emergence of Russian Universities at the Global market of Educational Services]. Retrieved from: <http://www.marketologi.ru/publikatsii/stati/vykhod-rossijskikh-vuzov-na-mezhdunarodnyj-rynok-obrazovatelnykh-uslug/>
- Lankov, A. (2000). *Severnaya Korea: vchera i segodnya*. [North Korea: yesterday and today]. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura.
- Lapkin, V.V., Pantin, V. I. (2003). *Zapad i zapadnyi opyt sotcialno-politicheskogo razvitiya v rossijskom obshchestvennom soznanii*. [The Western World and the Western Experience of Social and political Development in the Russian Public Mentality]. Retrieved from: <http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/643/692/1219/022.LAPKIN.pdf>
- Lapko, A.F. (1972). Razvitie visshego obrazovania v SSSR v period trekh pervykh pyatiletok. [Progress of higher education in the USSR during the first three Five-year plans]. *Uspehi matematicheskikh nauk*, 6 (168), 68-83.
- Larionova, M.V. (2012). Mezhdunarodnoe sotrudnichestvo kak resurs razvitiya vuza. [International Cooperation as a University's Development Resource]. *Rektor VUZa*, 7, 22-27.
- Latsis, O. R. (1987). Problema tempov v socialisticheskom stroitelstve: razmyshleniya ekonomista. [The Problem of Pace in the Construction of Socialism: Considerations of an Economist]. *Kommunist*, 8, 5-17.
- Latypov, R. (2004). Internacionalizaciya: vyzov i shans dlya provincialnogo vuza. [Internationalization: challenge and chance for a provincial university]. *Politicheskie Issledovaniya*, 3, 162-167.
- Laureys, G. (1992). "Mobility Has Come to Stay": Management Strategies to Meet the Demands of Internationalization in Higher Education. *Higher Education Management*, 4(1), 108-120.
- Lavrova, O.V. (2004). Problemy uchastiya Rossii v evropeiskoi obrazovatelnoi integracii. [Russia's participation in European educational integration]. In A.S.Vostrikov (Ed.), *Problemy visshego tehničeskogo obrazovaniya* (pp.18-22). Novosibirsk: NGTU.
- Lebedeva, M. M. (Ed). (2006). *Bolonskiy process: problemy i perspektivy*. [Bologna Process: Problems and Prospects]. Moscow: Orgservis -2000 Press.
- Ledeneva, L.I. (2002). *Rossiiskie studenty za rubegom – perspektivi vozvrasheniya v Rossiiu*. [Russian students in abroad – perspectives of returning back to Russia]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Ledeneva, L.I. (2007). Sovremennaya emigraciya rossijskoj obrazovannoi molodezhi. [Modern emigration of educated Russian Youth]. In *Actualnie aspekty istorii i sovremennosti russkogo zarubezhia: paraleli i antitezy* (pp. 25-51). Moscow: IVI RAN.
- Ledeneva, L.I., Tyuryukanova, E.V. (2005). Orientacii detei migrantov na poluchenie vysshego obrazovania. [Orientation of Migrant's Children for Getting Higher Education]. *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya*, 4, 94-100.



- Lelchuk, V.S. (1984). *Industrializatsiya SSSR: istoriya, opyt, problemy*. [Industrialization in the USSR: History, Experience, Problems]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Lenin, V. I. (1897). *Zadachi russkikh social-demokratov*. [Tasks of Russian Social-Democrats]. In *LPPS, Vol. 5* (pp. 433-470). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V.I. (1899). *Popyatnoe napravlenie v russkoi social-demokratii*. [Backward Direction in Russian Social-Democracy]. In *LPPS, Vol. 4* (pp. 240-273). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1902). *Chto delat? Nabolevshie voprosy nashego dvizhenia*. [What Is To Be Done? Burning Questions of Our Movement]. In *LPPS, Vol. 6* (pp. 1-192). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1904). *Chego my dobivaemsa? (K partii)*. [What We Are Aiming For: To the Party]. In *LPPS, Vol. 9* (pp. 1-12). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V.I. (1905). *Dve taktiki social-demokratii v demokraticheskoi revolucii*. [Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in Democratic Revolution]. In *LPPS, Vol. 11* (pp. 1-131). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1908). *Uroki Komunny*. [Lessons of Commune]. In *LPPS, Vol. 16* (pp. 451-454). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1910). *O nekotorykh osobennostyakh istoricheskogo razvitiya marksizma*. [About Some Peculiarities of Marxist Historical Development]. In *LPPS, Vol. 20* (pp. 84-89). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1913). *Tri istochnika i tri sostavnykh chasti marxizma*. [The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism]. In *LPPS, Vol. 23* (pp. 40-48). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1915a). *Krakh 2 Internationala*. [The Collapse of II International]. In *LPPS, Vol. 26* (pp. 209-265). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1915b). *Sotsializm i voina (otnoshenie RSDRP k voine)*. [Socialism and War. Relation of RSDRP to War]. In *LPPS, Vol. 26* (pp. 307-350). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1915c). *O dvuh liniyakh revolucii*. [About Two Directions of Revolution]. In *LPPS, Vol. 27* (pp. 76-81). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V.I. (1915d). *U posledney cherty*. [At the End of Tether]. In *LPPS, Vol. 27* (pp. 267-274). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1916a). *Sotsialisticheskaya revolyuciya i borba za demokratiyu*. [Socialist Revolution and Struggle for Democracy]. In *LPPS, Vol. 27* (pp. 253-255). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1916b). *Imperializm, sotsializm i osvobozhdenie ugnennykh natsiy*. [Imperialism, Socialism, and Liberation of Oppressed Nations]. In *LPPS, Vol. 27* (pp. 252-253). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1916c). *Imperializm kak vysshaya stadiya kapitalizma*. [Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism]. In *LPPS, Vol. 27* (pp. 299-426). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1916d). *Imperializm i raskol sotsializma*. [Imperialism and Split of Socialism]. In *LPPS, Vol. 30* (pp. 163-179). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1916e). *Imperializm i pravo natsii na samoopredelenie*. [Imperialism and Right of Nations

- for Self-Determination]. In *LPPS, Vol. 27* (pp. 440-444). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1916f). O programme mira. [About Program of Peace]. In *LPPS, Vol. 27* (pp. 267-274). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1917a). Proshchalnoe pismo k shveitsarskim rabochim. [Farewell Letter to Swizz Workers]. In *LPPS, Vol. 31* (pp. 87-94). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V.I. (1917b). Zadachi proletariata v nashei revolucii. [Tasks of Proletariat in Our Revolution]. In *LPPS, Vol. 31* (pp. 149-186). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1917c). Gosudarstvo i revolucia. [State and Revolution]. In *LPPS, Vol. 33* (pp. 1-120). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1917d). O zadachah proletariata v dannoi revolucii. [About Tasks of Revolution in The Coming Revolution]. In *LPPS, Vol. 31* (pp. 113-118). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1917e). Grozyashchaya katastrofa i kak s ney borotsa. [Threatening Catastrophe and How to Struggle with It]. In *LPPS, Vol. 34* (pp. 151-199). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1918a). Rech na zasedanii Petrogradskogo soveta. [Speech at the Meeting of Petrograd Council]. In *LPPS, Vol. 35* (pp. 63-64). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1918b). Ocherednye zadachi Sovetskoi vlasti. [Next Tasks of Soviet Regime]. In *LPPS, Vol. 36* (pp. 165-208). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1919a). Rech na II Vserossiyskom Siezde uchiteley-internationalistov ot 18 yanvarya 1919 g. [Speech at the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Teachers-Internationalists, January 18, 1919]. In *LPPS, Vol. 37* (pp. 430-433). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1919b). Vse na borbu s Denikinym! [All should arise to fight Denikin]. In *LPPS, Vol. 39* (pp. 44-63). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1919c). O zadachah III Internatsionala [About the tasks of the 3rd International]. In *LPPS, Vol. 39* (pp. 90-109). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1920a). O rabote narkomprosa. [About Work of Narkompros]. In *LPPS, Vol. 42* (pp. 322-332). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1920b). Doklad o mezhdunarodnom polozhenii i osnovnyh zadachah kommunisticheskogo internatsionala. [Report on International Situation and Major Tasks of Communist International]. In *LPPS, Vol. 41* (pp. 215-235). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1920c). Zadachi souzov molodezhi. [Mission of Youth Unions]. In *LPPS, Vol. 41* (pp. 298-318). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1921a). Ob edinom hozyaistvennom plane. [About Unified Industrial Plan]. In *LPPS, Vol. 42*, (pp. 339-347). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Lenin, V. I. (1921b). Ob usloviyah, obespechivaushih nauchnuu rabotu akademika I.P. Pavolova i ego sotrudnikov. [On the provision of needed conditions for the successful work of academician I.P. Pavolov and his staff]. In *LPPS, Vol. 42* (pp. 262-263). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.

- Lenin, V. I. (1922). Proekt tezisov o roli i zadachah profsouzov v usloviyah Novoi Ekonomicheskoi Politiki. [Draft of Thesis about Mission of Trade Unions in the conditions of New Economic Policy]. In *LPPS, Vol. 44* (pp. 341-353). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.
- Letopis MGU, dokumenty za 1918*. [Chronology of MGU, Documents from 1918]. Retrieved from: <http://letopis.msu.ru/>
- Letopis MGU, dokumenty za 1926*. [Chronology of MGU, Documents from 1926]. Retrieved from: <http://letopis.msu.ru/>
- Letopis MGU, dokumenty za 1958*. [Chronology of MGU, Documents from 1958]. Retrieved from: <http://letopis.msu.ru/>
- Levin, A. (1988). Expedient Catastrophe: A Reconsideration of the 1929 Crisis at the Soviet Academy of Sciences. *Slavic Review*, 47, 261-279.
- Levin-Stankevich, B.L., Popovich, E. (1992). *The Soviet System of Education A PIER World Education Series Special Report*. Washington, D.C.: AACRAO.
- Levshin, V. (1986). *Dokumenty po istorii Akademii nauk SSSR, 1917-1925*. [Historical Documents of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1917-1925]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Liferov, A.P. (2002). *Global Education as a Trend Reflecting the Problems of Today and Meeting the Requirements of Tomorrow*. Retrieved from: <http://archive.is/rgCIY>
- Ligachev, E. K. (2012). *Boris byl ne prav*. [Boris was wrong]. Moscow: Algoritm.
- Lim, G.C. (1995). *Strategy for a Global University: Model International Department Experiment*. East Lansing, MI: MSU Press.
- Litvin, A., Keep J. (2005). *Stalinism: Russian and Western Views at the Turn of the Millennium*. London: Routledge.
- Livanov, D. (2013a). *Kak preobrazovat obrazovanie: razmyshlenia ministra*. [How is it Possible to Reform Education: Thoughts of a Secretary for Education]. *Ogonyok*, 21(5281), 1-2.
- Livanov, D. V. (2013b). *O hode realizatsii mer gosudarstvennoi podderzhki vedushih universitetov Rossiyskoi Federatsii v tselyah povysheniya ih konkurentnosposobnosti sredi vedushih mirovyyh nauchno-obrazovatelnykh tseftrov. Proekt 5-100*. [About Execution of the Government Directive for the Special State Provision to Leading Russian Universities to Enlarge Their Competitiveness Among Leading World Academic Centers. Project 5-100]. Retrieved from: [http://минобрнауки.рф/прессцентр/3569/файл/2407/13.08.21-Правительство-Ливанов-Вузы\\_5-100.pdf](http://минобрнауки.рф/прессцентр/3569/файл/2407/13.08.21-Правительство-Ливанов-Вузы_5-100.pdf)
- Lomakina, I. I. (2006). *Mongolskaya stolitsa, staraya i novaya*. [Mongolian Capitol: Old and New]. Moscow: KMK Press.
- Lorenz, C. (2006). Will the Universities Survive the European Integration? Higher Education Policies in the EU and in the Netherlands before and after the Bologna Declaration. *Sociologia Internationalis*, 44(1), 123-153.
- Lozhkin, A.G. (2012). *Interventsia, anneksia i sovetizatsia vo vneshnei politike SSSR: istoriko-pravovye aspekty noveyshih issledovaniy*. [Intervention, Annexation, and Sovietization in the USSR's International Policy: Legal Aspects in Newest Research]. Moscow: AIRO-XXI.

- Lucas, E. (2009). *The New Cold War: Putin's Russia and the Threat to the West*. NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lukashenko, M. (2003). Rynok obrazovatel'nykh uslug: desyat let spustya. [Market of educational services: ten years later]. *Visshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 1, 40-52.
- Lukov, V. A. (2005). Reformy obrazovaniya. [Education Reforms]. *Entsiklopedia gumanitarnykh nauk*, 3, 217-219.
- Lukyanov, F.A. (2006). *Vneshnyaya politika Rossii: vitki spirali*. [International Policy of Russia: Spiral Windings]. Retrieved from: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2006/50/lu13.html>
- Lunacharskiy, A.V. (1917). *Kulturnye zadachi rabochego klassa*. [Cultural tasks of the Working Class]. Petrograd: Socialist Press.
- Lunacharskiy, A. V. (1927). *Desyatiletie revolyutsii i kultura*. [Decade after Revolution and Culture]. Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Lunacharskiy, A.V. (1976). Zadachi prosveshcheniya v sisteme sovetskogo stroitel'stva. [Issues of Enlightenment in the System of Socialist Construction]. In *Lunacharskiy, A.V., O vospitanii i obrazovanii* (p.146). Moscow: Pedagogika. (Original work published 1925).
- Lurye, L.I. (2002). *Issledovatel'skiy universitet i modernizatsiya obrazovatel'nogo kompleksa v Rossii*. [Research university and modernization of education system in Russia]. Perm: PGU Press.
- Magrath, P.C. (2000). Globalization and its Effects on Higher Education Beyond the Nation-state. *Higher Education in Europe*, XXV (2), 251-258.
- Magrath, P.C. (2003). A World Higher Education Forecast: More Changes Coming. In *The Cultural, Civic, and Economic Purposes of Higher Education. Salzburg Seminar Session Report*. Retrieved from [http://www.salzburgglobal.org/current/sessions-b.cfm?nav=media&IDSPECIAL\\_EVENT=646](http://www.salzburgglobal.org/current/sessions-b.cfm?nav=media&IDSPECIAL_EVENT=646)
- Magrath, P.C. (2010). *A University That Is Not International Is Not A University*. Retrieved from [www.fulbright.pt/index.php/download/](http://www.fulbright.pt/index.php/download/)
- Maisky, I.M. (1964). *Vospominaniya sovetskogo posla*. [Memoirs of a Soviet Ambassador]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Makarenko, V.P. (2005). *Uchebno-metodicheskoe posobie po spetskursu "Nauka i vlast"*. [Text-book for the special course "Science and Power"]. Rostov-na-Donu: RDGU Press.
- Makarcheva, O.A. (1998). *Istochniki finansirovaniya vuzov Rossii*. [Financial Sources of Russian Universities]. Retrieved from: <http://www.disserscat.com/content/istochniki-finansirovaniya-vuzov-v-rossii>
- Makarycheva, M.G. (2002). Regionalnye universitety v epokhu globalizatsii: proektnaya kultura i rasprostraneniye setevogo opyta. [Regional universities in the era of globalization: project culture and spread of the networking experience]. In *Upravleniye social'nogo-ekonomicheskimi processami v regionah: rol universitetov* (pp.417-422). Kostroma: KGTU.
- Malakshyanov, K. L. (2006). *Irkutskiy start mongolskiykh ekonomistov*. [Irkutsk – the Starting Point for Mongolian Economists]. Irkutsk: BGUEP Press.
- Malinskiy, I.G. (2004). *Politika vkhodeniya rossiyskoi vsshei shkoly v Bolonskiy process*. [Politics of

integration of Russian higher education into Bologna Process]. Saratov: SGU Press.

Mao Zedong, (1967). *Sochineniya*. [Collection of Works]. Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

Marginson, S. (2000). Rethinking Academic Work in the Global Era. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 22(1), 23-35.

Margolis Y.D. (1994). Akademicheskii Universitet [Academic University]. In *Otechestvennaya istoriya s drevneishih vremen do 1917 god, Vol.1*. Moscow: Obrazovanie Press.

Martov, Yu.O. (2004). *Zapiski social-demokrata*. [Memorandum of Social-Democrat]. Moscow: ROSSPEN Press. (Original work published 1924).

Marx, K. (1835). Razmyshlenia yunoshi pri vybore professii. [Reflections of a young man on the choice of a profession]. In *MECW, Vol. 40* (p. 7). Moscow: Politizdat.

Marx, K. (1845). Tezisy o Feiyerbahe. [Theses On Feuerbach]. In *MECW, Vol. 3* (pp. 1-4). Moscow: Politizdat.

Marx, K. (1847). Nishcheta filosofii. [The Poverty of Philosophy]. In *MECW, Vol. 4* (pp. 65-185). Moscow: Politizdat.

Marx, K. (1859). K kritike politicheskoi ekonomii. [Contribution to Critique of Political Economy]. In *MECW, Vol. 13* (pp. 1-167). Moscow: Politizdat.

Marx, K. (1869). Zapis rechei Marksa o vseobshchem obrazovanii v sovremennom obshchestve. [Marx Recorded Speeches on General Education in Modern Society]. In *MECW, Vol. 16* (pp. 595-597). Moscow: Politizdat.

Marx, K. (1875). Kritika Gotskoi programmy. [Critique of the Gotha Program]. In *MECW, Vol. 19* (pp. 9-32). Moscow: Politizdat.

Marx, K., Engels, F. (1846). Nemetskaya ideologia. [The German Ideology]. In *MECW, Vol. 3* (pp. 7-544). Moscow: Politizdat.

Marx, K., Engels, F. (1848). Manifest Kommunisticheskoi partii. [The Communist Manifesto]. In *MECW, Vol. 4* (pp. 419-459). Moscow: Politizdat.

Marx, K., Engels, F. (1850). Obrashchenie Tcentralnogo komiteta k soyuzu kommunistov. [Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League]. In *MECW, Vol. 7* (pp. 257-267). Moscow: Politizdat.

Martianov, D. (2005). *O meste demokratii v sovremennom obshchestve*. [About the Place of Democracy in the Modern Society]. In *Sovremennye problemy mezhkulturnih kommunikatsiy* (pp.149-155). St.Petersburg: RGPU.

Masliychuk, V., Portnov, A. (2012). *Sovetizatsia istoricheskoi nauki po-ukrainski*. [Sovietization of historical science in the Ukrainian Way]. Retrieved from: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nz/2012/3/m20-pr.html>

*Materialy Aprelskogo Plemuma TsK KPSS*. [Materials of April Session of TsK CPSU, 1985]. (1985). Moscow: Politizdat.

*Materialy Martovskogo Plenuma TsK KPSS*. [Materials of March Session of TsK CPSU, 1985]. (1985). Moscow: Politizdat.

- Materialy XIX Vsesoyuznoi konferencii KPSS*. [Documents of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference]. (1988) Moscow: Politizdat.
- Materialy k istorii Akademii nauk SSSR za sovetkiy period: 1917-1947 gg.* [Documents on the History of the USSR Academy of Sciences for the Soviet Period: 1917-1947]. (1950). Moscow: Nauka.
- Materialy po istorii AN SSSR, 1917-1925*. [Materials on History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1917-1925]. (1986). Leningrad: Nauka.
- Matthews, M. (1982). *Education in the Soviet Union. Policies and Institutions since Stalin*. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Matvienko, V. (2003). Visshei shkole – novie impulsy. [New impulses in higher education]. *Vishee obrazovanie v Rossii, 1*, 19-22.
- Mauch, J., Spaulding, S. (1992). The Internationalization of Higher Education: who should be taught, what and how? *Journal of General Education, 41*, 111-129.
- Mazov, S.V. (1999). Afrikanskiye studenty v Moskve v god Afriki (po arhivnym materialam). [African Students in Moscow in the Year of Africa: using Archival materials]. *Vostok, 3*, 89-103.
- Mazov, S.V. (2000). “Rasizm po russki?” Afrikanskiye studenty v SSSR v 1960 g. [Racism Russian Style? African Students in Moscow in 1960]. In *Evrotsentrizm i Afrotsentrizm nakanune XXI veka: Afrikanistika v mirovom kontekste* (pp. 103-112). Moscow: IVI RAN.
- McCabe, R., Ruffio, P., Heinamaki, P. (2011). *TEMPUS @ 20: A Retrospective of the Tempus Programme over the Past Twenty Years, 1990-2010*. Retrieved from: [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/tools/documents/tempus\\_en\\_110308.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/tools/documents/tempus_en_110308.pdf)
- McGinn, N.F. (2007). *Educational Policies to Promote Social Cohesion*. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/503382/Education\\_policies\\_to\\_promote\\_social\\_cohesion](http://www.academia.edu/503382/Education_policies_to_promote_social_cohesion)
- McClelland, J. (1971). Bolshevik Approaches to Higher Education, 1917-1921. *Slavic Review, 30*(4), 818-831.
- Medvedev, D. A. (2008). *Press-konferentsiya po itogam sammita Rossiya-Evropsouz*. [Press-Conference on the Results of Summit Russia-EU]. Retrieved from: <http://news.kremlin.ru/transcripts/575>
- Medvedev, D. A. (2012a). *Medvedev verit chto pyat vuzov RF smogut voiti v sotnu luchshih mirovyhuchebnykh zavedeniy*. [Five Russian Universities Must Enter the List Top-Hundred Universities of the World]. Retrieved from: <http://www.rosbalt.ru/main/2012/10/11/1044929.html>
- Medvedev, D.A. (2012b). *Nugno oprobovat novuu sistemu upravleniya vuzami*. [Introduction of a new system of administration in Russian higher education]. Retrieved from [http://www.ria.ru/edu\\_higher/20120712/698010920.html](http://www.ria.ru/edu_higher/20120712/698010920.html)
- Medvedev, D.A. (2013). *Vstupil v silu novyi zakon “Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federacii.”* [New Law On Education in Russian Federation Has Been Empowered]. Retrieved from: <http://blog.da-medvedev.ru/post/308/transcript>
- Medvedev, V.A. (1994). *V komande Gorbacheva: vzglyad iznutri*. [In Gorbachev’s Team: Look from Inside]. Moscow: Bylina.

- Medynskiy, E. N. (1947). *Narodnoe obrazovanie v SSSR*. [People's Education in the USSR]. Moscow: APN RSFSR Press.
- Melnikova, I. (2002). *Torgovlya znaniyami*. [Trade of Knowledge]. Retrieved from: <http://www.itogi.ru/archive/2002/51/104154.html>
- Melnikova, N.I. (2003). *Sostoyanie i perspektivy vysshego obrazovania v epohu globalizacii*. [Status and prospects of higher education in the era of globalization]. Saratov: SGU Press.
- Melvil, A.Yu. (Ed.). (2005). *Myagkiy put vhozhdenia rossiiskih vuzov v Bolonskiy process*. [Easy Path for the Russian Universities into the Bologna Process]. Moscow: Olma-Press.
- Mendelev, D.I. (1907). *Dopolnenia k poznaniu Rossii*. [Understanding Russia: Additions]. St.Peterburg: Suvorin Press.
- Meredith, M. (1984). *The First Dance of Freedom: Black Africa in the Postwar Era*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Merono, D. (2006). *Sovetskaya pomosh Ispanskoi Respublike i vynuzhdennaya emigratsiya v SSSR*. [Soviet Help to Spanish Republic and Forced Immigration in the USSR]. Retrieved from: <http://www.milresource.ru/Merono.html>
- Meshkova, T.A. (2010). Internacjonalizatsiya obrazovaniya stanovitsya praktikoi vuza. [Internationalization of Education Becomes a University Practice]. Retrieved from: <http://www.hse.ru/news/avant/18082393.html>
- Meyer, K., Anweiler, O. (1961). *Die Sowjetische Bildungspolitik Seit 1917*. [Soviet Educational Policy since 1917]. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- Milner, B. (1999). Upravlenie znaniyami – vyzov 21 veka. [Management of Knowledge – challenge of the 21st century]. *Voprosy Ekonomiki*, 9, 108-118.
- Mindely, L.E. (2011). *Nauchno-tehnicheskiiy potential Rossii*. [Academic and Technical Potency of Russia]. Moscow: IPRAN RAN.
- Mints, I.I. (1973). Triumfalnoe shestvie Sovetskoi Vlasti. [Triumphal Progress of Soviet Regime]. In Mits. I.I. *Istoria Velikogo Oktyabrya, Vol 3*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Mironov, B.N. (1991). *Istoria v tsifrah: matematika v istoricheskikh issledovaniyakh*. [History in Numbers: Math in Historical Research]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Mironov, S. M. (2010). *Unikalnyi opyt RDN – nashe nacionalnoe dostoyanie*. [Unique Experience of RUDN is our national treasure]. Retrieved from: <http://www.rudn.ru/?pagec=2267>
- Mitin, V.V. (2008). Nauka i politika: sovetskie uchenye v Mongolii v 1920-1930-e g.g. [Science and Politics: Soviet Academics in Mongolia in 1920-1930s]. *Vestnik PsGU*, 5, 34-40.
- Mlechin, L.M. (2009). *Istoriya vneshnei razvedki. Kariery i sudby*. [History of Foreign Intelligence. Careers and Destinies]. Moscow: Tcentropoligraf.
- Mlechin, L.M. (2011). *Stalin. Navazhdenie Rossii*. [Stalin. Delusion of Russia]. St. Petersburg: Piter.

## Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia – References

- Molodtsova, V. (1990). Eshe odin shag po doroge v budushee: o vstreche rektorov s Prezidentom M.S. Gorabchevym. [One More Step by the Road to Future: Regarding a Meeting of President Gorbachev with the Rectors of Universities]. *Vestnik Vysshey Shkoly*, 7, 4–9.
- Molotov, V.M. (1952). *Vstupitel'naya rech na XIX syezde VKP (b)-KPSS*. [Introduction Speech On the 19th CPSU Congress]. Retrieved from: [http://mirknig.mobi/sci\\_all/sci\\_politics/1414012-XIX\\_sezd\\_vkpb\\_kpss\\_5\\_14\\_oktjabrja\\_1952\\_g..dokumenty\\_i\\_materialy.html](http://mirknig.mobi/sci_all/sci_politics/1414012-XIX_sezd_vkpb_kpss_5_14_oktjabrja_1952_g..dokumenty_i_materialy.html)
- Morgan, J. (1935). *Moskovsky Metropoliten – luchshiy v mire*. [Moscow Underground is the best in the world]. Retrieved from: <http://www.metro.ru/library/morgan/>
- Morozova, N.I. (2006). Integracia Rossii v evropeiskoe obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo. [Integration of Russia into European Educational Space]. *Sovremennye problemy nauki i obrazovania*, 4, 69.
- Mühle, E. (1994). Rückkehr nach Europa. Zur Reform der ostmitteleuropäischen Hochschulsysteme seit 1989. [About Higher Educational Reforms of 1989 in Central and Eastern Europe]. *Osteuropa*, 44, 907-925.
- Müllerson, R. (2011). *Biography*. Retrieved from: [http://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/ls/Mullerson\\_bio.pdf](http://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/ls/Mullerson_bio.pdf)
- Murrell, P. (1993). What is Shock Therapy? What did it Do in Poland and Russia? *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 9(2), 111-140.
- Murrey, W., Millett, A.R. (2001). *A War To Be Won: Fighting the Second World War*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press
- Myasnikov, V. A. (2002). Informacionnoe vzaimodeistvie v obrazovanii stran SNG v kontekste globalizatsii. [Informational cooperation of the educational systems of the NIS countries in the context of globalization]. *Mir Obrazovaniya*, 4, 23-37.
- Myzrova, K.A. (2011). Sovremennye tendencii razvitiya vysshego obrazovania. [Modern Tendencies in the Development of Higher Education]. *Kreativnaya ekonomika*, 9 (57), 48-52.
- Nagaitsev, A.E. (2009). Nedovolstvo inostrannykh studentov v SSSR rassmatrivalos' kak provokatsiya [Expression of Dismay by the Foreign Students was Considered in the USSR as a Provocation]. In Goncharuk, G. I., Nagaitsev, A. E. *Neravnaya borba prodolzhalas: dvizhenie za nezavisimuyu Ukrainu po otechestvennym dokumentam 1965-1974* (pp. 138-139). Moscow: Astro-Print.
- Naimark, N. M. (1997). *The Russians in Germany: A History of the Soviet Zone of Occupation, 1945-1949*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Narodnoye hozyaistvo SSSR v tsifrah*. [The USSR National Economy in Numbers]. (1940). Moscow: Moskovsky rabochiy Press.
- Narodnoe hozyaistvo v SSSR v 1989 godu*. (Statisticheskiy ezhegodnik). [National Economy of the USSR in 1989]. (1990). Moscow: Finansy i statistika.
- Narodnoe obrazovanie v SSSR*. [Public Education in the USSR]. (1987). Moscow: Yuridicheskaya Literatura Press.
- Naumchenko, I. (1998). Obrazovanie i nauka na putyakh integratsii. [Education and Science on the Way to Integration]. *Vyshee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 2, 10-14.



- Naumova, T.V. (1996). Utechka umov iz Rossii. [Brain Drain from Russia]. *Sociologicheskie issledovania*. 6, 138-140.
- Nehrt, L.C. (1987). The Internationalization of the Curriculum. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 18(1), 83 - 90.
- Nekipelova, E.F. (1998). *Emigracia i professionalnaya deyatelnost rossiiskih uchenyh za rubezhom*. [Immigration and professional Activities of Russian Academics Abroad]. Moscow: Tsentr issledovaniy i statistiki nauki.
- Nesmeyanov, A.N. (1959). *Izbrannye Trudy*. [Selected Works]. Moscow: Znanie.
- Nesmeyanov, A.N. (1970). *Nauka i chelovechestvo*. [Science and Humanity]. Moscow: Znanie.
- Newman, F., Couturier, L. (2002). *Trading Public Good in the Higher Education Market*. Retrieved from <http://www.nerche.org/futuresproject/publications/observatory.pdf>
- Novikov, M. (2012). *Sovetskij Souz, Komintern i grazdanskaya voina v Ispanii 1936-1939 g.g.* [Soviet Union, Comintern and Civil War in Spain, 1936-1939]. Drezden: LAP Press.
- Noskova, S.V. (2003). Obuchenie inostrannyh studentov v rossiskih vuzah: spetsifika i prognozy. [Education of the foreign students in the Russian higher educational institutions: specifics and prognosis]. In *Obrazovanie dlya vseh: puti integracii* (pp. 48-61). Saratov: SGTU.
- Nuzhin, M.T. (1975). *Universitety i ih rol v visshem obrazovanii*. [Universities and their role in higher education]. Kazan: KGU
- Nyborg, P. (2004). *The development of the Bologna process. Central elements and basic concepts*. Retrieved from: [http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/03-PNY/040517-18\\_S-Caucasus.pdf](http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/03-PNY/040517-18_S-Caucasus.pdf).
- O gosudarstvennoi podderzhke razvitiya innovatsionnoi infrastruktury v vuzah. Postanovlenie Pravitelstva RF*. [About State Support for the Development of Innovation Infrastructure in Higher Educational Institutions]. (2010). Retrieved from <http://rii-vuz.extech.ru/doc/p219.php>
- O merah gosudarstvennoi podderzhki vedushih universitetov RF v tselyah povysheniya ih konkurentnosposobnosti sredi vedushih mirovyh nauchno-obrazovatelnyh tsentrov*. [About Special State Provision to Leading Russian Universities to Enlarge Their Competitiveness Among Leading World Academic Centers. Directive of the Government of Russian Federation from March 16, 2013]. Retrieved from: [http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/3208/файл/2006/13.03.16-Постановление\\_211.pdf](http://минобрнауки.рф/документы/3208/файл/2006/13.03.16-Постановление_211.pdf)
- O merah po realizacii gosudarstvennoi politiki v oblasti obrazovania i nauki. Ukaz prezidenta RF*. [About Measures of Practical Execution of the State Policy in the field of Education and Science. Statement of the President of Russian Federation]. (2012). Retrieved from: <http://www.rg.ru/2012/05/09/nauka-dok.html>
- O nekotoryh izmeneniyah v sostave i ustroistve gosudarstvennyh uchebnyh i vysshih uchebnyh zavedeniy Rossiyskoi Respubliki. Dekret SNK ot 9 oktyabrya 1918 g.* [On the Changes in the Composition and Organization of Educational and Higher Educational Institutions of Russian Republic. Decree SNK from October 9, 1918]. Retrieved from: <http://istmat.info/node/31565>
- O pervoocherednyh merah po razvitiyu obrazovania v RSFSR. Ukaz prezidenta RSFSR*. [About Priority Measures for the Development of Education in RSFSR. Directive of the President of RSFSR]. (1991). Retrieved from <http://base.garant.ru/102690/>

*O pravilah priema v vysshie uchebnye zavedeniya. Dekret SNK RSFSR ot 2 avgusta 1918 g.* [Rules of Admission to the Higher Educational Institutions. Decree of SNK from August 2, 1918]. Retrieved from: <http://marxists.narod.ru/works/37-4.htm>

*O prisvoenii Universitetu druzhby narodov v Moskve imeni Patrisa Lumumby. Postanovlenie Sovmina SSSR ot 9 yanvarya 1961g.* [About Honoring the People's Friendship University in Moscow with the name of Patrice Lumumba. Statement of Statement of the USSR Sovmin, January, 9, 1961]. Retrieved from: [http://50let.rudn.ru/?page\\_id=219](http://50let.rudn.ru/?page_id=219)

*O priznanii nauchnyh, literaturnyh, muzykalnih i hudozhestvennyh proizvedeniy gosudarstvennym dostoyaniem. Dekret Sovnarkoma ot 26.11.1918.* [On the Recognition of Scientific Discoveries, Literature, Musical and Art Creations as State Properties. Decree of SNK from November, 26, 1918]. Retrieved from: <http://istmat.info/node/31898>

*O razvitii sotrudnichestva s zarubezhnymi stranami v oblasti obrazovania. Postanovlenie Pravitelstva RF.* [On the Development of Cooperation with the Foreign Countries in the Field of Education. Statement of the Russian Government]. (1995). Retrieved from: <http://zakon.law7.ru/base29/part2/d29ru2317.htm>

*O reforme obshcheobrazovatelnoi i professionalnoi shkoly: sbornik dokumentov i materialov Sovmina SSSR.* [About reform of secondary and higher education: collection of documents of the USSR Sovmin]. (1984). Moscow: Politizdat Press.

*O sozdanii vysshei shkoly ekonomiki. Postanovlenie pravitelstva RF.* [About Establishment of the Higher School of Economics. Decision of the Government of Russian Federation. (1992). Retrieved from: <http://www.hse.ru/docs/21042493.html>

O strategii obrazovaniya. [On the Strategy of Education]. (1989). *Vestnik Vysshei Shkoly*, 12, 3-7.

*O vnesenii izmeneniy i dopolneniy v Zakon RF Ob obrazovanii.* [About Adoption of Changes and Amendments to the Law of RF "On Education"]. (1996). Retrieved from: <http://base.garant.ru/10105933/>

*O vysshem i poslevyuzovskom professionalnom obrazovanii. Federalnyi zakon.* (1996). [About Graduate and Post-Graduate Professional Education]. Retrieved from: <http://base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc;base=LAW;n=121834>

*O zakluchenii dogovorov o vzaimootnosheniyah obrazovatelnyh uchrezhdeniy s uchreditelyami. Instruktivnoe Pismo Minobra RF.* [Instructive Letter of the Ministry of Education of Russian Federation On the procedure of Conducting Relationship Agreements Between Educational Institutions and their Founders]. (1993). Retrieved from: <http://base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc;base=EXP;n=273001>

*Ob iskluchenii iz perechnya gorodov i raionov, zakritih dlya posesheniya inostrannymi grazhdanami Saratova. Rasporyazhenie Pravitelstva RF ot 28 yanvarya 1992g.* [About Exclusion of Saratov City from the List of Cities and Regions Prohibited for Visits by Foreign Citizens. Directive of the Government of RF, January 28, 1992]. (1992). Retrieved from: <http://base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online.cgi?req=doc;base=EXP;n=222472>

*Ob obrazovanii. Zakon Rossiiskoi Federacii.* [About Education. Law of Russian Federation]. (1992). Retrieved from: [http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons\\_doc\\_LAW\\_1888/](http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_1888/)

*Ob obrazovanii v Rossiiskoi Federacii. Zakon RF ot 29 dekabrya 2012g.* [On Education. Law of Russian Federation, December 29, 2012]. Retrieved from: <http://www.rg.ru/2012/12/30/obrazovanie-dok.html>

*Ob organizatsii i strukture upravleniya narodnym obrazovaniem v strane. Postanovlenie SM SSSR.* [About Organization and Administrative Structure of People's Education System in the Country]. (1988). Retrieved from: [http://zakon.scli.ru/ru/legal\\_texts/act\\_national\\_law/printable.php?do4=document&id4=0062cf68-28b2-40fd-a9b9-96af67a83119](http://zakon.scli.ru/ru/legal_texts/act_national_law/printable.php?do4=document&id4=0062cf68-28b2-40fd-a9b9-96af67a83119)

*Ob Organizatsii Universiteta Druzhy Narodov. Postanovlenie TsK KPSS i Sovmina SSSR ot 5 fevralya 1960g.* [About Establishment of People's Friendship University. Statement of TsK CPSU and the USSR Sovmin, February 5, 1960]. Retrieved from: [http://50let.rudn.ru/?page\\_id=219](http://50let.rudn.ru/?page_id=219)

Ob osnovnyh napravleniyah reformy obshcheobrazovatelnoi i professionalnoi shkoly: Postanovlenie VS SSSR. [About main directions of reformation of secondary and professional education: Directive of the USSR Supreme Soviet]. (1984). *Vedomosti VS SSSR*, 16, 237.

*Ob ukreplenii svyazi shkoly s zhizniyu i o dalneishem razvitii sistemy narodnogo obrazovaniya v SSSR, Zakon SSSR, prinyaty Verhovnym Sovetom SSSR 24.12.1958.* [On the strengthening connection between education and reality, and furthering development of educational system of the USSR. The All-Union Legal Act, adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet on December 24, 1958]. Retrieved from: <http://ppt.ru/newstext.phtml?id=40246>

Obrazovanie i Nauka. [Education and Science]. (1957). In *Dostizheniya Sovetskoi vlasti za sorok let* (pp.273-288). Moscow, Gosstatizdat.

*Obshchestvo i Vlast. Povestvovanie v dokumentah.* [Society and Power. Narrative in Documents]. (1998). Moscow: ROSSPEN.

*Obshchestvennoe mnenie i Perestroika visshnei shkoly. Informacionnaya zapiska. Predvaritelnyi analiz.* [Public Opinion and Perestroika of Higher Education. Information Note: Preliminary Analysis]. (1987). Moscow: Ministerstvo vysshego i srednego specialnogo obrazovaniya Press.

Oganessian, K. (2008). *Krasnaya Armiya v VOV.* [Red Army in Great Patriotic War]. Moscow: Yauza.

Oganov, A. (2009). *Kak ostanovit utechku mozgov iz Rossii?* [How could be stopped the brain drain from Russia]. Retrieved from <http://lenta.ru/conf/oganol/>

Okorokov, A. V. (2008). *Sekretnye voyny Sovetskogo Soyuz.* [Secret Wars of the Soviet Union]. Moscow: Yauza.

Okorokova, G.P., Klikunov, N.D. (2002). "Za" i "protiv" vvedeniya obrazovatelnykh vaucherov v sistemu visshnego obrazovaniya. [Pros and cons of an introduction of educational vouchers into the system of higher education]. *Rossiiskiy ekonomicheskii zhurnal*, 3, 71-75.

Olds, K. (2011). *Making Sense of the Emerging Global Higher Education Landscape.* Retrieved from <http://globalhighered.files.wordpress.com/2009/06/oldsiaupaperenglish.pdf>

Oleinikova, O. N. (2013). Internationalizatsiya kak novoe kachestvo mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva v sfere professionalnogo obrazovaniya. [Internationalization as a New Quality of International Cooperation in the Field of Professional Education]. In *Materialy VII Mezhdunarodnogo kongressa-vystavki "Global educational – obrazovanie bez granits -2013"* (pp.141-153). Moscow: Concord Group.

Onkoi, L.S. (2004). Na puti integratsii v obsheevropeiskuyu sistemu obrzovaniya. [Russia on its way to the integration into the EU system of education]. *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya*, 2, 80-85.

- Orlov, A.S. (2000). Koreya: Proba sil. [Korea: Checking Power]. In A.S. Orlov (Ed.). *Tainaya bitva sverhderzhav* (pp. 265-380). Moscow: Veche.
- Osipov, U.S. (1999). *Akademia nauk v istorii Rossiiskogo gosudarstva*. [Academy of Sciences in the History of Russian State]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Osnovateli Moskovskogo Mezhdunarodnogo Universiteta (MUM)*. [Founders of Moscow International University, MUM]. (1991). Retrieved from: <http://www.interun.ru/fathers.html>
- Osnovnye dokumenty SEV*. [Formation Documents of Comecon]. (1970). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye Otnoshenia.
- Otchet po samoobsledovaniu RUDN*. [Report on Self-Evaluation of the People's Friendship University]. (2009). Moscow: RUDN Press.
- Ovsyannikov, A. A. (1999). Sistema obrazovaniya v Rossii i obrazovanie Rossii. [System of Education in Russia and Actual Education of Russian]. *Mir Rosii*, 3, 73-132.
- Ovsyannikov, A., Iudin, A. (1988). *Universitety Rossii. Problemy i specifika*. [Universities of Russia: Problems and Specifics]. Moscow: GKNO SSSR.
- Ovsyannikov, A. A., Iudin, A. A. (2001). Socialnye ocenki programmy modernizatsii obrazovaniya. [Social Evaluation of the Program for Modernization in Education]. In *Rossia-2000. Socialno-demograficheskaya situatsiya* (pp.13-28). Moscow: ISEPN RAN Press.
- Pak, M. N. (2003). *Istoria i istoriografiya Korei*. [History and Historiography of Korea]. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura.
- Panachin, F.G. (1977). *Upravlenie prosveshcheniem v SSSR*. [Governance of Education in the USSR]. Moscow: Prosveshchenie Press.
- Panfilova, T.V. (2011). Higher Education Reform in Russia: Democratization or Bureaucratization? *Russian Education and Society*, 53(7), 25-39.
- Panfilova, T.V., Ashin, G.K. (2009). *Perspektivy vysshego obrazovaniya v Rossii: reformirovanie ili likvidatsiya*. [Prospects of Higher Education in Russia: Reformation or Liquidation]. Retrieved from: [http://www.zanauku.ru/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=1888&Itemid=31](http://www.zanauku.ru/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1888&Itemid=31)
- Panin, V. (2011a). *Rossii grozit totalnaya kommercializatsiya sistemy obrazovaniya*. [Total Commercialization Threatens Russian System of Education]. Retrieved from: <http://interaffairs.ru/read.php?item=687>
- Panin, V. (2011b). *Besplatnoe obrazovanie. Vzyatki v vuzah*. [Free Education. Bribes in Universities]. Retrieved from: <http://www.iarex.ru/news/21080.html>
- Pavlenko, E.V. (2006). *Integratsiya rossiyskoi visshoi shkoly v obsheevropeiskoe obrazovatelnoe prostranstvo*. [Integration of Russian Higher Education into the European Educational Space]. Rostov-na-Donu: RGPU.
- Pavlov, I.P. (1951). *Izbrannye proizvedeniya*. [Selected works]. Moscow: Gosizdat Polit Literatury.
- Pechatnov, V.O. (2006). *Ot Soyuzov vo Vtoroi Mirovoi – k protivnikam v holodnoi voine. Sovetsko-amerikanskie otnosheniya v 1945-1947 gg.* [From WWII Allies to Cold War Rivals. Soviet-American

relations in 1945-1947]. Moscow: MGIMO Press.

Peipinsch, V. (2012). *Mongolia: iz feodalizma – v socialism*. [Mongolia: From Feudalism to Socialism]. St. Petersburg: Press-Kurier.

Pennar J., Bakalo, I., Bereday G. (1971). *Modernization and Diversity in Soviet Education*. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.

Perchenok, F.F. (1995). Delo Akademii nauk i Velikiy Perelom v sovetskoj nauke [Case of Academy of Sciences and Great Break in Soviet Academia]. In *Tragichieskie Sudby: Repressirovannyye Uchenyye Akademii nauk SSSR* (pp.201-235). Moscow: Memorial.

Perevozchikova, L.S. (2012). Liberalnaya paradigma vysshego professionalnogo obrazovaniya i kompetentnostnyy podhod. [Liberal Paradigm of Higher Professional Education and Competent Approach]. *Vestnik VGU, seria Problemy vysshego obrazovaniya, 1*, 105-109.

Pervyyh, N.A. (2012). Mezhdunarodnaya deyatelnost kak strategiya innovatsionnogo razvitiya. [International Activity as a Strategy for Innovation]. *Akkreditatsiya v obrazovanii, 2(54)*, 24-25.

*Pervyy Syezd Narodnykh Deputatov SSSR. Stenograficheskiy otchet*. [First Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR. Stenographic Report]. (1989). Moscow: Verhovnyi Sovet SSSR Press.

Peteri, G. (2000). The formation of the Soviet Academy of Sciences: Bolsheviks and Academicians in the 1920s and the 1930s. In M.David-Fox, G.Peteri (Eds.). (2000). *Academia in Upheaval: Origins, Transfers, and Transformations of the Communist Academic Regime in Russia and East Central Europe* (pp. 64-81). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Petrik, V.V. (2007). Vysshee obrazovanie SSSR kak faktor ukrepleniya mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva v oblasti podgotovki spetsialistov (konets 50-h - nachalo 90h godov XX v). [USSR Higher Education as the Factor of Strengthening of the International Cooperation in the Field of Vocation Education of Specialists (end of 1950s – beginning of 1990s)]. *Vestnik TGPU, 7(70)*, 132-137.

Petrov, F.A. (Ed.). (2003). *Formirovaniye sistemy universitetskogo obrazovaniya v Rossii*. [Establishment of the University System in Russia]. Moscow: Nauka.

Petrov, N.V. (2011). *Po scenariu Stalina: rol organov NKVD-MGB SSSR v sovetizatsii stran Tsentralnoi i Vostochnoi Evropy, 1945-1953 gg*. [According to Stalin's Scenario: Role of Soviet Special Services in Sovietization of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, 1945-1953]. Moscow: ROSSPEN.

Petrov, N.V., Skorkin, K.V. (1999). *Kto rukovodil NKVD. 1934-1941. Spravochnik*. [Who ruled NKVD in 1934-1941]. Moscow: Memorial Press.

Petrova, N. B. (2007). Programma IREX po podderzhke administrativnogo upravleniya universitetov. [IREX University Administration Support Program]. *Universitetskoe upravlenie: praktika i analiz, 1*, 79-80.

Petrovich, O.G. (2010). *Sovremennoe rossiyskoe vysshee obrazovanie v kontekste globalizatsii*. [Modern Russian Higher education in the Context of Globalization]. Retrieved from <http://leb.nlr.ru/edoc/350837/>

Petrovskiy, A. V., Slobodchikov, V. I., Bim-Bad, B. M. (1988). *Zadachi i napravleniya perestroiki pedagogicheskoi nauki*. [Tasks and Directions for Perestroika of the Pedagogical Science]. Moscow: VNIK "Shkola".

Pichugin, A. (2002). Eshe raz ob uchebnoy nagruzke prepodavatelya [Discussing once again the teaching

load of a professor]. *Vyshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 2, 122-124.

Pihoya, R. (2000). *Sovetskiy Soyuz. Istoria vlasti. 1945-1991*. [Soviet Union: History of Power, 1945-1991]. Novosibirsk: Sibirskiy Khronograf Press.

Pinkevich, A.P. (1929). *The New Education in the Soviet Republic*. New York, NY: John Day Co.

Pirogova, E. V. (2008). Otcenka konkurentnosposobnosti professorsko-prepodavatelskogo sostava vysshego uchebnogo zavedeniya. [Evaluation of the faculty's competitiveness in a university]. *Vestnik SGEU*, 10(48), 11-115.

*Platnoe obuchenie: progress ili regress Rossiyskogo obrazovaniya?* [Payment for Education: Progress or Retrogress of Russian Education]. (2011). Retrieved from: <http://www.d-kvadrat.ru/dk/info/15482.html>

Platonov, O.A. (2013). *Epokha Stalina*. [Stalin Epoch]. Moscow: Rodnaya strana.

Pokrovskiy, M. N. (1929). *Oktyabrskaya revoliucia*. [October Revolution]. Moscow: Komakademia Press.

Plekhanov, G.V. (1898). V.G.Belinsky. In Plekhanov, G.V. (1925). *Sochinenia. Vol. 10* (pp. 317-350). Moscow-Leningrad: Gosizdatzdat.

Plekhanov, G.V. (1905). Dnevnik social-demokrata. [Diary of a Social-Democrat]. In Plekhanov, G.V. (1926). *Sochinenia, Vol.13* (pp.233-357). Moscow-Leningrad: Gosizdat.

Plekhanov, G.V. (1922). *Osnovnye voprosy marksizma*. [Fundamental Problems of Marxism]. Moscow: Moskovskiy rabochiy. (Original work published 1908).

Plekhanov, G.V. (1940). Pervye shagi sotcial-demokraticeskogo dvizhenia v Rossii. [First Steps of Social-Democratic Division in Russia]. In *Literaturnoe nasledie G.V. Plekhanova 8(1)* (pp. 58-66). Moscow: GosSotc-ekonomPress.Gruppa. (Original work published 1909).

Plekhanov, G.V. (1948). Socializm i politicheskaya borba. [Socialism and Political Struggle]. In *Plekhanov, G.V. Sotcializm i politicheskaya borba. Nashi raznoglasiya* (pp.2-57). Moscow: Gosizdat Politicheskaya literatura. (Original work published 1883).

Pokrovskiy, M. N. (1929). *Oktyabrskaya revoliucia*. [October Revolution]. Moscow: Komakademia Press.

Pokrovskiy, N. E. (2000). Rossiiskoe obshestvo v kontekste amerikanizatsii (principlalnaya schema). [Russian society in the context of Americanization (basic pattern)]. *Sociologicheskie issledovaniya*, 6, 3-10.

Polevoi, Yu.Z. (1959). *Zarozhdenie marxizma v Rossii, 1883—1894*. [Genesis of Marxism in Russia]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR.

Popov, G.H. (2011). *Perestroika Mihaila Gorbacheva: vyhod iz socializma*. [Perestroika of Michael Gorbachev: Exodus from Socialism]. Moscow: Izdatelskiy dom Mezhdunarodnogo universiteta.

Popov, V., Zhukov, V., Pilipenko, A. (2007). Nuzhny li Rossii inostrannyye studenty? [Does Russia need Foreign Students]. *Vyshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 11, 57-61.

Porter, R. Ed. (2003). *The Cambridge History of Science Volume 4: Eighteenth-Century Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Powar, K.B. (2001). *Internationalization of Indian Higher Education*. New Delhi: Association of Indian

Universities.

Pozharskaya, S., Saplin, A. (Ed.) (2001). *Komintern i grazhdanskaya voina v Ispanii*. [Comintern and Civil War in Spain]. Moscow: Nauka.

Pozhilov, I. E. (2010). Chtoby bogateli vse vmeste: Rossiya i Kitay. [To get Wealthier Together: Russia and China]. *Izvestia vyshsikh uchebnykh zavedenii. Povolzhskiy region. Gumanitarnye nauki*, 4, 34-41.

*Programma i Ustav VKP (b)*. [VKP (b) Program and Charter]. (1937). Moscow: Partizdat TsK VKP (b).

*Programma Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soyuza*. [Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union]. (1961). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.

Programma RSDRP 1905 goda. [RSDRP Program of 1905]. (2001). In *Polnyi sbornik platform vseh russkikh politicheskikh partiy* (pp. 9-16). Moscow: GPIBR Press.

Prokhorov, A.V. (2012). Novye akademicheskie tsennosti vysshego obrazovaniya. [New Academic Values of Higher Education]. *Gaudeamus*, 1, 22-27.

Prokofiev, M.A. (Ed.). (1967). *Narodnoe obrazovanie v SSSR*. [People's Education System in the USSR]. Moscow: Prosveshenie.

*Protocoly 6go Siezda RDSRP, 1917*. [6th RSDRP Congress, 1917. Protocols]. (1958). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.

Protokoly 6th Prazhskoi Vserossiiskoi konferentsii. RSDRP (1912). [Protocols of the 6th Prague Conference of RSDRP, 1912]. (1988). *Voprosy Istorii KPSS*, 5, 6-7.

Pruss, I. (2006). *Mozgi utekayut navsegda*. [Brain Drain Seems as an Eternal Process]. Retrieved from: <http://vzglyad.ru/society/2006/12/20/61732.html>

Pryadko, S.N. (2013). *Issledovanie rynka obrazovatelnykh uslug kak marketingovyi instrument prinyatiya planovykh resheniy v vuze*. [Study of the educational market as te marketing instrument for the decision making at a university]. Retrieved from <http://www.science-education.ru/100-5093>

Public Papers of William J. Clinton. (1994). In *Public Papers of Presidents of the United States, William J. Clinton, 1993, Book 1* (pp.1252-1269). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Pursiainen, Ch., Medvedev, S. (Eds). (2005). *Bolonskiy Protcess i ego vliyanie na Rossiu*. [The Bologna Process and its Implications for Russia]. Moscow: RESEP.

Pushkarenko, A. (2010). *Inostrannye studenty v Tomske ispytyvayut problemy s rabotoi, grazhdanstvom i lecheniem*. [International Students in Tomsk experience problems with jobs, status and medical care]. Retrieved from: <http://tomsk.sibnovosti.ru/society/239085-inostrannye-studenty-v-tomske-ispytyvayut-problemy-s-rabotoy-grazhdanstvom-i-lecheniem>

Putin, V.V. (2005). *Raspad SSSR – krupneishaya geopoliticheskaya katastrofa veka*. [Collapse of the USSR is the Largest Geo-Political Catastrophe of the Century]. Retrieved from: <http://www.regnum.ru/news/444083.html>

Putin, V.V. (2011). *Putin prizval biznes investirovat v podgotovku kadrov*. [Putin Requested from Business Investments in the Vocational Training of Professional Manpower]. Retrieved from <http://rus.ru/2011/12/23/62777408/>

- Putin, V.V. (2012a). Odná iz vazhneyahih zadach universiteta – eto internatoliizacia obrazovania. [One of the Major tasks of a University is to produce Internationalization of Education]. *Vysshee obrazovanie segodnya*, 10, 2-3.
- Putin, V.V. (2012b). *Nam nuzhna novaya ekonomika*. [We Need New Economy]. Retrieved from: [http://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/news/1488145/o\\_nashih\\_ekonomicheskikh\\_zadachah?full#cut](http://www.vedomosti.ru/politics/news/1488145/o_nashih_ekonomicheskikh_zadachah?full#cut)
- Putin, V.V. (2013). *Nado ostanovit' utechku mozgov*. [Brain Drain from Russia Should be Stopped]. Retrieved from <http://pernym.pf/news/215260.html>
- Pyatdesyat let narodnoi revoliucii v Mongolii*. [50 years Since the Victory of Revolution in Mongolia]. (1970). Moscow: Nauka.
- Pyzhikov, A. (2002). *Khrushchevskaya "ottepel 1953-1964 g.g.* [Khrushchev's Thaw, 1953-1964]. Moscow: Olma-Press.
- Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of Higher Education: Toward a Conceptual Framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, 1(2), 248-270.
- Raeff, M. (1990). *Russia Abroad: A Cultural History of the Russian Emigration, 1919-1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rajangu, V. (1997). *Higher Education in Estonia*. Bucharest: UNESCO-CEPES.
- Rakhimov, T.R. (2009). Osobennosti organizacii obucheniá inostrannyh studentov v rossiiskom vuze i napravlenie ego razvitiya. [Specifics in Organization of Studies for the Foreign Students at a Russian University and Divisions in this Development]. *Vestnik Tomskogo Universiteta*, 4(12), 123-136.
- Rakunov, V.A. (2011). *Gosudarstvennaya politika v sfere obshego obrazovaniya v 1920-30-h godah*. [State Policy in the field of General Education in 1920-30s]. Retrieved from: [http://www.zpu-journal.ru/e-zpu/2011/1/Rakunov\\_Formal\\_Education/](http://www.zpu-journal.ru/e-zpu/2011/1/Rakunov_Formal_Education/)
- Rapport Annuel Alliance Francaise*. [Annual Report of French Alliance]. (2003). Retrieved from: <http://afrus.ru/>
- Rashin, A.G. (1956). *Naselenie Rossii za 100 let (1811-1913)*. [Population of Russia during a hundred years, 1811-1913]. Moscow: Gosstat Press.
- Rasskazov, L.P. (2003). Rol GULAGa v predvoennyh pyatiletkah. [Role of GULAG in Five-Year Plans of the Pre-WWII period]. In *Ekonomicheskaya Istoriya: Ezhegodnik za 2002* (pp.269-319). Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Rastopshina, I.A. (2006). *Razvitie negosudarstvennogo vysshego obrazovania v Rossii v konce XX-nachale XXI v.v.* [Development of Non-State Higher Education in Russia: End of XX – beginning of XXI centuries]. Retrieved from: [http://www.mosgu.ru/nauchnaya/publications/abstract/Rastopshina\\_IA/](http://www.mosgu.ru/nauchnaya/publications/abstract/Rastopshina_IA/)
- Rekomendacii Minobra RF po protsedure provedeniya vyborov v vuzah*. [Recommendations of the Ministry of Education of Russian Federation for the Election Procedures in the Higher Educational Institutions]. (2006). Retrieved from: [www.sutd.ru/upload/iblock/afd/16.rtf](http://www.sutd.ru/upload/iblock/afd/16.rtf)
- Redl, H. B. (1964). *Soviet Educators on Soviet Education*. London: Collier-Macmillan.



- Reese, R. R. (2011). *Why Stalin's Soldiers Fought: The Red Army's Military Effectiveness in World War II*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Report of the Director of the Census, 1913*. Retrieved from: [http://www.census.gov/history/pdf/1913\\_Annual.pdf](http://www.census.gov/history/pdf/1913_Annual.pdf)
- Report of the Director of the Census, 1917*. Retrieved from: [http://www.census.gov/history/pdf/1917\\_Annual.pdf](http://www.census.gov/history/pdf/1917_Annual.pdf)
- Richmond, Y. (1987). *U.S.-Soviet cultural exchanges, 1958-1986: who wins?* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Richmond, Y. (2009). *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: How the West Won*. Retrieved from: [http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2013/0105/ca/richmond\\_exchange.html](http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/item/2013/0105/ca/richmond_exchange.html)
- Rickover, H.G. (1959). *Education and Freedom*. New York, NY: E.P. Dutton & Co.
- Rimskiy, V.L. (2002). *Korrupcia v sisteme obrazovania*. [Corruption in the System of Education]. Retrieved from: [http://www.indem.ru/rimskiy/Izv\\_corr\\_1.htm](http://www.indem.ru/rimskiy/Izv_corr_1.htm)
- Rinskiy, M. (2007). *Festival 1957*. Retrieved from: <http://berkovich-zametki.com/2007/Zametki/Nomer13/Rinsky1.htm>
- Roberts, G. (2005). Stalin and Soviet Foreign Policy. In M.P. Leffler, D.S.Painter (Eds.). *Origins of the Cold War: An International History* (pp.42-57). London: Routledge.
- Robertson, S.L. (2012). Researching Global Education Policy: Angles In/On/Out... In A. Verger, M.Novelli, H.Altinyelken (Eds.). *Global Education Policy and International Development: New Agendas, Issues and Practice* (pp.1-21). New York, NY: Continuum Books.
- Rodonova, S.Yu. (2002). Socialnaya adaptatsiya inostrannykh studentov k obucheniu v Rossiyskom vuze. [Social Adaptation of Foreign Students in Russian Universities]. *Yaroslavskiy Pedagogicheskii Vestnik*, 3(32), 1-6.
- Rodrigues, A.M., Leonov, S.V., Ponomarev, M.V. (2008). *Istoria XX veka. Rossia. Zapad. Vostok*. [History of 20th Century. Russia: West, East]. Moscow: Drofa Press.
- Rogachevskaya, L.S. (2005). *Kak sostavlyalsya plan pervoi pyatiletki*. [How the First 5-year plan was conducted]. Retrieved from: [http://www.situation.ru/app/j\\_art\\_692.htm](http://www.situation.ru/app/j_art_692.htm)
- Romashova, E.V. (2011). *Etno-kulturnye i pedagogicheskie tradicii Mongolii*. [Ethno-Cultural and Educational Traditions in Mongolia]. Retrieved from: [http://ctep.tpu.ru/ Report/Romashova.html](http://ctep.tpu.ru/Report/Romashova.html)
- Roosevelt, E. (1957). *My Day, November 15, 1957*. Retrieved from <http://www.gwu.edu/~erpapers/myday/1957>
- Rosen, S.M. (1963). *Higher Education in the U.S.S.R: Curriculum, Schools, and Statistics*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Rotblat, J. (1962). *Science and World Affairs: History of the Pugwash Conferences*. London: Dawsons of Pall Mall.
- Rozhdestvensky, A.V. (2009). *Internationalizatsiya rossiiskoi sistemy vysshego professionalnogo*

- obrazovania: Problemy i perspektivy*. [Internationalization of Russian System of Higher Professional Education: Problems and Prospects]. Retrieved from: <http://www.russia.edu.ru/information/analit/official/prorektor/3961/>
- Rozov, N.S. (1992). *Kultura, tsennosti i razvitie obrazovania*. [Culture, Values and Development of Education]. Moscow: Prosveshenie.
- Rozovskaya, L. (2010). *Oni uchilis v SSSR*. [They studied in the USSR]. Retrieved from: [http://www.bbc.co.uk/russian/russia/2010/02/100204\\_peoples\\_friendship\\_lumumb.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/russian/russia/2010/02/100204_peoples_friendship_lumumb.shtml)
- Rubin, Yu.B. (Ed.). (2004). *Globalizatsiya i konvergentciya obrzovaniya: tehnologicheskii aspekt*. [Globalization and conversion of education: technological aspect]. Moscow: Market DS.
- Rumyantsev, A.M. (Ed.). (1992). *Economicheskie i politicheskie reformy v stranah vostochnoi Evropy i Azii*. [Economic and Political Reforms in the countries of Eastern Europe and Asia]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Ryabov, G.P. (2004). Vysshee obrazovanie: puti k integratsii. [Higher education: Path to Integration]. *Vestnik MGU*, 20(1), 3-9.
- Sadlak, J. (1993). The Development of Higher Education in Eastern And Central Europe and the Aftermath of Recent Changes. In P.G. Altbach, Z. Morsy (Eds.). *Higher Education in International Perspective: Toward the 21st Century* (pp. 157 – 169). NY: Advent Books, Inc.
- Sadlak, J. (1995). In Search of the “Post-Communist” University – the Background and Scenario of the Transformation of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe. In K. Hufner (Ed.). *Higher Education Reform Processes in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp.43-62). Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Sadlak, J. (2000). Globalization versus the Universal Role of the University. *Higher Education in Europe*, XXV(2), 243-249.
- Sadovnichiy, V. A. (2002). *Budushchee rossiiskogo obrazovania v opasnosti!* [Future of Russian Education is in Danger]. In: Materialy VII s'ezda Rossiiskogo soyuza rektorov (p.p.9-21). Moscow: MGU Press.
- Sadovnichiy, V. (2003). Traditsii i sovremennost. [Traditions and Modernity]. *Vysshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 1, 11-18.
- Sadovnichiy, V.A. (2013). *MGU imeni Lomonosova: k chemu obyazyvayet osobyi status vuza*. [Moscow State University named after Lomonosov: Obligations, Associated with the Special Status of the University]. Retrieved from: <http://presscentr.rbc.ru/pressconf/2013/06/20/1077/>
- Safrazyan, N.L. (1977). *Borba KPSS za stroitel'stvo sovetskoi visshoi shkoly*. [Communist Party efforts in creation of the Soviet higher school]. M: Pedgiz.
- Saginova, O.V. (2005). *Mezhdunarodnaya strategiya vuza na rynke obrazovatelnykh uslug*. [International Strategy of a University on the Market of Educational Services]. Moscow: REA Press.
- Sakharov, A.D. (1996). *Vospominania*. [Memoirs]. Moscow: Prava cheloveka.
- Sakhovskiy, D.A. (2013). Razvitie mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva kak faktor povysheniya konkurentosposobnosti vypusknikov obrazovatelnykh organizatsii v Rossii. [Development of International Cooperation as a Growth Factor for the Competitiveness of the Russian University Graduates]. In *Global Educational – Obrazovanie bez granits* (pp.154-155). Moscow: Concord Group.

- Sakwa, R. (2008). *Putin: Russia's Choice*. NY: Routledge.
- Salmi, J. (2009). *The Challenge of Establishing World-Class Universities*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Savin, V.M. (Ed.). (2009). *Pyatdesyat let RUDN: internatsionalnyi opyt podgotovki spetsialistov dlya SSSR, Rossii i zarubezhnyh stran*. [50 Years Anniversary of the People's Friendship University: International Experience of Vocational Training Provision to the Specialists from the USSR, Russia and Foreign Countries]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo RUDN.
- Savvin, A.S. (2012). Bolonsky protsess i natsionalnaya sistema obrazovaniya. [The Bologna Process and the Russian national system of education]. *Filosofiya obrazovaniya*, 41(2), 43-47.
- Sazanova, N.V. (2007). Natsionalnaya bezopasnost i nauchnye i obrazovatelnye obmeny mezhdru SSSR (RF) i USA v 1985-2006 g.g. [National Security and Scientific, and Educational Exchanges between the USSR (RF) and the USA in 1985-2006]. *Izvestia Samarskogo nauchnogo tsentra RAN*, 9 (2), 503-508.
- Schectman, J. (2003). *Groundbreaking Scientific Experiments, Inventions and Discoveries of the 18th Century*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Scott, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The Globalization of Higher Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Scott, P. (1999). Globalization and Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4(1), 3-10.
- Scott, P. (Ed.). (2000a). *Higher Education Re-formed*. London: Falmer Press.
- Scott, P. (2000b). Higher Educational in Central and Eastern Europe: An Analytical Report. In *Ten Years After and Looking Ahead: A review of Transformations of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe. Studies on Higher Education* (pp. 341-408). Bucharest, UNESCO- CEPES.
- Scott, P. (2002). Reflections on the Reform of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe. *Higher Education in Europe*, 27(1-2), 137-152.
- Scott, P. (2009). Markets and New Modes of Knowledge Production. In J.Enders, E.De Weert (Eds.). *The Changing Face of Academic Life: Analytical and Comparative Perspectives* (pp.58-77). Oxford: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scott, P. (2010). Higher Education and the Transformation of Society. In P.Peterson, E.Baker, B.McGaw (Eds.). *International Encyclopaedia of Education* (pp. 370-376). Cambridge, MA: Elsevier.
- Sedgwick, R. (2002). The Trade Debate in International Higher Education. *World Education News and Reviews*, 15(5), 2-5.
- Sedmaya Vserossiiskaya konferencia RSDRP. Protokoly, 1917*. [Protocols of the 7th All-Russian Conference of RSDRP, 1917]. (1958). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Senashenko, V., Tkach, G. (2003). Bolonskiy process: o sopostavimosti kvalifikatsiy. [Bologna Process: compatibility of qualifications]. *Visshiee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 3, 25-34.
- Sevek, R.M. (2011). *Upravlenie vzaimodeistviem na rynke obrazovatelnykh uslug (na primere respubliki Tyva)*. [Cooperative Management in the Market of Educational Services (Case of Tuva Republic)]. Retrieved from: <http://economy-lib.com/upravlenie-vzaimodeystviem-na-rynke->

obrazovatelnyh-uslug

Shabelnikov, V.I. (2011). Vprovadzhennya administrativno-territorialnoi politiki URSR na novopriednanih zahidnih zemlyah (veresen 1939-cherven 1941 pp.). [Application of Soviet Ukrainian Administrative Policy in the Newly Incorporated Territories]. *Istorichni i politologichni doslidzhenia*, 1-2(47-48), 14-17.

Shadrikov, V.D. (1993). *Filosofiya obrazovania i obrazovatelnye politiki*. [Philosophy of Education and Educational Policy]. Moscow: Logos Press.

Shadrikov, V.D. (2004). Gosudarstvennye obrazovatelnye standarty vysshego professionalnogo obrazovania i Bolonskiy process. [State Educational Standards for Higher Professional Education and Bologna Process]. *Voprosy obrazovania*, 4, 5-9.

Shafarevitch, I.R. (1991). *Sotsializm kak yavlenie mirovoi istorii*. [Socialism as a Phenomenon of World History]. Moscow: Sovetsky Pisatel.

Shalmanov, S. (2006). *Rossia poteryala ot "Utechki mozgov" \$1 trillion*. [Russia lost \$1 Trillion dollars from "Brain Drain."]. Retrieved from: <http://www.silicontaiga.ru/home.asp?artId=1449>

Shaoqi, L. (1954). Doklad o proekte Konstitutsii KNR. [Report on the draft of the Constitution of Chinese People's Republic]. In *Sbornik vazhnykh dokumentov, nachinaya s momenta obrazovania gosudarstva* (pp.25). Pekin: Foreign Languages Press.

Schweizer P. (2003). *Reagan's War: The Epic Story of His Forty-Year Struggle and Final Triumph over Communism*. Westminster, MD: Doubleday Publishing.

Shehovtsev, M. V. (2006). *Strategiya razvitiya informatcionno-kommunikatcionnogo sektora: tendentsii i perspektivy Rossii*. [Strategy of Development of the Information-Communication Sector: Tendencies and Prospects]. Moscow: Ankil.

Shenderova, S.V. (2011a). Struktura dohodov vedushih mirovyh i rossiyskih universitetov: sravnitelnyi analiz po otkritim istochnikam. [Income Structure of the Leading Foreign and Russian Universities: Comparative analysis on the Basis of Open Sources]. *Universitetskoe Upravlenie: Praktika i Analiz*, 1, 12-19.

Shenderova, S.V. (2011b). *Institucionalniy mehanizm mnogourovnevnogo vysshego obrazovaniya v Rossiyskoi Federatsii: formirovanie i razvitie*. [Institutional mechanism of Multi-level Higher Education in Russian Federation: Formation and development]. St. Petersburg: SPbGUEF.

Shepkina, E. (2002). Student v Rossii i Amerike: sociologicheskiy portret. [Students in Russia and America: sociological portrait]. *Visshiee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 2, 83-87.

Sherbak, E.N. (2007). *Platnoe obrazovanie v vysshih uchebnykh zavedeniyakh Rossii*. [Introduction of Tuition in Russian Universities]. Moscow: Yurkompany.

Sherbak, E. (2010). *Platnye obrazovatelnye uslugi v sfere vysshego professionalnogo obrazovania v sisteme finansovo-ekonomicheskikh otnosheniy vysshei shkoly Rossii*. [For-Pay Educational Services in the Field of Higher Professional Education as Part of the System of Financial-Economic Relations in Modern Russian Education]. Retrieved from: <http://www.law-n-life.ru/arch/n137.aspx>

Sheregi, F.E., Dmitriev, M.N., Arefiev, A.L. (2002). *Nauchno-pedagogicheskiy potencial i eksportnye vozmozhnosti rossiyskikh vuzov*. [Scholarly and pedagogical capacity, and export capabilities of Russian universities]. Moscow: TsSP Press.

- Sheregi, F.E., Kharcheva, V.G., Serikov, V.V. (1997). *Sociologia obrazovania: prikladnoi aspect*. [Sociology of Education: Aspect of Application]. Moscow: Yurist.
- Shestnadsataya konferentsia VKPb. Stenograficheskiy otchet*. [Sixteenth Congress of VKP (b). Stenographic Report]. (1929). Moscow: Gosizdat Press.
- Shestoi Siezd RDSRP, 1917. Protocoly*. [6th RSDRP Congress, 1917. Protocols]. (1958). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Shestoperova, L. (1995). Zarubezhnyi opyt podgotovki specialistov i nekotorye obrazovatelnye processy v Rossii. [Experience in vocational training of professional specialists abroad, and educational processes in Russia]. *Visshiee obrazovanie v Rossii, 1*, 165-169.
- Shevardnadze, E.A. (1988). Sovetskaya vneshnyaya politika i diplomatiya. Doklad na XIX siezde KPSS. [Soviet International Policy and Diplomacy. Report to the XIX CPSU Conference]. *Mezhdunarudnaya Zhizn, 9*, 9-133.
- Shevchenko, A.V. (2006). *Osnovnye tendencii razvitiya podgotovki specialistov dlya zarubezhnykh stran v otechestvennykh vuzakh v 1960-2003 g.g.* [Main Tendencies in Development of the Process of Vocational Training of Foreign Specialists in the Russian higher Educational Institutions in 1960-2003]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/osnovnye-tendentsii-razvitiya-podgotovki-spetsialistov-dlya-zarubezhnykh-stran-v-otechestven#ixzz2E1411Da6>
- Shevchenko, D.A. (2013). *Istoria stanovleniya i formirovaniya runka sistemy vysshego professionalnogo obrazovania v Rossii*. [History of Formation and Development of the market of Higher Professional Education in Russia]. Retrieved from: <http://shevchenko.rggu.ru/?p=439>
- Shirobokov, S. N. (2012). Sovremennye tendentsii razvitiya akademicheskoi mobilnosti subiektov obrazovatel'nogo protsessa. [Current tendencies in the development of academic mobility among the subjects of educational process]. *Vestnik IGLU, 4*, 201-207.
- Shiryayeva, I.V. (1980). *Osobennosti adaptatsii inostrannykh studentov k uchebno-vospitatel'nomu processu v sovetskom vuze*. [Specifics of Adaptation of Foreign Students to the Study Process and Ideological Upbringing in Soviet Higher Education]. Leningrad, LGU.
- Shishikin, V. G. (2011). Kontseptualnaya podgotovka reform vysshego obrazovania v SSSR (1987-1991 g.g.). [Conceptual Preparation of the Higher Education Reform in the USSR, 1987-1991]. In *Sbornik materialov Ioi Vserossiiskoi molodezhnoi nauchnoi konferentsii* (pp.247-253). Novosibirsk: Parallel Press.
- Shishkin, S.V. (Ed.). (2004). *Dostupnost vysshego obrazovania v Rossii*. [Availability of Higher Education in Russia]. Moscow: Nezavisimyi institut socialnoi politiki.
- Shlenov, Yu. (2001). Rashody na obrazovanie - vklad v budushee strany. [Expenses for Education is a Deposit into the Future of the Nation]. *Rodina, 3*, 33-47.
- Shohov, A. (2010). *Proekt reform sistemy obrazovania dlya postsovetskikh stran*. [Project of Reformation of Educational Systems in the Post-Soviet Countries]. Odessa: Alternativa Press.
- Sholohov, M. (1959). *Donskie rasskazy*. [Don Stories]. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya literatura.

- Shore, M. J. (1947). *Soviet Education: Its Psychology and Philosophy*. New York, NY: Philosophical Library, Inc.
- Shostakovskiy, V.N. (Ed.). (2002). *GULAG (Glavnoe upravlenie lagereiy. 1918-1960)*. [GULAG (Main Administration of Camps). 1918-1960]. Moscow: Materik.
- Shpotov B.M. (2013). *Amerikanskiy biznes i Sovetskiy Souz, 1920-1930-e gody: labirinty ekonomicheskogo sotrudnichestva*. [American Business and the USSR in 1920-30s: Labyrinth of Economic Collaboration]. Moscow: Librokom.
- Shtamm, S.I. (1985). *Upravlenie narodnym obrazovaniem v SSSR (1917-1936)*. [Management of Education System in the USSR in 1917-1936]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Shumilin, I. (1962). *Soviet Higher Education*. Munich: Institute for the Study of the USSR.
- Simpson, J. H. (1939). *The Refugee Problem: Report of a Survey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simonov, K.M. (1989). *Zhivye i mertvye*. [The Living and the Dead]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literatura.
- Sinelnikov, S. G. (1995). *Byudzhetniy krizis v Rossii: 1985-1995 gody*. [Budget Crisis in Russia: 1985-1995]. Moscow: Evrasia.
- Sivak, E.V., Yudkevitch, M.M. (2013). Akademicheskaya professiya v sravnitelnoi perspective: 1992-2012. [Academic Profession in the Comparative Perspective, 1992-2012]. *Forsait*, 7(30), 38-47.
- Sladkovskiy, M.I. (1980). *KNR. Kratkiy istoricheskiy ocherk (1949-1979 gg.)*. [PRC. Short Historical Excuse, 1949-1979]. Moscow: Politizdat.
- Sleen, M. (2004). *Final report on the second phase of the Tempus programme (1994-2000)*. Rotterdam: ECORYS-NEI.
- Slepukhin, A.Yu. (2004). *Vysshee obrazovanie v usloviakh globalizacii: problemy, protivorechia, tendencii*. [Higher Education in the Realities of Globalization: Problems, Contradictions, Tendencies]. Moscow: Forum Press.
- Slepukhin, A.Yu. (2005). Integracia obrazovatel'nogo prostranstva vysshei shkoly: globalnoe i lokalnoe. [Integration of Higher Education Space: Global and Local]. *Integracia obrazovaniya*, 1/2, 3-6.
- Sletkov, I. A. (2002). Regionalizatsiya visshego obrazovaniya: teoriya i praktika [Regional aspects of higher education: theory and practice]. In *Vissshee obrazovanie v regione: socialno-ekonomicheskii i sociokulturniy aspekty* (pp.24-29). Tambov: TGU Press.
- Slezin, A. A. (Ed.) (2010). *Grani istorii. 1946-1991*. [Facets of History]. Tambov: Yulis Press.
- Smirnov, E. (2003). Stanet li Rossiya visokotekhnologicheskoi stranoi? [Will Russia become a high-tech country?]. *Alma Mater*, 1, 34-36.
- Smirnov, S. (2004). Bolonskiy Process: perspektivi razvitiya v Rossii. [Bologna Process: perspectives of progress in Russia]. *Vissshee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 1, 43-51.
- Smirnov, V.N. (1960). V.I. Lenin i pervye shagi v organizatsii sovetskoi vysshei shkoly. [V. I. Lenin and first steps in the formation of the Soviet Higher Education]. *Pravovedenie*, 2, 15-28.

- Smolentseva, A. Yu. (2002). Challenges to the Russian Academic Profession. *Higher Education*, 45(4), 391-424.
- Smolentseva, A. Yu. (2004). International Students in Russia. *International Higher Education*, 36, 18-20.
- Smolentseva, A. Yu. (2011). Higher Education in Russia in the Twenty-First Century: Searching for Excellence. *World Studies in Education*, 12(1), 41-59.
- Smolentseva, A. Yu. (2012). *Access to Higher Education in the Post-Soviet States: Between Soviet Legacy and Global Challenges*. Retrieved from <http://www.salzburgglobal.org/mediafiles/PRES271.pdf>
- Smolyanitskiy, M. (2001). Deti festivalei. [Children of Festival]. In *Antologiya sovremennogo rasskaza, ili istorii kontsa veka* (pp. 109-139). Moscow: Olimp-AST.
- Smoot, D. (1962). *The Dan Smoot Report*. Dallas, TX: Dan Smoot Report Inc.
- Snyder, T.D. (Ed.). (1993). *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait*. Washington, DC: NCES Press.
- Soboleva, E.N. (2009). Rossiya mozhet i dolzhna vyiti iz krizisa okrepshoi i obnovlennoi. [Russia should come out of crises reformed and enforced]. *Vysshee obrazovanie segodnya*, 2, 2-5.
- Soboleva, I.D. (2011). Ekonomika i obrazovanie. [Economics and Education]. *Razvitie i ekonomika*, 1, 150-151.
- Sobranie postanovleniy i rasporyazheniy Soveta Ministrov SSSR, 1946*. [Collection of Decisions and statements of the USSR Council of Ministers for 1946]. Retrieved from: <http://naukaprava.ru/Catalog/Search/129>
- Socialisticheskoe obrazovanie. [Socialist Education]. (1937). In *Dvadcat let Sovetskoi vlasti* (pp.32-35). Moscow: Partizdat.
- Soderqvist, M. (2007). *Internationalization and its management at higher-education institutions: Applying conceptual, content and discourse analysis*. Helsinki: HSE Print.
- Sofinskiy, N.N. (1982). Mezhdunarodnye svyazi sovetskoi vysshei shkoly v 9 pyatiletke. [International Contacts of Soviet higher Education During the 9th Five-Year Plan]. *Vestnik vysshei shkoly*, 7, 10-13.
- Sokolov, A. K., Tyazhelnikova, V. S. (1999). *Kurs sovetskoi istorii, 1941-1991*. [The Course of Soviet History, 1941-1991]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Solomonov, V. A. (2000). *Pervoprohodtsy universitetskoj nauki. Kollektivniy portret pervyh professorov i studentov Saratovskogo universiteta*. [Pioneers of University Science. Collective Portrait of the Saratov University First Professors and Students]. Saratov: SGU.
- Soloviev, V.S. (1994). Russkaya ideya. [Russian Idea]. In Soloviev, V.S. *O hristianskom edinstve* (pp. 161-179). Moscow: Rudomino. (Original work published 1888).
- Soros, J. (2001). *Otkrytoe obshchestvo. Reformiruyaya globalnyi kapitalizm*. [Opened Society. Reforming Global Capitalism]. Moscow: Fond PKONIT Press.
- Soskin, V.L. (2000). *Vysshee obrazovanie i nauka v Sovetskoi Rossii: pervoe desyatiletie. 1917-1927*.

[Higher education and Science in Soviet Russia: First Decade, 1917-1927]. NGU Press.

Sotskov, L. (2011). *Agressia. Rassekrechennye dokumenty sluzhby vneshney razvedki RF 1939-1941*. [Aggression. Declassified Documents of Russian Intelligence Service, 1939-1941]. Moscow: Ripol klassik Press.

*Soveshchania Kominforma. 1947, 1948, 1949. Dokumenty i materialy*. [Meetings of Cominform 1947, 1948, 1949. Documents and Materials]. (1998). Moscow: RPE Press.

*Sovetskoe rukovodstvo: Perepiska, 1928-1941*. [Soviet Leadership. Communication, 1928-1941]. (1999). Moscow: ROSSPEN.

*Sovetskiy Faktor v Vostochnoi Evrope: 1944-1953 gg. Dokumenty*. [Soviet Factor in Eastern Europe: 1944-1953. Documents]. (2002). Moscow: ROSSPEN Press.

*Sovetsko-mongolskie otnosheniya 1921-1974. Dokumenty i materialy*. [Relations between the USSR and Mongolia in 1921-1974]. (1975). Ulan-Bator: Mir-Nom.

*Soviet-American Dialogue in the Social Sciences: Research Workshops on Interdependence Among Nations*. (1990). Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

*Sovremennye problemy i innovatsionnye perspektivy vuzov Rossii*. [Modern Problems and Innovation Prospects of Russian Universities]. (2010). Ufa: BIST ATiSO.

Soyfer, V.N. (2005). *Intellektualnaya elita i filantropia. Desyat let Sorosovskoi Obrazovatelnoi programmy*. [Intellectual Elite and Philanthropy. 10 years of Soros Educational Program]. Moscow: DDF Foundation.

*SSSR v tsifrah*. [USSR in Numbers]. (1934). Moscow: Soyuzorguchet Press.

Stalin, I.V. (1926). O vozmozhnosti postroeniya sotcializma v nashei strane. [On the Possibility of Construction of Socialism in Our Country]. In Stalin, I.V. *Sochineniya, Vol.8* (pp 95-98). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.

Stalin, I.V. (1929). God velikogo pereloma. [The Year of Great Break]. In Stalin, I.V. *Sochineniya, Vol.12* (pp.118-135). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.

Stalin, I.V. (1931). O zadachah hozyaistvennikov. [New Tasks for the Administrators of Industry]. In Stalin, I.V. *Sochineniya, Vol. 13* (pp. 51-80). Moscow: Politicheskaya literatura.

Stalin, I.V. (1934). Beseda s angliyskim pisatelem G.D. Uelsom. [Conversation with English writer H.G. Wells]. In Stalin, I.V. *Sochineniya, Vol. 14* (pp. 24-39). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Pisatel.

Stalin, I.V. (1935). Kadry reshaut vse. Iz rechi pered vypuschnikami voennykh akademiya. [Professional Human Resources are the Decisive Factor. From the Speech at the Graduation Ceremony of Military Academies]. In V.A. Nevezhin (2011), *Zastoliya Iosifa Stalina. Bolshie kremlevskie priemy 1930-h – 1940-h godov. Kniga 1*. [Banquet Speeches of Josef Stalin. Big Kremlin Official Functions in 1930-40s. Volume 1]. Moscow: Novyi Hronograf.

Stalin, I.V. (1938). Rech na prieme rabotnikov vysshei shkoly. [Speech at the official function in the honor of professionals in higher education]. In Stalin, I.V. *Sochineniya, Vol. 14* (pp. 250-251). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Pisatel.



- Stalin, I.V. (1939). Otchetnyi doklad na XVIII Siezde partii o rabote TsK VKP(b). [Report to the 18th VKP (b) Congress on the work of TSK VKP(b)]. In *Stalin, I.V. Sochineniya, Vol. 14* (pp. 290-341). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Pisatel.
- Stalin, I.V. (1946). Otvety na voprosy prezidenta amerikanskogo agenstva “Yunaited Press” gospodina H. Beyili. [Replies to Questions of Mr. H. Baillie, President of the United Press Agency]. In *Stalin, I.V. Sochineniya, Vol. 16* (pp. 40-43). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Pisatel.
- Stalin, I.V. (1952a). Economicheskie problemy sotcializma. [Economic Problems of Socialism]. In *Stalin, I.V. Sochineniya, Vol. 16* (pp. 154-223). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Pisatel.
- Stalin, I.V. (1952b). Rech na XIX Siezde VKP (b)-KPSS. [Speech at the XIX VKP(b)-CPSU Congress]. In *Stalin, I.V. Sochineniya, Vol. 16* (pp. 227-229). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Pisatel.
- Stalin, I.V. (1984). Zapis besedy Stalina s Trumenom ot 17 iulya, 1945. [Stenographic report of the meeting of Stalin and Truman on July 17th 1945]. In *Sovetskiy Souz na mezhdunarodnykh konferentsiyah perioda Velikoi Otechestvennoi voiny 1941-1945gg. Sbornik dokumentov, Vol.6* (p.39). Moscow: Izdatelstvo Politicheskoi literatury.
- Stalinskoe politburo v 1930-e gody. Sbornik dokumentov.* [Stalin Politburo in 1930s. Collection of Documents]. (1995). Moscow: AIRO XXV Press.
- Starikov, N.V. (2013). *Stalin, vspominaem vmeste.* [Stalin: Remembering together]. St. Petersburg: Piter.
- Starinov, I.G. (1964). *Miny zhdut svoego chasa.* [Land-mines are waiting for their time]. Moscow: Voenizdat.
- Stastna, V. (2005). *Bologna Process International Structure and National Consequences.* Prague: Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.
- Statisticheskii ezhegodnik Rossii za 1913.* [Annual Statistical Collection for Russia, 1913]. (1914). Petrograd.
- Stepanov, V. N. (1968). *Lenin i Russkaya organizatsiya Iskry, 1900-1903.* [Lenin and Organization of Iskra Newspaper Distribution in Russia]. Moscow, Mysl.
- Stoletov, V.N. (1975). Podgotovka kvalificirovannykh specialistov v SSSR. [Preparation of qualified specialists in the USSR]. In *Vospitanie v trude. Sbornik pedagogicheskikh materialov* (pp.32-45). Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Streitwieser, B. (2013). (Ed.). *Internationalization of Higher Education and Global Mobility.* Oxford: Symposium Books.
- Strydom, A.H. (2002). Globalization and Higher Education Studies in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 16*(10), 91-98.
- Sumarokova, E.V. (2002). *Finansirovanie visshogo obrazovaniya: zarubegniy opyt i otechestvennaya praktika.* [Financing higher education: foreign experience and domestic practice]. Retrieved from: [http://www.jeducation.ru/6\\_2002/42.html](http://www.jeducation.ru/6_2002/42.html)
- Suprunova, L.L. (2007). *Obrazovanie kak sredstvo mongolo-rossiiskogo sotrudnichestva.* [Education as a Resource of Russian-Mongolian Cooperation]. Ulan-Bator: Mir-nom Press.

- Surinsky, V. (1997). Nekotorye ekonomicheskie aspekty obucheniya inostrannykh grazhdan v rossiiskih vuzah. [Some Economic Aspects of Education of Foreign Citizens in Russian Universities]. *Alma mater (Vestnik vysshey shkoly)*, 6, 18-19.
- Suslov, M.A. (1982). *Na putyah stroitelstva kommunizma. Rechi i statii*. [On the Path of Communism Construction. Speeches and Articles]. Frunze: Kirgizizdat.
- Suspitsina, T. (2001). *A Formula of Success for Market-oriented Programs in Russia: A Study of Economics and Business Administration from the Perspective of Symbolic and Economic Capitals*. Retrieved from: <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~marvp/facultynetwork/whitepapers/suspitsina.html>
- Sutyurin, S.F. (2003). Internatsionalizatsiya vysshego obrazovaniya Rossii: problemy i perspektivy. [Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia: Problems and Prospects]. In *Mirovaya ekonomika na poroge novogo tysyacheletiya* (pp. 110-116). St. Petersburg: OTCEiM.
- Svinin, V. (2000). *Rossiya-Mongoliya: sodruzhestvo uchenyh*. [Russia – Mongolia: Cooperation of Academics]. Retrieved from: [http://www.vsp.ru/social/2000/12/16/344859?call\\_context=embed](http://www.vsp.ru/social/2000/12/16/344859?call_context=embed)
- Sweeney, C. (1994). Impact of Perestroika and Glasnost on Soviet Education: A Historical Perspective for Follow-on Research. *Slavic Review*, 53(2), 727-749.
- TashGU im. Lenina: istoria pervogo universiteta v Srednei Azii*. [Tashkent State University named after Lenin: history of the first university in Central Asia]. (1970). Tashkent: Uzbekistan.
- Tatur, Yu.G. (1999). *Obrazovatel'naya sistema Rossii: Vushsaya shkola*. [Educational System of Russia: Higher Education]. Moscow: MGTU Press.
- Tatur, Yu.G. (2013). *Sistema obrazovania Rossii*. [System of Education in Russia]. Retrieved from: <http://www.konc-ees.ru/pedagogika-vysshej-shkoly/sistema-obrazovaniya-rossii-page-3.html>
- Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a Strategy for Internationalisation: Lessons and Practice from Four Universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(2), 149-171.
- Tchougounov, T.K. (1961). *Vysshee obrazovanie v Sovetskom Souze*. [Higher Education in the Soviet Union]. Munich: COPE.
- Teichler, U. (1999). Internationalisation as a Challenge to Higher Education in Europe. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 5(1), 5-23.
- Teichler, U. (2003). Changing Concepts of Excellence in Europe in the Wake of Globalization". In E.,De Corte (Ed.). *Excellence in Higher Education* (pp. 33-51).
- Teichler, U. (2004). The Changing Debate on Internationalization of Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 48(1), 5-26.
- Teichler, U. (2009). Internationalisation of Higher Education: European Experiences. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10(1), 93-106.
- Ten Years of the European Training Foundation, 1994-2004*. (2004). Retrieved from: [http://www.etf.europa.eu/pubmgmt.nsf/%28getAttachment%29/9E86850E34C63F50C1257038002C125A/\\$File/ECU\\_10\\_years\\_04\\_EN.pdf](http://www.etf.europa.eu/pubmgmt.nsf/%28getAttachment%29/9E86850E34C63F50C1257038002C125A/$File/ECU_10_years_04_EN.pdf)

## Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia – References

*The Dynamics of Tempus in Higher Education: Tempus Conference Report.* (1997). Retrieved from: [http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/doc/portoroz\\_en.pdf](http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/tempus/doc/portoroz_en.pdf)

*The Important Documents of CPPCC.* (1950). Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

*The General Agreement between the Government of the USA and the Government of the USSR on Contacts, Exchanges and Cooperation in Scientific, Technical, Educational, Cultural and Other Fields.* (1985). Retrieved from: [http://www.channelingreality.com/Education/U.S.A.\\_and\\_U.S.S.R.\\_Agreement.pdf](http://www.channelingreality.com/Education/U.S.A._and_U.S.S.R._Agreement.pdf)

Timoshenko, A.G., Zinovieva, V.P. (Eds.). (2003). *Regiony Rossii i mirovye integratsionnye protsessy.* [Russian Regions and World Integration Processes]. Tomsk: TGU Press.

Tokin, I.P. (1932). *Lenin o Velikoi Francuzskoi Revolutcii.* [Lenin about Great French Revolution]. Moscow: Partiynoe Izdatelstvo.

Tokmoltseva, M. (2001). Vzaimnoe priznanie i ekvivalentnost dokumentov ob obrazovanii v Rossii. [Mutual nostrification and comparability of educational documents in Russia]. *Zakon*, 11, 106-113.

Tolz, V. (1997). *Russian Academicians and the Revolution: Combining Professionalism and Politics.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tomiak, J. J. (Ed.). (1986). *Western Perspectives on Soviet Education in the 1980s.* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Tomskih, A. A. (2011). Vysshee professionalnoe obrazovanie Mongolii v mirovykh strategiyah razvitiya. [Higher Professional Education in Mongolia in the Global Development Strategies]. *Perspektivy Nauki*, 9(24), 7-13.

Tomusk, V. (2000). *The Blinding Darkness of the Enlightenment. Towards the Understanding of Post State-Socialist Higher Education in Eastern Europe.* Turku: University of Turku Press.

Tregubova, T.M. (2009). Funkcii mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva professionalnykh uchebnykh zavedeniy v edinom obrazovatelnom prostranstve. In *Mezhdunarodnoe sotrudnichestvo v professionalnom obrazovanii: problemy i perspektivy* (pp.207-211). Kazan: ASO.

Trenin, D. (2006). *Integratsia i identichnost. Rossia kak "novyi Zapad".* [Integration and Identity: Russia as a "New West."]. Moscow: Evropa Press.

*Tretii syezd RSDRP, 1905. Protokoly.* [Third RSDRP Congress, 1905. Protocols]. (1959). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.

Tretyakov, V.G. (2003). *Istoria sotrudnichestva Rossii i Mongolii v sfere zheleznodorozhnogo transporta, 1890-1990-e g.g.* [History of Cooperation between Russia and Mongolia in Railroad Transportations]. Irkutsk: IGU Press.

Trotsky, L.D. (1910). *Intelligentsia i socialism.* [The Intelligentsia and Socialism]. Retrieved from: <http://magister.msk.ru/library/trotsky/trotl503.htm>

Trotsky, L. D. (1918). Oktyabrskaya revoliuciia. [October Revolution]. In Trotsky, L.D. (1925). *Sochinenia*, (Vol. 3). Retrieved from: <http://www.magister.msk.ru/library/trotsky/trotl360.htm>

Trotsky, L.D. (1919). *Mysli o hode proletarskoi revoliucii.* [Thoughts on the Progress of Proletariat

Revolution]. Retrieved from: <http://magister.msk.ru/library/trotsky/trotl512.htm>

Trotsky, L.D. (1923). *Zadachi kommunisticheskogo vospitaniya*. [Mission of Communist Education]. Retrieved from: <http://www.1917.com/Marxism/Trotsky/CW/Trotsky-XXI/XXI-04-01-04-01.html>

Trotsky, L. D. (1927). V Atmosfere Neustoichivosti i Rastleniya. [In the Atmosphere of Uncertainty and Decay]. In Trotsky, L.D. , *Evropa v Voyine, 1914-1918*. Retrieved from: <http://www.magister.msk.ru/library/trotsky/trotl843.htm> (Original work published 1916).

Trotsky, L. D. (1991). *Moya zhizn: opyt avtobiografii*. [My Life: An Attempt of Autobiography]. Moscow: Panorama. (Original work published 1930).

Truet, D., Doll, W. E., Wang, H., Pinar, W.F. (Eds.). (2003). *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies*. NY: Peter Lang.

Trushin, A. (1999). Svobodno konvertiruemye spetsialisty. [Freely Convertible Specialists]. *Kariera*, 10, 54-62.

Tsarev, V. (2000). Preimushchestva distancionnogo obucheniya. [Advantages of distant learning]. *Vysshhee obrazovanie v Rossii*. 4, 124-126.

*Tsentry Britanskogo Soveta v Rossii: 20 let istorii*. [British Council Centers in Russia: 20 years of history. (2013). Retrieved from: <http://www.rsci.ru/grants/fonds/106.php>

Tsoi, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Enciclopedia koreicev Rossii. 140 let v Rossii*. [Encyclopedia of Koreans in Russia]. Moscow: RAEN Press.

Tsvetkova, N.A. (2006). Vostochno-evropeyskoe napravlenie obrazovatelnoi politiki USA v gody Holodnoi voiny: sozdanie i razvitie dvizheniya dissidentov. [East-European Direction of the US Educational Policy during the Years of Cold War: Formation and Development of the Dissident Movement]. In *Amerika i mir. Sbornik trudov v chest 70-letia professora B.A. Shiryayeva* (pp.33-58). St. Petersburg: SPbGU Press.

Tsvetkova, N.A. (2007). *Cultural imperialism: mezhdunarodnaya obrazovatel'naya politika USA v gody "holodnoi voiny"*. [Cultural Imperialism: the US International Educational Policy during the Years of Cold War]. St. Petersburg: SPbGU Press.

Tubbeh, L., Williams, J. (2010). Framing Issues of International Education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (150), 7-16.

Tvardovskiy, A. T. (1976). *Vasily Terkin. Kniga pro boitsa*. [Vasily Terkin. A book about a warrior]. Moscow: Nauka.

Tyagunov, F. (2011). *Institut obrazovaniya i Pervaya sotsialisticheskaya revolyutsiya*. [System of Education and First Socialist Revolution]. Moscow: Otrasleyvaya Pressa.

Tzeng, O., Worton, M., Homma, M. (2008). *Developing Successful International University Strategies*. Retrieved from <http://ihe.britishcouncil.org/going-global/sessions/developing-successful-international-university-strategies>

Uanga, M. (2002). *Vzaimosvyaz i vzaimovlianiye nacionalnykh kultur Mongolii i Rossii*. [Interconnection and Cross-influence of Russian and Mongolian National Cultures]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dissercat.com/content/vzaimosvyaz-i-vzaimovlianiye-natsionalnykh-kultur-mongolii-i-rossii>

- Uryavina-Kupriyanova, I.F. (2005). *Velikaya Rossiya. Imena*. [Great Russia. Names]. Moscow: OOO Zakon i Poryadok.
- U.S., Soviets Expand Plan For Students*. (1988). Retrieved from: [http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1988-09-02/news/8801270438\\_1\\_high-school-students-private-exchange-soviet-union](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1988-09-02/news/8801270438_1_high-school-students-private-exchange-soviet-union)
- Ushakin, S.A. (1992). University i vlast. [Universities and Power]. *Obshchestvennye Nauki i Sovremennost*, 2, 55-58.
- Ushakova, U.M., Gracianova, A.E. (2012). Osobennosti adaptatsii inostrannykh studentov v Rossiiskih vuzah. [Adapting Specifics of Foreign Students in Russian Universities]. In *Aktualnye socialnye problemy molodezhi i obrazovania* (pp.113-115). Tomsk: TPU Press.
- Ushkalov, I.G., Malaha, I.A. (2011). *Utechka umov: masshtaby, prichiny, posledstviya*. [Brain drain: magnitude, reasons, results]. Moscow: Librokom.
- Ustinov, D.F. (1988). *Vo imya Pobedy*. [For the Sake of Victory]. Moscow: Voenizdat.
- Ustinskih, A.N. (1997). *Gde zaryazhali pushku*. [Where the guns were loaded]. Oryel: Trud Press.
- Uvalic-Trumbic, S. (2002). Globalization and Quality in Higher Education: An Introduction. In *Globalization and the Market in Higher Education. Quality, Accreditation and Qualifications* (pp.1-10). Paris: UNESCO.
- Vakarchuk, I. (2011). *Lvivsky natsionalnyi universitet imeni Ivana Franka, stareishiy universitet Ukrainy i SNG*. [Lviv national university named after I. Franko, the oldest university of Ukraine and NIS]. Retrieved from: <http://www.franko.lviv.ua/>
- Van der Wende, M. (2007). Internationalization of Higher Education in the OECD Countries: Challenges and Opportunities for the Coming Decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 274-289.
- Van der Wende, M. (2009). European Responses to Global Competitiveness in Higher Education. In J. Douglass, J. King, I. Feller (Eds.), *Globalization's Muse: Universities and Higher Education Systems in a Changing World* (pp. 317-341). Berkley: UC Press.
- Vanin, Yu. V. (Ed.). (1988). *SSSR i Korea*. [The USSR and Korea]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Varghese, N.V. (2009). *Globalization, Economic Crisis and National Strategies for Higher Education Development*. Paris: UNESCO-IIEP.
- Vasenina, I., Sorokina, N. (1999). Kadrovaya politika vuzov v sovremennykh usloviyakh. [University Personnel Policy in Current Realities]. *Vysshiee obrazovanie v Rossii*, 6, 48-49.
- Vasilevskaya, I. I. (1969). *Yaponia i strany Yugo-Vostochnoi Azii posle 2 mirovoi voiny*. [Japan and Countries of South-Eastern Asia after World War II]. Moscow: Nauka.
- Vatlin, A.Yu. (1993). *Komintern: Pervye desyat let. Istoricheskie ocherki*. [Comintern: First Ten Years. Historical essays]. Moscow: Rossiya Molodaya.
- Vavilov, S.I. (1947). *Tridtsat let sovetskoi nauki*. [Soviet Science is Thirty Years Old]. Retrieved from: [http://www.ras.ru/sivavilovarchive/1\\_actview.aspx?id=521&print=1](http://www.ras.ru/sivavilovarchive/1_actview.aspx?id=521&print=1)

- Verhoturov, D.N. (2006). *Stalin. Ekonomicheskaya revolutciya*. [Stalin. Economic Revolution]. Moscow: OLMA-Press.
- Vernadskiy, V.I. (1901). *Ob osnovaniyah universitetskoj reformy*. [About the Necessity for a University Reform]. Moscow: MGU Press.
- Vernadskiy, V.I. (1993). Zhizneopisanie. Izbrannye trudy. *Vospominania sovremennikov. Suzhdeniya potomkov*. [Biography. Selected Works. Memoirs of Friends. Opinions of Descendants. Moscow: Sovremennik.
- Veryevkin, L.P., Karelov, S.V. (2006). *Inostrannye studenty v rossiiskih vuzah: motivy priezda i perspektivy trudoustroistva*. [International Students in Russian Universities: Reasons to Come and Prospects of Finding Jobs, while Studying]. Retrieved from: [www.courieredu.ru/cour0667/300.htm](http://www.courieredu.ru/cour0667/300.htm)
- Vinogradov, P.G. (2008). *Rossia na rasputye. Istoriko-publitsisticheskie statyi*. [Russia on the Cross-Road. Historical Articles for Public]. Moscow: Territoriya Budusshego. (Original work published 1901).
- Vinokurova, N.A., Nikonova, M.A. (2010). *Kommercializacia obrazovania i izmenenie socialnogo sostava studentov*. [Commercialization of Education and Changes in the Social Composition of the National Student Body]. Retrieved from: <http://www.mce.su/rus/archive/authors/person467/doc62934/>
- Vitkovskaya, M.I., Trotsuk, I.V. (2005). Adaptacia inostrannykh studentov k usloviyam zhizni i ucheby v Rossii na primere RUDN. [Adaptation of Foreign Students to the Life and Study Conditions in Russia. Case of the People's Friendship University]. *Vestnik RUDN*, 6-7, 267-283.
- Vituhnovskaya M. (Ed.). (2000). Na korme vremeni: Interview s leningradcami 1930-h gg. [At the Stern of Time: Interviews with Leningrad citizen of 1930s]. *Neva*, 1, 3-17.
- Vladimirov, V.G. (1997). Gosudarstvenniy vuz v rynochnoi ekonomike. [A State university in the reality of the market economy]. *Vishee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 4, 6-13.
- Vneshnyaya politika Rossii. 1990-1992*. [Russian International Policy in 1991-1992]. (1996). Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya.
- Vodichev, E.G. (2000). *Issledovatel'skie universitety USA i rossiiskaya universitetskaya sistema: opyt sravnitel'nogo analiza*. [Research Universities in the USA and Russian University System: Comparable Analysis]. Omsk: OGPU.
- Voilenko, E.I. (Ed.). (1978). *Vysshaya shkola. Osnovnye postanovleniya, prikazy i instrukcii*. [Higher Education. Main Statements, Directives and Instructions]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Volin, M. (1964). *Leninskaya "Iskra" (1900-1903)*. [Lenin Iskra, 1900-1903]. Moscow, Izdatelstvo Politliteratury.
- Volkogonov, D. (1995). *Sem vozhdiei*. [Seven Leaders]. Moscow: Novosti Press.
- Volobuev, P.V. (1987). Russkaya nauka nakanune Oktyabrskoi revoliucii. [Russian Science on the Eve of October Revolution]. *Voprosy istorii estestvoznania i tehniki*, 3, 5-8.
- Voroshilov, K. E. (1939). *Krasnaya Armiya na zashite sotcialisticheskoi Rodiny. Rechi, prikazy, privetsviya 1938 goda*. [Red Army Protecting Socialist Motherland. Speeches, Directives, Greetings of 1938]. Moscow: Gospolitizdat.

## Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia – References

- Voroshilov, K.E. (1955). *Po slavnomu puti sotcializma*. [By the Glorious Path of Socialism]. Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Vosemnadsataya Vsesoyuznaya konferencia VKP (b), 1941. [18th VKP (b) Congress materials. 1941]. (1954). In *KPSS v rezolyuciah i resheniah syezdov, konferencii i plenumov, Vol. 3* (pp. 425-436). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Vosemnadcatyi Siezd VKP (b): Stenograficheskiy Otchet*. [Eighteenth VKP (b) Congress: Stenographic Report]. (1939). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Vtoroi syezd RSDRP, 1903. Protokoly*. [Second RSDRP Congress, 1903. Protocols]. (1959). Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Vucinich A. (1984). *Empire of Knowledge: The Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1917-1970*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Vysshaya shkola SSSR za 50 let*. [50 years of Higher Schooling in the USSR]. (1967). Moscow: Gosizdat.
- Vysshee obrazovanie v SSSR*. [Higher Education in the USSR]. (1990). Moscow: Prosveshenie.
- Waterhouse, S. (2005). *The Power of E-Learning: The Essential Guide for Teaching in the Digital Age*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Wieck, R. (1992). *Ignorance Abroad: American Educational and Cultural Foreign Policy and the Office of Assistant Secretary of State*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Weifang, M. (1999). *Improving the Effectiveness of Higher Education Institutions Through Inter-University Cooperation: the Case Study of Peking University*. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO.
- Weinberg, E.A. (1974). *The Development of Sociology in the Soviet Union*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Weinberg, G. L. (2005). *A World at Arms: A Global History of World War II*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press
- Wells, H.G. (2007). *Russia in the Shadows*. Oxford: Benediction Classics. (Original work published 1921).
- Werth, N. (1995). *Histoire de l'Union soviétique de Lénine à Staline, 1917-1953*. [History of Soviet Union from Lenin to Stalin, 1917-1953]. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Westergaard, P. K. (2009). *Globalised world calls for cultural knowledge*. Retrieved from: <http://ccrs.ku.dk>
- Woody, T. (1932). *New Minds: New Men? The Emergence of the Soviet Citizen*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Yagodin, G.A. (1989). *Cherez gumanizaciy i demokratizaciu k novomu kachestvu obrazovania*. [Through Humanization and Democratization to the New Quality of Education]. Moscow: APN Press.
- Yakovlev, A.N. (2005). *Sumerki*. [Twilight]. Moscow: Materik.
- Yakovlev, A. N. (2009). *Izbrannye intervyy: 1992-2005*. [Selected Interviews, 1992-2005]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodny Fond Demokratiya.
- Yampolskaya, L.I. (2004). Internacionalizaciya universitetskogo obrazovaniya v diskurse

- modernizatsionnykh processov i strategii reformirovaniya Rossiiskogo obshestva. [Internationalization of University Education in Discourse of Merdinzation Processes and Reforming Strategy of Russian Society]. *Izvestiya TGPU*, 307(2), 180-182.
- Yasin, E.G. (2002). *Rossiiskaya ekonomika. Istoki i panorama rynochnykh reform. Kurs lektsii*. [Russian Economy. Roots and Panorama of Market Reforms]. Moscow: GU VShE.
- Yasin, E. G. (2005). *Prizhivetsa li demokratiya v Rossii*. [Will Democracy Adapt in Russia]. Moscow: Novoe izdatelstvo.
- Yeltsin, B.N. (1992). Zayavlenie prezidenta Rossiiskoi Federatsii B.N. Yeltsina ot 29.01.1992. [Speech of the President of Russian Federation, Yeltsin B.N., in State Duma from January 29, 1992]. *Diplomaticheskii Vestnik*, 1, 4-5.
- Yeltsin, B.N. (2008). *Ispoved na zadannuyu temu. Razmyshleniya, vospominaniya, vpechatleniya*. [Confession on the Given Topic: Thoughts, Memoirs, Impressions]. Moscow: ROSSPEN.
- Yudkevich, M.M. (2012). *Konkurenciya vyvedet rossiyskie universitety na mirovoi uroven*. [Competition will lift Russian universities to the world level]. Retrieved from: <http://opec.ru/1566698.html>
- Yury Alexandrovitch Zhdanov: Biografiya*. [Yury A. Zhdanov: Biography]. (2005). Retrieved from: <http://www.knowbysight.info/ZhZZ/02556.asp>
- Zajda, J. (2003). Educational Reform and Transformation in Russia: Why Education Reforms Fail. *European Education*, 35(1), 58-88.
- Zak, T.V. (2007). Reformirovanie sistemy finansirovaniya vysshei shkoly kak uslovie povysheniya konkurentosposobnosti. [Reformation of the financial system of higher education as a condition of the growth of its competitiveness]. *Ekonomicheskie Nauki*, 35, 347-355.
- Zaretskaya, S.L. (2001a). Obrazovanie v kontekste globalizatsii. [Education in the context of globalization]. *Ekonomika obrazovaniya*, 4, 34-44.
- Zaretskaya, S.L. (2001b). Mezhdunarodnaya sostavlyayushchaya sovremennogo vysshego obrazovaniya. [International component of Modern Higher Education]. In *Globalizatsiya i obrazovanie: sbornik obzorov* (pp.38-74). Moscow: INION RAN.
- Zayonchikovskaya, Zh.A. (2003). Trudovaya emigratsiya rossiyskikh uchenykh. [Labor Emigration of Russian Scholars]. In *Sovremennye Problemy Migratsii v Rossii. Materialy Obshcherossiyskoi Konferentsii* (pp.13-20). Moscow: INP RAN.
- Zemlyanaya, T.B., Pavlycheva, O.N. (2011). Stanovlenie sistemy vysshego obrazovaniya v Sovetskiy period. [Establishment of the Higher Education System During the Soviet Period]. *Zhurnal nauchno-pedagogicheskoi informatsii*, 7, 179-219.
- Zernov, V.A. (2004). *Sovremennoe sostoyaniye i perspektivy razvitiya negosudarstvennogo dektora vysshego obrazovaniya Rossii*. [Non-State Sector of Russian Higher Education: Modern Status and Prospects of Development]. Retrieved from: <http://www.lomonosov.de/200403/sernow304.pdf>
- Zetkin, K. (1933). *Sbornik statei i materialov*. [Collection of articles and materials]. Moscow: Gospolitizdat.
- Zhalsapova, Zh. B. (2009). *Vzaimootnosheniya SSSR s MNR v voennoi sfere*. [Relations between the USSR



- and the People's Republic of Mongolia in the military field]. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.dissercat.com/content/vzaimootnosheniya-rossiisssr-s-mongolieimnr-v-voennoi-sfere>
- Zharenova, O.A., Ketchil, N.V., Pakhomov, E. (2002). *Intellektualnaya migraciya rossiyan. Blizhnee i dalnee zarubezhie*. [Intellectual migration of the Russians. Nearby and Faraway Abroad]. Moscow: GNOM i D.
- Zhdanov, A.A. (1947). *Doklad o mezhdunarodnom polozhenii na pervom sovesshanii kominforma*. [Report on the International Situation at the 1st Session of Cominform]. Retrieved from  
<http://www.alexanderyakovlev.org/fond/issues-doc/69358>
- Zhdanov, Yu. A. (2004). *Vzglyad v proshloe: vospominaniya ochevidtca*. [Look into Past: Memoirs of a Witness]. Rostov-na-Donu: Feniks.
- Zhelezov B.V., Melikyan A.V. (2012). Uchastie mezhdunarodnyh sotrudnikov v razvitii rossiiskih vuzov. [Participation of international faculty in the development of Russian universities]. *Universitetskoe upravlenie: praktika i analiz*, 6, 38-44.
- Zhidkova, A.A. (1999). Rannyya stranitca istorii inostrannogo investirovaniya sovetsoi nauki. [Early Page in the History of Foreign Investment in Soviet Science]. In *Godichnaya nauchnaya konferentsia IIET RAN* (pp. 163-170). Moscow: IIET RAN Press.
- Zhilkin, A.D. (1999). *Povorot kontca 20-h i vysshaya shkola na primere MGU*. [The turn of late 1920s and higher education, case of MGU]. Retrieved from: <http://www.hist.msu.ru/Calendar/1999/Apr/lomonos99/Zhilkin.htm>
- Zhivotovskaya, I.G. (2001). *Globalizaciya i obrazovanie: institucionalniy i ekonomicheskiy aspekty*. [Globalization and Education: institutional and economic aspects]. Moscow: INION RAN.
- Zhivotovskaya, I.G. (2005). Vysshee obrazovanie kak obshchestvennoe blago. [Public Education as Public Good]. *Ekonomika obrazovaniya*, 1, 95-104.
- Zhuikov, G.G. (1962). *Gruppa "Osvobozhdenie truda"*. ["Liberation of Labor" Group]. Moscow: Sotcekgiz.
- Zhukotsky, V.D. (2010). *Russkaya revolutsiya i gumanizm*. [Russian Revolution and Humanism]. Retrieved from: <http://humanism.al.ru/ru/articles.phtml?num=000189>
- Zhukov, G.K. (2010). Rech na parade Pobedy, 24 iyunya 1945 g. [Speech at the Victory Parade, June 24, 1945]. In *Zhukov, G.K., Vospominaniya i razmyshleniya* (pp.876-881). Moscow: Voenizdat.
- Zhukov, V.I. (1998). *Rossiiskoe obrazovanie: problemy i perspektivy razvitiya*. [Russian Education: Problems and Development Prospects]. Moscow: Finstatinform.
- Zhukov, V.I. (2001). *Rossiskoe obrazovanie: istoki, tradicii, problemy*. [Russian Education: roots, traditions, problems]. Moscow: Prospekt Press.
- Zimina, T. (2008). *Utechka mozgov ili tsirkulyaciya talantov?* [Brain Drain or Circulation of Talents]. Retrieved from: <http://www.nkj.ru/news/14700/>
- Zinoviev, G.E. (1921). *Studenty i proletarskaya revolutsiya*. [Students and Proletariat Revolution]. Petrograd: Gosizdat.

## Internationalization of Higher Education in Russia – References

Zmeev, V. A. (2010). *Istoriya vysshei shkoly Rossiyskoi Imperii. Kurs lektsiy*. [Higher Education in Russian Empire. Collection of Lectures]. Moscow: MAKSPress-M.

Zornikov, I.N. (2002). Internationalizatsiya vysshego obrazovaniya: rol mezhdunarodnykh organizatsii, fondov i program. [Internationalization of Higher Education: Role of International Organizations, Foundations and Programs]. In *Materialy Tretiei mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii* (pp. 32-36). St.Petersburg: SpbGU Press.

Zvyagelskaya, I .D. (2009). *Stanovlenie gosudarstv Tsentralnoi Azii: politicheskie protsessy*. [Formation of the States of Central Asia: Political Processes]. Moscow: Aspekt Press.

Zwass, A. (1989). *The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance: The Thorny Path from Political to Economic Integration*. Armonk, NY: M E Sharpe Inc.