

National Research University
Higher School of Economics

as a manuscript

KURLYANDTSEVA ANASTASIA

**THE USA AND THE USSR CULTURAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN 1950S AND 1980S:
ARTISTS, POLITICS, EXHIBITIONS**

DISSERTATION SUMMARY

for the purpose of obtaining
academic degree Doctor of Philosophy in History of Arts

Academic Supervisor:
Molok Nikolay,
Ph.D. in History of Arts

Moscow – 2021

I. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF WORK

THE MOTIVATION OF THE RESEARCH is determined by the fact that it is the first comprehensive study of Soviet-American cultural relationships in the 1950s – 1970s through the problems of official and private initiatives in the artistic sphere (such as exhibitions, business travel policy, private artistic contacts, etc.) and a subsequent analysis of America's iconography in Soviet art. These multi-subject topics are practically not developed both in local and worldwide science. The historiographic analysis helped fill the gaps in the understanding of issues related to both exhibition practices of Soviet-American cultural exchange and the late Soviet history of art in general. The motivation of studying the history of art through the history of exhibitions is determined by the global museum tendency to rethink the history of art through the reconstruction of exhibition projects and their history (for example, projects of recent years at MoMA, the Guggenheim Museum, at the New Museum of Contemporary Art (New York), at Tate (London), at the Centre Pompidou (Paris), at the Garage Museum (Moscow), V-A-C (Moscow), etc.). Such projects and studies offer a new perspective on well-established concepts and are intended to expand the framework of the existing canon.

The chronological framework of the paper covers the period from the mid-1950s to the late 1970s. The lower year is the beginning of the *Thaw* era and of the transformations in the cultural sphere that began with the coming to power — after the death of Stalin — by Georgy Malenkov, and then Nikita Khrushchev. The upper time limit has several cultural and political rationales. On the one hand, in 1979, the *General Agreement between the USSR and the United States on contacts, exchanges and cooperation* ends¹, which was not extended due to the outbreak of the war in Afghanistan and the aggravation of political tension — official cultural relations were frozen for several years. As for private connections in the art field, the end of the 1970s was the launch of several important processes in the history of Soviet unofficial art, which marked the next stage of its development: the publication of the *A–Z* magazine in Paris and New York (1979–1986), relocation the collection of Alexander Gleser from France in the USA and the opening of the Museum of Russian Art (MORA) (1980), the first in a series of exhibitions of non-conformist art organized by Margarita Tupitsyna in the USA (Nonconformists, Museum of the University of Maryland, 1980), opening of the Contemporary Russian Art Center of America in Soho (New York), founded by Norton Dodge (1981) and others.

BRIEF LITERATURE REVIEW. The multidisciplinary approach used to write this work was based on the study of a large body of materials including the bibliography of official art, unofficial art,

¹ Ivanyan E.A. (2001) *Entsiklopediya rossiysko-amerikanskikh otnosheniy XVIII–XX veka* [Encyclopedia of Russian-American relations. The 18th – 20th centuries]. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya, p.318.

History of International Relations and Cultural Diplomacy, Cultural Studies, Philosophy, Sociology of Culture, Mass Communications History, Media Studies, American Studies, and other disciplines. The historiography of the topic covers the period from the 1950s to the present and geographically gravitates towards Russia, the USA, Eastern Europe, and partly towards France, England, and Israel as the priority areas of emigration of Soviet artists and art historians. Below is a summary of the literature review of the dissertation in an abridged version.

The history of the study of various problems of the Cold War has an extensive historiography on both sides of the ocean, but the study of the peculiarities of cultural aspects within the framework of this issue remained in the shadows until a certain time. In 2001, Robert Griffith outlined a «cultural turn» in Cold War Studies². He noted that since the mid-1980s, literally few studies have focused on the culture of the Cold War, and even fewer have looked at the Cold War as a cultural phenomenon. However, since the mid-1990s, Griffith has cited a whole list of studies, noting its redundancy. All these studies, essays and monographs include various disciplines — history, anthropology, American Studies, Media Studies, sociology, philology, Cultural Studies, etc., and the subject of study — culture during the Cold War — is understood in its broadest meaning and includes all possible formulations of problems. There is also a list of works exploring more specific issues — the work of the US Information Agency³, exhibition policy of the USA and the USSR on various international fairs during the Cold War⁴ etc.

It is important to say that research on the Cold War in general, and on cultural interaction, is American-centric. Susan Reid, professor, and researcher of Soviet visual and cultural history, connects this with the fact that any Soviet sources, articles, statements are read by researchers as knowingly false, insincere and, opportunistic, following the generally accepted discourse⁵.

The research especially notes the work of several authors whose academic papers are related to cultural policy, for example, the American writer and researcher Yale Richmond, who worked in the

² Griffith R. (2001) The Cultural Turn in Cold War Studies. *Reviews in American History*, vol. 29, № 1, pp. 150–157. URL: www.jstor.org/stable/30031041 (accessed: 24.04.2020).

³ Dizard, Jr. W. P. (2004) *Inventing Public Diplomacy: The Story of the U.S. Information Agency*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers; Cull N. J. (2008) *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Public Diplomacy, 1945–1989*. New York: Cambridge University Press etc.

⁴ Rydell R. W. (1993) *World of Fairs: The Century-of-Progress Expositions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; Haddow R. H. (1997) *Pavilions of Plenty: Exhibiting American Culture Abroad in the 1950s*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press; Masey J., Morgan C. (2008) *Cold War Confrontations. US Exhibitions and their Role in the Cultural Cold War*. Baden; Wulf A. J. (2015) *U.S. international exhibitions during the Cold War: winning hearts and minds through cultural diplomacy*. Lanham; Boulder; New York; London: Rowman & Littlefield etc.

⁵ Reid S. E. (2008) «Who Will Beat Whom?» Soviet Popular Reception of the American National Exhibition in Moscow, 1959. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, vol.9, № 4, pp. 855–905. – In 2007, a collection of essays was published entitled «Russian Art and the West: A Century of Dialogue in Painting, Architecture, and the Decorative Arts». The articles analyze artistic dialogue in various arts between Russia and the West (Great Britain, France, USA, and other countries), from the 1860s to the Thaw. Blakesley R. P., Reid S. E. (eds.) (2007) *Russian Art and the West: A Century of Dialogue in Painting, Architecture, and the Decorative Arts*. DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press.

diplomatic service for thirty years⁶. In his papers, Richmond analyzes cultural programs and briefly examines the entire complex of exchange processes as part of a large project that influenced Perestroika. In the book *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain*, a small chapter is devoted to exchange programs related to the performing arts — ballet, theater, dance, and another — exhibitions. Walter Hixson examines the propaganda and cultural infiltration of the United States into the USSR during the era of presidents Harry Truman and Dwight Eisenhower, using such a term as psychological war⁷, and examines the origins and motives of American foreign policy aggression — the created myth of America's moral superiority and the duty to protect all of humanity. Michael David-Fox writes about the interaction between Russia and the West in the pre-war Stalinist period⁸ and raises the question of Soviet modernity — in what capacity it was in the USSR and how Soviet society developed⁹.

In art criticism, journalism, social research, there is a corpus of works exploring the genesis and development of the cultural Cold War through the prism of the influence of various structures subordinate to the CIA, as well as studying American art and abstract expressionism as a weapon of the Cold War. In this regard, the names of such researchers, art critics and art critics as Max Kozloff, Eva Cockcroft, British journalist and historian Francis Stonor Saunders are mentioned¹⁰. American art as a weapon of the Cold War has been repeatedly viewed by Western authors, and in most cases, stories have been devoted to American Expressionism.

Valerie Hillings describes how the United States and the USSR used official and unofficial art as a part of the general discourse of the Cold War in the catalog of the *RUSSIA!* exhibition held at the Guggenheim Museum in New York (September 16, 2005 – January 11, 2006)¹¹. Hillings reviews a series of exhibitions and publications from 1956 to 1977, describing their links to the political agendas of their countries. The emphasis is on such milestones as the American National Exhibition in Sokolniki (Moscow, 1959), the *Manege case* (1962), the Bulldozer Exhibition and its consequences. Hillings also touches on the topic of the exhibition of Russian art at the Guggenheim Museum in 1977.

⁶ Richmond Y. (2003) *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain*. University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press; Richmond Y. (1987) *U.S.–Soviet Cultural Exchanges, 1958–1986: Who Wins?* Boulder, Colo., and London: Westview

⁷ Hixson W. L. (1998) *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945–1961*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

⁸ David-Fox M. (2012) *Showcasing the great experiment: cultural diplomacy and western visitors to Soviet Union, 1921–1941*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

⁹ David-Fox M. (2015) *Crossing borders: modernity, ideology, and culture in Russia and the Soviet Union*. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press.

¹⁰ Kozloff M. (1973) American Painting During the Cold War. *Artforum*, vol. 11, № 9, pp. 43–54; Cockcroft E. (1974) Abstract Expressionism, Weapon of the Cold War. *Artforum*, vol. 12, № 10, pp. 39–41; Saunders F. S. (1999) *Who paid the piper?: the CIA and the cultural Cold War*. London: Granta Books.

¹¹ Hillings V. (2005) Official Exchanges / Unofficial Representations: The Politics of Contemporary Art in the Soviet Union and the United States, 1956–1977. *RUSSIA!* New York: The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, pp. 350–363.

Cultural diplomacy through the prism of travel and business contacts of Alfred Barr (founder of MoMA and later director of the collection) in 1956 and 1959, was separately written by Simo Mikkonen¹² and Masha Chlenova¹³.

Within the framework of the Russian academic community, the study of the Soviet-American cultural diplomacy is rather non-systemic. Since the 1970s, the works of Eduard Ivanyan, a prominent Soviet and Russian specialist in the history of Russian-American relations, began to appear. In 2007, he published a monograph directly on American-Russian cultural relations: *When the Muses Speak. History of Russian-American Cultural Relations (2007)*¹⁴. The book became the first attempt to study this field. Special attention was paid to the period of the 1950s – 1960s, when the process of restoring cultural diplomacy at the state level begins. In the popular science book by Ivan Kurilla *Sworn Friends. A history of opinions, fantasies, contacts, mutual (mis) understanding of Russia and the United States (2018)*¹⁵, the author examines the cultural relationship between the United States and Russia through the prism of private stories and personal contacts.

In 2018, the collective monograph *Soviet Cultural Diplomacy in the Conditions of the Cold War (1945–1989)*¹⁶ was published and was called «the first generalizing work on Soviet cultural diplomacy in the post-war period»¹⁷. The book understands cultural diplomacy in the broadest meaning and includes such a topic as national exhibitions. Another collective work that is important for this study is *The USSR and the USA in the 20th Century: Perception of the «Other»*¹⁸, which focuses on various aspects of the official and everyday perceptions of the American and the Soviet as «other». The topic of the representation of American art in the USSR during the Cold War (1950s –1960s) is exploring by Kirill Chunikhin¹⁹.

Works on the history of Soviet art, in connection with the socio-historical specifics of development, are traditionally most often divided into two parts within the framework of binary oppositions that

¹² Mikkonen S. (2013) Soviet-American Art Exchanges during the Thaw: from Bold Openings to Hasty Retreats. *Proceedings of the Art Museum of Estonia: Art and Political Reality*, vol. 3, № 8, pp. 57–76.

¹³ Chlenova M. (2021) Traveler's Tales. Alfred Barr, the Soviet Union, and International Modernism in the Postwar Period. *New Histories of Art in the Global Postwar Era* (eds. F. Frigeri, K. Handberg). New York: Routledge, pp. 193–207.

¹⁴ Ivanyan E.A. (2007) *Kogda govoryat muzyi: istoriya rossiysko-amerikanskikh kulturnykh svyazey* [When the Muses Speak: A History of Russian-American Cultural Relations]. Moscow: *Mezhdunar. otnosheniya*.

¹⁵ Kurilla I.I. (2018) *Zaklyatyie druz'ya. Istoriya mneniy, fantaziy, kontaktov, vzaimo(ne)ponimaniya Rossii i SSHA* [Sworn friends. History of opinions, fantasies, contacts, mutual (mis) understanding of Russia and the United States]. Moscow: *Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye*.

¹⁶ Nagornaya O. S. (ed.) (2018) *Sovetskaya kul'turnaya diplomatiya v usloviyakh Kholodnoy voyny. 1945–1989* [Soviet cultural diplomacy during the Cold War. 1945–1989]. Moscow: *ROSSPEN*.

¹⁷ Tikhonov V.V. (2019) *Vitriny sverkhderzhavy* [Showcases of a superpower]. *Istoricheskaya ekspertiza* [Historical examination], no. 2, pp. 279–286.

¹⁸ Fieseler B., Magnusdottir R. (2017). *SSSR i SSHA v XX veke: vospriyatiye "drugogo"* [The USSR and the USA in the XX century: the perception of the "other"]. Moscow: *ROSSPEN*.

¹⁹ Chunikhin K. (2016) *The Representation of American Visual Art in the USSR during the Cold War (1950 to the late 1960s)* (Ph.D), Jacobs University Bremen; Chunikhin K. A. (2012) *Skvoz' zheleznyy zanaves: reprezentatsiya izobrazitel'nogo iskusstva SSHA v zhurnale «Amerika» v epokhu kholodnoy voyny* [Through the Iron Curtain: Representation of the US Fine Arts in America during the Cold War]. *Artikul't* [Artikult], no. 8 (4), pp. 20–38.

have developed since the beginning of the 1960s: official / unofficial. In recent years, a trend has begun to emerge for a more general and complex analysis.

The dissertation identifies some of the trends in the study of official art over the past seventy years. Works of different years by Yuri Gerchuk, Anna Dekhtyar, Daniil Dondurey, Alexander Kamensky, Victoria Lebedeva, Alexander Morozov, Alexander Yakimovich, and others are mentioned²⁰.

Interpretation and comprehension of the Soviet socialist realist project, as well as various realisms within the Soviet artistic system, is noted in the works and dissertations of such art critics and art historians as Alexei Bobrikov, Alexander Borovsky, Ekaterina Degot, Vladimir Levashov, Alexandra Novozhenova, Gleb Napreenko, Kirill Svetlyakov, etc²¹.

By now, a little-studied area remains issues related to the analysis of the work of the late Soviet official artistic apparatus from different angles. Thereby the works of Boris Ioganson²² and Galina Yankovskaya²³ are separately noticed.

²⁰ Dekhtyar A. (ed.) (1979). *Molodyye zhivopistsy 70-kh godov* [Young painters of the 70s]. Moscow: *Sov. Khudozhnik* [Soviet artist]; Dondurey D. B. (1985) *Zhivopis' 1970-kh godov: izmeneniye printsipa obshcheniya so zritelem i funktsii kritiki* [Painting of the 1970s: Changing the Principle of Communication with the Viewer and the Function of Criticism]. *Sovetskoye iskusstvoznaniye* [Soviet Art Studies], issue 19, p. 252; Kantor A. (1980) *1970-ye gody kak etap istorii iskusstva* [1970s as a stage in the history of art] // *Sovetskoye iskusstvoznaniye* 79 [Soviet art history 79], issue 2, pp. 41–57; Kamensky A. A. (1989) *Romanticheskiy montazh*. Moscow: *Sovetskiy khudozhnik* [Soviet artist]; Morozov A. I. (1989) *Pokoleniya molodykh: Zhivopis' sov. khudozhnikov 1960–1980 godov* [Young Generations: Painting of soviet artists of the 1960s – 1980s]. Moscow: *Sov. Khudozhnik* [Soviet artist]; Yakimovich A. K. (1990) *Molodyye khudozhniki vos'midesyatykh. Debyuty: besedy ob iskusstve zhivopistsev, skulptorov i grafikov, nachavshikh svoj put' v 1980-ye gody* [Young artists of the eighties. Debuts: talks about the art of painters, sculptors and graphic artists who began their journey in the 1980s]. Moscow: *Sovetskiy khudozhnik* [Soviet artist]; Yakimovich A. K. (2009) *Poloty nad bezdnoy: iskusstvo, kul'tura, kartina mira, 1930–1990* [Flying over the Abyss: Art, Culture, Picture of the World, 1930–1990]. Moscow: *Iskusstvo-XXI vek*; Gerchuk Yu. Ya. (2016) *Effekt prisutsviya* [The effect of presence]. Moscow: *Art Volkhonka* etc.

²¹ Bobrikov A. (2003) *Surovyy stil': mobilizatsiya i kul'turnaya revolyutsiya* [Severe style: mobilization and cultural revolution]. *Khudozhestvennyy zhurnal* [Art magazine], no. 51–52. URL: <http://moscowartmagazine.com/issue/57/article/1137> (accessed: 05/05/2020); Borovsky A. D. (2017) *Ottaivaniye porody [Thawing of the breed]. Otpepel: katalog vystavki* [The Thaw: catalog of an exhibition] (Eds. A. S. Kurlyandseva, Yu. V. Vorotyntseva). Moscow: State Tretyakov Gallery, pp. 20–43; Borovsky A. D. (2020) *Semidesyatyye* [Seventies]. *Eto bylo navsegda. 68–85: katalog vystavki* [Everything Was Forever. 68–85: catalog of an exhibition] (Eds. Yu. Vorotyntseva, A. Kurlyandseva, K. Svetlyakov). Moscow: State Tretyakov Gallery, pp. 24–32; Degot E. (2000) *Istoriya russkogo iskusstva* [History of Russian art]. Moscow: Trilistnik; Degot E., Levashov V. (1990) *Razreshonnoye iskusstvo* [Permitted art]. *Iskusstvo* [Art], no. 1, pp. 58–61; Karpova K. V. (2015) *Surovyy stil'. Sud'ba napravleniya* [Severe style. Destiny direction] (PhD Thesis), Moscow: Moscow State Stroganov Academy of Industrial and Applied Arts; Lebedeva V. E. (1999) *Prostranstvo mifa v moskovskoy zhivopisi 1960–70 godov* [The space of myth in Moscow painting of the 60s - 70s]. Moscow: *GII*; Napreenko G., Novozhenova A. (2018) *Epizody modernizma. Ot istokov do krizisa* [Episodes of modernism. From the origins to the crisis]. Moscow: *NLO*; Svetlyakov K. A. *Kul'tura epokhi zastoya i problemy postmoderna* [Culture of the era of stagnation and the problems of postmodernism]. *Eto bylo navsegda. 68–85: katalog vystavki* [Everything Was Forever. 68–85: catalog of an exhibition] (Eds. Yu. Vorotyntseva, A. Kurlyandseva, K. Svetlyakov). Moscow: State Tretyakov Gallery, pp.12–18 etc.

²² Johanson B. (2019) *Moskovskiy soyuz khudozhnikov. Vzglyad iz XXI veka* [Moscow Union of Artists. A look from the XXI century]. Moscow: *BuksMart*, 2019. – The functioning of the Moscow Union of Artists and the Union of Artists of the USSR in late soviet times is also described in: Napreenko G. (2011) *Mashina vsesoyuznoy vystavki* [Machine of the All-Union Exhibition]. *OpenSpace.ru* [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://os.colta.ru/art/projects/30795/details/31510/?expand=yes#expand> (accessed: 07/11/2020); Napreenko G. (2011) *Monumentalist: khudozhnik v sisteme* [Monumentalist: an artist in the system]. *OpenSpace.ru* [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://os.colta.ru/art/projects/30795/details/34231> (accessed: 07/11/2020); Salnikov V. (2001) *Chem byl Soyuz khudozhnikov* [What was the Union of Artists]. *Khudozhestvennyy zhurnal* [Art magazine], no. 36. URL: <http://moscowartmagazine.com/issue/84/article/1847> (accessed: 05.05.2020).

²³ Yankovskaya G. A. (2019) *Poluraspad. Soyuz khudozhnikov SSSR na poroge samolikvidatsii* [Half-life. The Union of Artists of the USSR on the Threshold of Self-Liquidation]. *Neprikosnovennyy zapas. Debaty o politike i kul'ture*

The research also provides a detailed analysis of several stages in the study of Soviet unofficial art of the second half of the twentieth century in the works of a) foreign art critics, historians, journalists; b) the artists themselves; c) Russian emigration; d) and since the late 1970s — of art historians and critics from near-underground circles.

We are focusing on the main monographs and articles published in the United States, authored by Priscilla Johnson and Leopold Labedz²⁴, Paul Sjeklocha and Igor Mead²⁵, John Berger²⁶. The paper noted the special role of journalists of periodicals such as, *The New York Times*, who were not only participants of the events, but sometimes levers of pressure through their editorial offices on the Soviet government. The names of John Canaday, Hilton Cramer, Grace Glueck, Hedrick Smith, and others are listed. European authors are also briefly indicated (Jindřich Chalupecký, Nicoletta Misler, Jamie Gambrell, etc.). Among Western art critics and art historians (or Russians but working in the West) who were engaged in Soviet art in the second half of the twentieth century, we are mentioning the names of Karl Aymermakher, John Bowlt, Frederick Starr, Alison Hilton, Alla Rosenfeld, Jane Sharp, Yulia Tulovsky, and others²⁷.

In connection with the special role of artists in the formation of criticism of nonconformist art, the books by Yuri Albert, Grisha Bruskin, Ilya Kabakov, Georgy Kizevalter, Vyacheslav Koleichuk, Viktor Pivovarov, Alexander Putov, Oscar Rabin, Mikhail Chernyshov, Vladimir Yankilevsky and many others²⁸ are mentioned, as well as *A – Z magazine* history, which became a unique platform for

[Emergency Reserve. Debates about politics and culture], no. 125, pp. 111–128; Yankovskaya G. A. (2007) *Iskusstvo, den'gi i politika. Khudozhnik v gody pozdnego stalinizma* [Art, money, and politics. Artist during the years of late Stalinism]. Perm: Perm State university.

²⁴ Johnson P., Labedz L. (1965) *Khrushchev and the Arts: The Politics of Soviet Culture, 1962–1964*. Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press.

²⁵ Sjeklocha P., Mead I. (1967) *Unofficial Art in the Soviet Union*. Berkeley: University California Press.

²⁶ Berger J. (1969) *Art and Revolution: Neizvestny and the Role of the Artist in the USSR*. New York: Pantheon.

²⁷ Exhibition catalogs: Rosenfeld A. (ed.) (2011) *Moscow conceptualism in context* [New Brunswick]. N.J.: Zimmerli Art Museum at Rutgers University; Munich; New York: Co-published by Prestel: [Gardners Books]; Neumaier D. (ed.) (2014). *Beyond Memory: Soviet Nonconformist Photography and Photo-related Works of Art*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press; Aymermakher K. (1988) *Ot yedinstva k mnogoobraziyu. Sotsial'no-kul'turnyye aspekty sovetskogo iskusstva v period mezhdu 1945 i 1988 v Moskve* [From unity to diversity. Socio-cultural aspects of Soviet art between 1945 and 1988 in Moscow]. Berne; Aymermakher K. (2004) *Ot yedinstva k mnogoobraziyu. Razyskaniya v oblasti «drugogo» iskusstva 1950–1980-kh godov* [From unity to diversity. Research in the field of "other" art of the 1950–1980s]. Moscow: *Ros. Gos. Gumanit. un-t*, 2004.

²⁸ Rabin O. Ya. (1986) *Tri zhizn* [Three lives]. Paris – New York: CASE / Third Wave publishing; Chernyshov M. (1988) *Moskva, 1961–67 = Moscow, 1961–67*. New York: Published by Bella Volfman; Koleichuk V. F. (1994) *Kinetism*. Moscow: Galart; Brusilovsky A. R. (2000) *Vremya khudozhnikov* [Time of Artists]. Moscow: *Magazin iskusstva*; Pivovarov V. D. (2001) *Vlyublenny agent* [An agent in love]. Moscow: *NLO*; Bruskin G. (2001) *Proshedsheye vremya nesovershennogo vida* [Past tense of imperfect form]. Moscow: *NLO*; Yankilevsky V. B. (2003) *I dve figury...: Rasskazy dlya druga* [And two figures ...: stories for a friend]. Moscow: *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*; Kabakov I. (2008). *60–70e... Zapiski o neofitsial'noi zhizni v Moskve* [60s–70s... Notes on Unofficial Life in Moscow]. Moscow: *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*; Kiesewalter G. D. (ed.) (2010) *Eti strannyye semidesyatyye, ili Poterya nevinnosti. Esse, interv'yuy, vospominaniya* [These Strange Seventies, or The Loss of Innocence. Essays, interviews, memoirs]. Moscow: *Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye*; Albert Yu. F. (2011) *Chto ya videl* [What I saw]. Moscow: *Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye*; Kiesewalter G. D. (2018) *Vremya nadezhd, vremya illyuziy. Problemy istorii sovetskogo neofitsial'nogo iskusstva. 1950–1960 gody: Stat'i i materialy* [Time of hopes, time of illusions. Problems of the history of Soviet unofficial art. 1950–1960: Articles and materials]. Moscow: *NLO*, etc.

critical analysis of the art of nonconformism and whose editorial and authorship consisted mainly of the artists themselves.

Another aspect of the historiography of Soviet art is reflected through the works of the Russian emigration, whose ranks began to actively replenish again from the beginning of the 1970s. Zinaida Starodubtseva's book *Russian Artists Abroad, 1970–2010s* (2020) provides a list of all magazines, almanacs, magazines, newspapers that were published in Paris, New York, Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, Berlin, and London²⁹.

The history of Soviet artistic emigration of the third wave and an analysis of the adaptation of Soviet art in the West are presented in the works of Viktor Agamov-Tupitsyn, Alexander Glezer, Boris Groys, Igor Golomshtok, Margarita Masterkova-Tupitsyna, Alla Rosenfeld and others³⁰.

From the *Perestroika* to the present, the body of works about unofficial art has grown significantly. Today the bibliography consists of catalogs of exhibitions, memoirs, critical literature and monographs, which largely cement the formed myths surrounding nonconformist art³¹. One of the fundamental books in the study of the history of Soviet nonconformism and the main chronicle of the history of unofficial art is still *Other Art: Moscow, 1956–1988* (Irina Alpatova, Leonid Talochkin and Natalya Tamruchi)³².

It is noted that the body of academic works dedicated to individual artists includes a huge exhibition history and bibliography. We are mentioning names of Yekaterina Andreeva, Leonid Bazhanov, Joseph Backstein, Marat Gelman, Irina Gorlova, Alexandra Danilova, Andrey Erofeev, Evgenia Kikodze, Elena Kurlyandseva, Elena Kuprina-Lyakhovich, Yulia Lebedeva, Vladimir Levashov, Marina Loshak, Victor Misiano, Nikolai Molok, Sasha Obukhova, Olga Sviblova, Viktor Patsyukov, Sergei Popov, Kirill Svetlyakov, Elena Selina, Sergei Khripun, Olesya Turkina and other Russian curators, art critics and gallery owners, whose exhibitions and projects have defined and institutionalized the image of Soviet non-conformism.

There is a list of works analyzing the unofficial art of this period in a complex manner. The names of such researchers as Yekaterina Andreeva, Yevgeny Barabanov, Yekaterina Bobrinskaya, Alexander Borovsky, Yekaterina Degot, Andrei Kovalev, Elena Kurlyandseva, Alexandra Obukhova, Sergei

²⁹ Starodubtseva Z. B. (2020) *Russkiye khudozhniki za rubezhom, 1970–2010 gody* [Russian Artists Abroad, 1970s – 2010s]. Moscow: *BuksMart*.

³⁰ Rueschemeyer M., Golomshtok I., Kennedy J. (1985) *Soviet Emigré Artists. Life and Work in the USSR and the United States*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.; Golomshtok I., Glezer A. (1977) *Soviet Art in Exile*. New York: Random House; Glezer A. D. (1986) *Russkiye khudozhniki na Zapade. Esse i stat'i* [Russian Artists in the West. Essays and Articles]. Paris; New York: *Tret'ya volna*; Tupitsyn V. (1998) *Kommunal'nyy (post) modernism* [Communal (post) modernism]. Moscow: Ad Marginem; Tupitsyn M. (2017) *Moscow Vanguard Art 1922–1992*. London; New Haven: Yale University Press и др.

³¹ This remark has become an integral part of any research on this topic in recent years.

³² Talochkin L., Alpatova I. (eds.) (1991). «*Drugoye iskusstvo*», *Moskva, 1956–76: katalog vystavki* [«Other art», Moscow, 1956–76: exhibition catalog]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya galereya «Moskovskaya kolleksiya»: SP «Interbuk»; Talochkin L., Alpatova I., Tamruchi N. (eds.) (2005) *Drugoye iskusstvo. Moskva 1956–1988* [Other art. Moscow 1956–1988]. Moscow: Galart.

Popov, Vladimir Salnikov, Natalia Sinelnikova, Anna Florkovskaya and others³³. In the dissertation especially highlighted the book by Ekaterina Bobrinskaya «Strangers? Unofficial Art: Myths, Strategies, Concepts» (2013) where the author works with the material of Soviet unofficial art and explores its artistic strategies³⁴. Also are noted books and papers focusing on the unofficial art and aesthetics of the Thaw³⁵.

The list of monographs of artists includes the names of Boris Orlov, Viktor Pivovarov, Eric Bulatov, Mikhail Roginsky, Komar and Melamid³⁶, Oscar Rabin, Mikhail Grobman, Yuri Sobolev, Ilya Kabakov, Eduard Steinberg, Mikhail Roginsky and others³⁷.

The last works listed in the historiographic review are linked with the research in the field of Soviet anthropology, sociology of culture, philosophy of art and the history of culture in general (Sergei Ushakin, Alexei Yurchak, Peter Weil, Alexander Genis, etc.³⁸). Review of the anti-modern literature and publications on «bourgeois mass culture» could be found in the *first chapter* of the study.

³³ Bobrinskaya E. (1994) *Kontseptualizm* [Conceptualism]. Moscow: Galart; Degot E. (2000) *Istoriya russkogo iskusstva* [History of Russian art]. Moscow: Trilistnik; Obukhova A. E., Orlova M. V. (2001) *Zhivopis' bez granits. Ot pop-arta k kontseptualizmu: Amerika. Yevropa. Rossiya. 1960–1970* [Painting without borders. From Pop Art to Conceptualism: America. Europe. Russia. 1960-1970s]. Moscow: OLMA-Press; Galart; Sinelnikova N. A. (2009) *Nonkonformisty* [Nonconformists]. Moscow: *Virtual'naya galereya*; Borovsky A. D. (2009) *Blizkoye chteniye* [Close reading]. Moscow: *Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye*; Andreeva E. Yu. (2012) *Ugol nesootvetstviya. Shkoly nonkonformizma. Moskva – Leningrad 1946–1991* [Angle of inconsistency. Schools of non-conformism. Moscow - Leningrad 1946-1991]. Moscow: *Iskusstvo XXI vek*; Bobrinskaya E. (2013). *Chuzhie? Neofitsial'noye iskusstvo: mify, strategii, kontseptsii* [Strangers? Unofficial Art: Myths, Strategies, Concepts]. Moscow: *Art-Media*; Kovalev A. A. (2017) *Kniga peremen. Tom I. Materialy k istorii russkogo iskusstva* [The Book of Changes. Volume 1. Materials for the history of Russian art]. Moscow: *Izdatel'skiye resheniya*; Salnikov V. (2018) *Pikasso o nas ne slyshal: razmyshleniya ob istochnikakh i sostavnykh chastyakh sovremennogo russkogo iskusstva* [Picasso has not heard about us: reflections on the sources and components of contemporary Russian art]. Moscow: Garage Museum of Contemporary Art etc.

³⁴ Bobrinskaya E. (2013). *Chuzhie? Neofitsial'noye iskusstvo: mify, strategii, kontseptsii* [Strangers? Unofficial Art: Myths, Strategies, Concepts]. Moscow: *Art-Media*, p. 13.

³⁵ Khrenov N. A. (ed.) (2013) *Ot iskusstva ottepeli k iskusstvu raspada imperii* [From the art of the thaw to the art of the collapse of the empire]. Moscow: *GII, «Kanon+», ROOI «Reabilitatsiya»*; Kazakova O. V. (ed.) (2013) *Estetika «ottepeli»: Novoye v arkhitekture, iskusstve, kul'ture* [Aesthetics of the Thaw: New in Architecture, Art, Culture]. Moscow: *Rossiyskaya politicheskaya entsiklopediya (ROSSPEN)*; Florkovskaya A. K., Busev M. A. (eds.) (2014) *Neofitsial'noye iskusstvo v SSSR. 1950–1980- gody* [Unofficial art in the USSR. 1950–1980s]. Moscow: *NII teorii i istorii izobrazitel'nykh iskusstv Rossiyskoy akademii khudozhestv, BuksMart*; Gerchuk Yu.Ya. (2016) *Effekt prisutstviya* [Presence effect]. Moscow: Art Volkhonka, 2016; Kurlyandtseva A. S., Vorotyintseva Yu. V. (eds.) (2017) *Ottepel: katalog vystavki* [The Thaw: catalog of an exhibition]. Moscow: State Tretyakov Gallery.

³⁶ Lazareva E.A. (2017) *Boris Orlov: kontury vremeni* [Boris Orlov: the contours of time]. Moscow: Breus; Lazareva E.A. (2017) *Viktor Pivovarov: trayektoriya polotov* [Victor Pivovarov: flight trajectories]. Moscow: Breus; Popov S. V. (2017) *Erik Bulatov: kartina posle zhivopisi* [Erik Bulatov: canvas after painting]. Moscow: Breus; Yushkova O. A. (2017) *Mikhail Roginskiy: narisovannaya zhizn'* [Mikhail Roginsky: a painted life]. Moscow: Breus; Svetlyakov K. A. (2019) *Vam khorosho: sokrushiteli kanonov* [You feel good: the destroyers of the canons]. Moscow: Breus.

³⁷ Petrovskaya E. V. (ed.). (1999) *Kabakov Ilya, Groys Boris. Dialogi (1990–1994)* [Kabakov Ilya, Groys Boris. Dialogues (1990–1994)]. Moscow: Ad Marginem; Romanova A., Vasilevskaya N. (eds.) (2009) *O Mikhaile Roginskom. Duraki yedyat pirogi* [About Mikhail Roginsky. Fools eat pies]. Moscow: *Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye*; Kantor-Kazovskaya L. (2014) *Гробман | Grobman*. Moscow: *Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye*; Romanova A., Metelichenko G. (2014) *o.s.t.r.o.v.a. Yuriya Soboleva* [o.s.t.r.o.v.a. of Yuri Sobolev]. Moscow: Moscow Museum of Modern Art; Epshtein A.D. (2015) *Khudozhnik Oskar Rabin: zapechatlonnaya sud'ba* [Artist Oscar Rabin: Sealed Destiny]. Moscow: *Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye*; Barabanov E.V. (2017) *Metageometriya khudozhnika Shteynberga* [Metageometry of the artist Steinberg]. Moscow: Moscow Museum of Modern Art, etc.

³⁸ Weill P., Genis A. (2013) *60-ye. Mir sovetskogo cheloveka* [60th. The world of the Soviet man]. Moscow: AST: CORPUS; Yurchak A. (2006) *Everything was forever, until it was no more : the last Soviet generation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, etc.

LIST OF SOURCES. The source base of this dissertation was formed in the process of studying a wide range of published and unpublished sources, both documentary and art. Official letters, orders, press releases, personal correspondence, diaries and other documentation concerning the history of exhibition exchange, official and personal cultural relations from the archives of Russian museums (Pushkin State Museum of Fine Arts, State Trtyakov gallery, Garage Museum, National Centre for Contemporary Art, State Hermitage Museum, etc.), from the Russian state archives (State Archives of the Russian Federation, Russian State Archives of Literature and Art, etc.), from the archives of US museums (Museum of Modern Art, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Brooklyn Museum, Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, etc.) were involved in the dissertation as *documentary sources*. The works of Soviet artists of the 1950s – 1970s, including paintings, graphics, book illustrations, etc., were analyzed as *art sources*. The paper also analyzes critical and news journalism for the specified period (magazines and newspapers: «*Tvorchestvo*», «*Krokodil*», «*Tehnika molodezhi*», «*Dekorativnoe iskusstvo SSSR*», «*Ogonyok*», «*Sovremennaya arhitektura*», «*Znanie sila*», «*Himiya i zhizn*», «*Novyy mir*», «*Yunost*», «*Literaturnaya gazeta*», «*Pravda*» etc.).

THE HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESEARCH is that the presence of American culture within the Soviet was greater than just the magazines *America*, the American National Exhibition in Sokolniki (1959), the portrait of the writer Ernest Hemingway on the wall, and the rare releases of Hollywood films. On the one hand, indeed, in the era of the Iron Curtain, the Cold War, and analog culture, information from the outside world to the Soviet Union was received very selectively and through a limited number of channels. The official media provided news in limited proportions, consistent with the ideological program of the party and government. On the other hand, for the Soviet artistic elite, America was not an «imaginary» West, but an actor with whom communications took place and cultural relations were built (at different levels — on the state and on the private). Official artists, journalists and writers took part in the formation of the images of America in Soviet mass culture, who did not depict *a collective vision* of the West, but often constructed it base on their own memories, sketches and documentation made during business trips. Soviet unofficial artists, in turn, built their own dialogue with America and its agents — collectors, artists, gallery owners, journalists, etc., which sometimes influenced the agenda, cultural relations between the two countries or became an occasion for creative collaborations.

THE OBJECT of the research is the Soviet-American artistic relationships in the 1950s – 1970s.

THE SUBJECT of the research is the Soviet-American art exhibition exchange, conducted both at the state level and through a system of personal contacts; Soviet-American official and private artistic contacts,

including business trips, correspondence, and other forms of communication, as well as the formation of the representation of America in Soviet art, made possible by these art relations.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH: to reconstruct and study Soviet-American artistic relations through the history of exhibition practices, through business trips, through official and private artistic contacts, identifying the main mechanisms of their formation and analyzing their impact on Soviet art history.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES:

- to analyze the sociocultural context of the Soviet art history of the 1950s – 1970s, including the system, main events, cultural triggers, sociopolitical realities of artists' lives;
- to consider aspects of the Soviet-American cultural diplomacy of the indicated period;
- to systematize and to study the official exhibition policy of the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, including the reconstruction of selected projects of the exchange program;
- to explore official and unofficial connections between Soviet artists and various circles of the American art scene (artists, gallery owners, collectors, politicians, emigrants);
- to study the business trips of Soviet official artists;
- to determine the specifics of the representation of America in the work of official and unofficial artists.

METHODOLOGY. The multidisciplinary nature of the research determined the use of a wide range of methods and the use of methodological tools from various humanitarian and social disciplines, as well as sociological and anthropological positions (Alexey Yurchak). The method of complex historical and problematic research, which was necessary in the analysis of a wide range of interdisciplinary problems, had made it possible to consistently reveal the history of the development of cultural diplomacy and artistic relations between the two countries, as well as historical, socio-economic, and cultural issues in the context of Soviet-American political history. The formal-stylistic method made it possible to analyze the qualities of the stylistic modes of figurative and non-figurative Soviet art, to reveal the peculiarities of the interpretation of visual codes. An important methodological basis was the social history of art of a different spectrum, which made it possible to analyze the social state of society as a factor influencing the nature of representation and visual language, and to fit this representation into a certain communication structure of this society. Visual Studies and Cultural Studies were also useful in part for analyzing the relationship between culture and various forms of power, art propaganda and totalitarian forms of artistic activity (Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall, Richard Johnson, Chris Barker, etc.). As another tool in this research, we used a synchronic approach,

which made it possible to connect the local Soviet context with the logic of the development of American art history, with modernism and postmodernism.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE RESEARCH consists in the analysis and reconstruction of the history of Soviet-American artistic relationships — the official exhibition exchange, unofficial exhibition exchange, the history of Soviet artists' business trips, the history of the creation of joint works by Soviet and American artists, and the iconography of US, which are not comprehensively studied. For the first time, the research focuses on an analysis of Soviet art in the second half of the twentieth century through the exhibition history and tries to recreate the processes of a single cultural field without dividing it into official and unofficial. The paper identifies the main mechanisms of building Soviet-American cultural relations, describes their impact on the Soviet socio-cultural context, reconstructs the exhibition policy of the 1950s – 1970s, explores private connections between Soviet and American artists, critically analyzes the specifics of American iconography in the work of official and unofficial Soviet artists.

MAIN FINDINGS:

1. Soviet-American cultural diplomacy of the 1950s – 1970s included a growing exhibition exchange program. The USA and the USSR used different ideological and tactical methods choosing exhibitions and exhibiting objects. In the USSR, exhibitions of American art were organized a) within the framework of a general agreement, where the principle of parity was observed; b) through personal channels with progressive artists; c) through agreements with individuals (for example, Armand Hammer). These exhibitions demonstrated that idea of development of American art, which was approved and acceptable in the USSR. In the United States, Soviet art exhibitions were a) part of an official exchange also within the framework of an Agreement or a hybrid agreement (i.e., a state with a private person), if it was about official art; b) the result of private initiatives, if it was about unofficial art. Showing Soviet art through government agreements, the American side was not interested in exhibiting contemporary art, but focused its attention on showing icons and the avant-garde at the exhibitions.
2. Private relations between Soviet artists and American actors (artists, collectors, gallery owners, diplomats, economists, Soviet emigrants, etc.) were a full-fledged part of the artistic cultural process during this period. On the one hand, they started showing the work of unofficial artists in the United States. On the other hand, although rarely, these relations resulted in either Soviet-American joint projects (Komar & Melamid and Douglas Davis), or they were

unexpectedly reflected in the works of artists (James Rosenquist, Robert Rauschenberg, Alex Lieberman, Yuri Dyshliko, etc.). It is also important to note that these connections were also of an educational nature — thanks to them, Soviet artists learned the latest modern trends, which influenced their work.

3. During their business trips, Soviet official artists were introduced to the same actors, who, on the one hand, influenced the agenda and their perception of the American art scene, and on the other, did not interfere with the already formed and well-developed type of perception of contemporary American art through the prism of Soviet ideology.
4. The business trips of official Soviet artists at the turn of the 1960s influenced the formation of iconography and images of America in Soviet mass culture.

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL SIGNIFICANCE. The research is the first analysis of the Soviet art through the Soviet-American cultural relations, formed in the framework of the official cultural diplomacy, as well as through private communications.

The theoretical significance is determined by the fact that the results presented in the dissertation expand our knowledge about Soviet and partly American art of the second half of the 20th century, about the relationship between the two superpowers, about the socio-historical aspects of its functioning, about the influence of cultural diplomacy on the development of exhibition exchange, about the formation of myth about the “other” in the conditions of mutual counter-propaganda and an established ideological program, about the modeling of images of perception of the “other” in art and mass culture, etc. Those new circumstances and facts indicate a vast field for future research. Materials and conclusions can be used in the academic field, in curatorial practices, educational and pedagogical sphere, etc. The material introduced into scientific circulation will contribute to the further development of the history of cultural diplomacy, the history of international relations, American studies, and, most importantly, the study of various aspects of Soviet art history.

EVALUATION OF RESULTS. This research was prepared, discussed, and recommended for defense at the Doctoral School of Arts and Design at the Higher School of Economics. During the preparation, the candidate worked at the State Tretyakov Gallery as a research fellow in the Department of Contemporary Art. In 2014–2021, the candidate read lectures at the State Tretyakov Gallery and at the Higher School of Economics within the framework of the studied theme. Some aspects of the dissertation were presented in reports at international, Russian and interuniversity academic conferences: «Tretyakov Readings-2019» (State Tretyakov Gallery, March 20–22, 2019), «Theories

and Practices of Art and Design: Sociocultural, Economic and Political Contexts» (HSE, April 10–12, 2019), «What is to be done? Discussions in Russian Art Theory and Criticism II» (Jacobs University, Bremen, September 19–20, 2019), and published in articles in scientific peer-reviewed Russian journals.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE DISSERTATION is determined by the objectives and includes an introduction, five chapters, a conclusion and a list of sources and literature.

II. MAIN CONTENT

By the early 1950s — during the Cold War — the cultural diplomacy between the USSR and the United States, which included cultural exchange and the reception of foreign guests, was both limited. The growth of mutually aggressive anti-propaganda was at its peak. The first timid attempts to restore cultural exchange between the United States and the USSR were made in the mid-1950s, almost immediately after the death of Joseph Stalin. For several years, these rare events have been of an extra-systemic nature and are not part of a well-thought-out program.

Several years of negotiations lead to the conclusion on January 27, 1958, of an Agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States of America on exchanges in the fields of science, technology, education, culture, and other fields. It received its short name from the names of the heads of delegations at the talks — the Lacy-Zarubin Agreement on Cultural Exchange — and became the first treaty in the history of Russian-American relations that created the base for the development of cultural and academic relations in the legal field. Until 1973, the Agreement was renewed every two years. And even though the mutual close attention of the USSR and the United States and the mutual interest of the two superpowers in each other in the 1950s-1970s were conditioned by the realities of intense competition and counterpropaganda, nevertheless, during this time, dozens of collectives, troupes, orchestras performed in both countries. Then, until 1979, a new agreement was concluded - the General Agreement between the USSR and the United States on contacts, exchanges, and cooperation.

Within these agreements, exchanges took place not only in the performing, sports, scientific or academic fields, but also in the art and exhibition fields. The official Soviet-American exhibition exchange began. The first example was two large and well-known national exhibitions held in 1959 in the United States and the USSR: Soviet Exhibition of Science, Technology and Culture in New York and the American National Exhibition in Sokolniki. But in addition to them, in the 1960s and 1970s, a whole series of exchange projects took place on both sides of the ocean, demonstrating the achievements of the United States and the USSR in various fields, ranging from industrial exhibitions to a grand display of museum collections. On the other hand, the softening of the Iron Curtain policy leads to the development of private informal relations between artists and collectors, thanks to which exhibitions of unofficial Soviet artists, organized outside the agreements at the state level, began to take place in the United States. Third, within the Agreement, Soviet official artists were sent on business trips to the United States, because of which they brought sketches and studies of American life, showed them at special exhibitions, and published thematic books. At the same time, unofficial

artists were building their own system of communication with the American art scene, entering dialogue with American artists or friends who had already emigrated to America.

The history of Soviet-American artistic relations in the 1950s – 1970s — through exhibitions, business trips, correspondence, personal communication and built both within the framework of official cultural diplomacy of those years, and privately, through personal channels — now seems to be unexplored or a well-forgotten area. As well as the consequences of these connections, which are reflected in Soviet art and Soviet-American creative collaborations through the formation of the myth about America in Soviet visual arts, seem to be unexplored. The study of these issues will significantly enrich the understanding of how Soviet art functioned, how it built its reputation on the international stage, how it reflected and formulated sociopolitical realities.

The first chapter of the dissertation briefly explains the terminology, internal chronology, general event contours and milestones associated with the history of post-war Soviet art and directly related to research. It touches upon such topics as the peculiarities of the artist's existence within the framework of the Soviet system, the emergence and development of Soviet unofficial art, the origin of the ideologeme *abstractionism versus realism*, which largely determined the Soviet-American discourse, the main sociocultural triggers for the artistic community that influenced the change in the vector of art development, the struggle of unofficial artists for the right to exhibit officially, etc.

In the second chapter, the research focuses on a brief history of the cultural relations between the United States and the USSR, the socio-historical context, and general problems of foreign policy of the two countries. A general short description of the New York art scene during the period is also given.

The third chapter is devoted to the history of the official exhibition exchange in the 1950–1970s. As the most curious precedent from the history of exhibition exchange in the 1960s, two exchange exhibitions held in Moscow and New York in the mid-1960s are examined in detail: an exhibition of works by the American primitivist artist Grandma Moses at the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts and the exhibition of the Soviet realist artist Pavel Korin in the Hammer galleries. As an example of the most outstanding exchange project of the 1970s, we analyze the history of the relationship between the largest American museums (Metropolitan Museum, New York) and the largest Soviet museums (Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow; State Hermitage Museum, Leningrad).

The fourth chapter of the dissertation focuses on private exhibition initiatives, which, due to the specifics of the functioning of the Soviet ideological system, were primarily associated with unofficial art. Here, among other, is analyzed a small exhibition of Contemporary Soviet Artists at MoMA (1974), which was organized in support of the struggle of non-conformist artists for the right to exhibit their art and had a political nature.

The fifth chapter is devoted to the theme of the representation of America in the work of Soviet artists. On the one hand, it is associated with such an aspect of artistic relations as business trips, when artists were sent to America to exchange experiences, to accompany exhibitions or to take part in congresses. They came back with a set of sketches, which were then either turned into full-fledged paintings and exhibited at thematic exhibitions, or printed as illustrations in books and various magazines, thereby forming an idea of America among readers and viewers. On the other hand, the theme of American representation is also associated with unofficial artists who have built their own personal connections with Americans and their own mythology of imaginary America.

CONCLUSION. This study is the first such analysis of Soviet art through the optics of cultural diplomacy and exhibition history and articulates an important phenomenon of the formation of various aspects of Soviet culture through the prism of Soviet–American artistic relations. The wide coverage and the introduction into scientific circulation of a large amount of new (or well-forgotten) material do not imply an absolute study of topics within the framework of the dissertation research — this is only the beginning of the study of a large narrative. In each chapter, we have tried to identify and emphasize those *gray* areas that have been discovered and could later become important additions to the study in this area.

In this paper, we did not consider such an aspect as the image of "evil" America, that is, the America that was constantly present in the caricatured version of political agitation graphics. The authors were all the same artists — Vitaly Goryaev, Ivan Semyonov, who were discussed in the *Fifth Chapter*, as well as the famous Kukryniksy, Boris Efimov, Boris Prorokov and others. Without a scrupulous study of this material, it is difficult to talk about the full-fledged iconography of America. In this work, we focused more on the material that reflected the direct documentary impressions of the trips to the United States.

Due to boundaries of the dissertation genre, such subjects as an exhibition of works by progressive American graphic artists sent from San Francisco by the Institute of American-Russian Friendship (May 1958) or an exhibition of American graphics and paintings donated to the Soviet people by twenty-five American realist artists, including Rockwell Kent, Fremont F. Ellis, Raphael Soyer, Anton Refregier, and others (July 1960), as well as Soviet exhibitions in the United States, which took place in the 1970s, in addition to the exchange with the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, described in the *Third Chapter*.

Nevertheless, here are some general theses that were identified during the research.

The history of the relationship between Soviet artists (both official and unofficial) with America is complex, multifaceted, ambiguous, and covered with a web of myths, omissions, and gossip. Post-war Soviet art, despite the small temporal distance, includes no less secrets, mysteries, and white spots than

the art that is more separated in time. The project of mythologization included both the artists themselves and politicians, diplomats, foreign journalists, art historians, critics, and other agents. There are many elements of this network that are yet to be found. An even more unexplored area is the cultural relationship between the United States and the USSR in the artistic field, despite the myriad corpus of works devoted to the Cold War Studies in culture.

In current research, one could go into the analysis of Soviet art, proceeding from the American context, start looking for traces of the appropriation of pop art, conceptualism, abstract expressionism, new wave, or the realistic American school in the works of official and unofficial artists. As a result, this would lead us astray. And it would also be speculative, would require the involvement of postmodern concepts and problems of the theory of modernity, as well as colonial and postcolonial discourses. In this research, we took a different path — we started with an analysis of the exhibition grid of the thirty-year period and tried to partially restore the network of acquaintances and contacts that were characteristic of this period. Again, in this study, we only touched on mainstream exhibitions, mainly within the framework of museum exchanges, and, as mentioned above, did not dive into exhibition history, for example, the House of Friendship with the Peoples of Foreign Countries, the Institute of Soviet-American Friendship, and other organizations.

Here we can draw several conclusions. Indeed, both countries were interested in maintaining cultural relations — as clearly demonstrated by the scale of the exchange program. Of course, various political context of both powers influenced the exhibition program, but in general, until 1979 (until the end of *détente*) both countries continued to show their efforts to make compromises and to develop cultural exchange. It is not surprising that at the exhibitions, both countries demonstrated the ideological values of their states. However, it is curious that in the formation of the programs of art exhibitions — this is especially noticeable in the 1970s — the USA seem to be inferior to the Soviet Union. In New York, one could see the artistic line of development of Russian and Soviet art, dictated by the Soviet side, while in Moscow, American art was exhibited practically devoid of a modernist beginning, not to mention the latest trends (in this case, pop art was represented as a part of the realistic tradition).

However, as it becomes obvious that this concession has a reverse side. The disinterest of the United States in contemporary Soviet art is clearly visible; since the 1960s, an inevitable verdict has been heard about its provinciality and backwardness.

As a result, the formation of the American exhibition history of the latest Soviet art will become a matter of emigration and rare enthusiasts. The interest of the American side was different, and the Soviets began to satisfy it over time. We are talking, of course, about the Russian avant-garde, which began to be issued at exhibitions, first in European countries, then in the United States. In the 1970s, there was a boom in exhibitions of the Russian avant-garde, and all the best museums in the country

took part in the race. Only at the modest exhibition Contemporary Soviet Art (1974) at MoMA was there a timid attempt to link contemporary Soviet art and the avant-garde of the turn of the century, when a press release states that «the Museum's concern with the work of contemporary Soviet artists is a natural extension of its interest in the Russian modernism of earlier generations»³⁹. Nobody tried to use this link again. Especially indicative in this case is the story of Margarita Tupitsyn's letter with a proposal to include the works of contemporary artists in the exhibition of the avant-garde from the Costakis collection at the Guggenheim Museum in New York (*Art of the Avant-Garde in Russia: Selections from the George Costakis Collection*, 1981) and the subsequent refusal.

Again, another curious conclusion is the fact that for the Soviet government, a private individual was a better guarantor than an American state institution. Hence a whole network of various agents with whom the USSR preferred to deal. A more detailed history of the connections of Soviet artists and politicians with such people as Robert W. Dowling, Capton Michael Paul, or William Walton, as well as their role in the Soviet-American exchange, remains to be studied.

All the official privileged artistic elite (including set designers, poets, artists, playwrights, directors, and journalists) after trips to the United States was creating visual and textual material: articles, reporting exhibitions, books, scenery for plays and films etc. In this content the image of the West mutated, and then in a revised form it entered the visual field of soviet viewers and readers. This is how soviet citizens' perception of America was formed. The main feature of these *descriptions* can be called *uniformity*. They are, in fact, metanarrative, which is devoid of personal experience and formed cemented collective statement. For the creative elite, American life and culture was not an imaginary West. Further, memories and impressions of America passed through the framework and templates of the Soviet ideological program, and the output was a reduced product that was broadcasting to Soviet people for decades. Here we can recall the example with the interpretation of American art history, which Andrei Chegodaev was rewriting by analogy with the canons and logic of the development of Soviet art rejecting entire artistic schools and trends.

The Soviet underground did not need processed information and built its own logic of relations with America. These dialogues were building on different levels — cultural, personal, or mass media — there was no universal recipe. Most often journalists, collectors and artists became such intermediaries, and contacts were passing from hand to hand. The main tool was correspondence, or rare personal meetings. Moreover, one of the reasons that this huge Soviet-American exchange program fell into oblivion is the surprisingly extremely rare mention of it in the memoir corpus of both unofficial and official artists.

³⁹ Press Release, "Contemporary Soviet Art on View at Museum," 1974, September 27. The Museum of Modern Art, New York. URL: https://www.moma.org/documents/moma_press-release_326911.pdf (accessed 01.03.2021)

III. LIST OF AUTHOR'S ORIGINAL ARTICLES

THE HSE UNIVERSITY LIST OF HIGHLY RANKED JOURNALS

- Kurlyandtseva A. S. (2019) *Pavel Korin v Nyu-Yorke. Iz istorii sovetsko-amerikanskogo vyistavochnogo obmena* [Pavel Korin in New York. From the history of the Soviet-American exhibition exchange]. *Iskusstvoznaniye*, № 2, pp. 206–229.
- Kurlyandtseva A. S. (2020) America in 1950–1960s through the Soviet Artist's Eyes. *USA & Canada: Economics, Politics, Culture*, № 1, pp. 88–105.
- Kurlyandtseva A. S. (2021) USA and USSR: the History of an Amazing Exhibition Exchange. *International Journal of Cultural Research*, 2(43), pp. 127–142. DOI: 10.52173/2079-1100_2021_2_127.

CATALOGS OF EXHIBITIONS

- Kurlyandtseva A. S., Vorotyintseva Yu. V. (eds.) (2017) *Ottepel: katalog vyistavki* [The Thaw: catalog of an exhibition]. Moscow: State Tretyakov Gallery.
- Vorotyintseva Yu., Kurlyandtseva A., Svetlyakov K. (ed.) (2020) *Eto bylo navsegda. 68–85: katalog vyistavki* [Everything Was Forever. 68–85: catalog of an exhibition]. Moscow: State Tretyakov Gallery.

ARTICLES IN CATALOGS AND OTHER JOURNALS

- Kurlyandtseva A. S. (2019) *Istoriya odnoy vyistavki: Contemporary Soviet Art, MOMA, 1974* [The story of the exhibition: Contemporary Soviet Art, MOMA, 1974]. *Tretyakovskie chteniya, 2019: materialyi otchetnoy nauchnoy konferentsii* [Tretyakov Readings, 2019: materials of academic conference]. Moscow: State Tretyakov Gallery, pp. 354–364.
- Kurlyandtseva A. S. (2020) *Styagivanie beregov* [Pulling the shores]. *Eto bylo navsegda. 68–85: katalog vyistavki* [Everything Was Forever. 68–85: catalog of an exhibition] (eds. Yu. Vorotyintseva, A. Kurlyandtseva, K. Svetlyakov) Moscow: State Tretyakov Gallery, pp. 62–69.
- Kurlyandtseva A. S. (2020) *Masterskaya kak mesto deystviya* [Workshop as a place of action]. *Russkoe iskusstvo* [Russian art], № 3, pp. 132–137.