HOW TO EDUCATE PIONEERS IN INDEPENDENCE AND INITIATIVE: THE PEDAGOGICAL TACTICS OF ARTEK AND ORLYONOK (1957–1991)

Anna Kozlova
European University at St Petersburg
6/1A Gagarinskaya Str., St Petersburg, Russia
yeklopozhka@gmail.com

Abstract: The article examines the attempt by the leaders and planners of the Artek and Orlyonok model camps in the USSR in the 1960–80s to put into practice the popular idea of the Soviet project of the child as the active and independent subject of his / her actions. Using archival documents and retrospective interviews with people employed at the children's centres, it examines the reasons which at the beginning of the Thaw led the ideologists of the Central Committee of the Komsomol to allow sanatoria (where actions of the children who visited them at that time were strictly regulated by the regimen) to be turned into 'schools of Pioneer activity'. It also surveys the reflections of pedagogues who carried out state orders to realise in particular ways this requirement under the conditions of an 'organised' institutional regime. The author points out that the techniques of developing 'independence and initiative' (inspired by order of the Central Committee of the Komsomol), developed over time in the late Soviet period, came to be understood by ex-employees as the seeds of an innovative personality-orientated approach, radically different from the Soviet pedagogical tradition. Michel de Certeau's theory of 'strategies' and 'tactics' is used to explain the collision between the intention of the order and its perception.

Keywords: Soviet pedagogical traditions, Pioneer camp, Soviet subject, Michel de Certeau's theory of 'strategies and tactics', child subjectivity, Artek, Orlyonok.

To cite: Kozlova A., 'How to Educate Pioneers in Independence and Initiative: The Pedagogical Tactics of Artek and Orlyonok (1957–1991)', *Forum for Anthropology and Culture*, 2020, no. 16, pp. 101–138.

doi: 10.31250/1815-8927-2020-16-16-101-138

URL: http://anthropologie.kunstkamera.ru/files/pdf/eng016/kozlova.pdf

Anna Kozlova

How to Educate Pioneers in Independence and Initiative: The Pedagogical Tactics of Artek and Orlyonok (1957–1991)

The article examines the attempt by the leaders and planners of the Artek and Orlyonok model camps in the USSR in the 1960–80s to put into practice the popular idea of the Soviet project of the child as the active and independent subject of his / her actions. Using archival documents and retrospective interviews with people employed at the children's centres, it examines the reasons which at the beginning of the Thaw led the ideologists of the Central Committee of the Komsomol to allow sanatoria (where actions of the children who visited them at that time were strictly regulated by the regimen) to be turned into 'schools of Pioneer activity'. It also surveys the reflections of pedagogues who carried out state orders to realise in particular ways this requirement under the conditions of an 'organised' institutional regime. The author points out that the techniques of developing 'independence and initiative' (inspired by order of the Central Committee of the Komsomol), developed over time in the late Soviet period, came to be understood by ex-employees as the seeds of an innovative personality-orientated approach, radically different from the Soviet pedagogical tradition. Michel de Certeau's theory of 'strategies' and 'tactics' is used to explain the collision between the intention of the order and its perception.

Keywords: Soviet pedagogical traditions, Pioneer camp, Soviet subject, Michel de Certeau's theory of 'strategies and tactics', child subjectivity, Artek, Orlyonok.

Beginning in the sixties at the very least, Artek became a bulwark, if not of pedagogical opposition, certainly of pedagogical dissidence. Much of what was practised and cultivated at Artek was simply unthinkable outside it. This must have been the only territory in the USSR where there was child freedom — not in the sense that everything was permitted, but in the sense of freedom of self-expression [Polyukhovich 2005].

The Artek All-Union Pioneer Camp, opened in 1925 as the first children's sanatorium in the Soviet Union, and its younger brother Orlyonok, which opened its doors to Soviet children in 1960, were known everywhere in the USSR and beyond: they were advertised in the papers and in brochures as the Soviet dream come true. A trip to one of these camps was a reward for particular successes or achievements in Pioneer or Komsomol work, in one's studies, or in a wide variety of other forms of activity. From 1957, right up to the collapse of the USSR, Artek and Orlyonok, having received orders from the state to become 'schools for Pioneer activists', were directly subordinated to the Central Committee of the Komsomol. This new task that Artek and Orlyonok had been set obliged the planners and leaders working there to prepare

Anna Kozlova
European University
at St Petersburg
6/1A Gagarinskaya Str.,
St Petersburg, Russia
yeklopozhka@gmail.com

'right-flank' pioneers — boys and girls who on returning from the camp would be able to make a success of the workings of the Pioneer organisations in their schools and conduct interesting projects. In late Soviet times the mission of 'forming an active life position' was defined as 'having been put forward by the Party' and classified as one of the points of the programme of 'political upbringing' [Archive of the Museum of the History of Artek, f. 1, op. 1, d. 925, f. 8]. In the post-Soviet denunciatory discourse, the presence of 'ideology' in the camp's educational programmes often leads to the conclusion that the main health resorts for the Pioneers were celebrated for the operation of '"brainwashing" — the education of zombies submissive to the system' ['Artek prazdnuet…' 2005]. How then did its former leaders (the opinion of one of whom is used as the epigraph to this article) find it possible to understand the pedagogical tradition of the camp as dissident, liberal, and opposed to the Soviet educational system as a whole? My hypothesis is that the roots of such a reading of the Soviet pedagogy of Artek and Orlyonok should be sought, paradoxical though it may sound, in the attempt by the Central Committee of the Komsomol to politicise these two camps by giving them the mission of educating the Pioneer and Komsomol 'activists' of the country during the period of the Thaw.

This article will deal with the pedagogical experiment of bringing to life a particular ideologeme of the Soviet project, namely the attempts made at the beginning of the Thaw by the pedagogues at the Soviet model Pioneer camps Artek and Orlyonok to develop educational tactics directed towards forming feelings of 'independence and initiative' in children. I shall make it my aim to explain the mechanisms of the practical realisation of the idea of the child as an actively operative social actor (an idea formed within the context of official Soviet documents), and also how this experience affected the former leaders' self-presentation. This aim must be achieved in several stages. First, I consider it necessary to explain why the Pioneer camp became one of those platforms on which the attempt to bring to life the Soviet ideological concept of the child as independent subject took place. Secondly, it is necessary to outline the set of instruments which the pedagogues of the model Pioneer camps used to devise their way of educating 'creative and enterprising' Soviet citizens, and why they now call it 'democratic'. And finally, I shall offer a suggestion as to why an educational practice devised to prepare Pioneer and Komsomol 'activists' in the final years of the Soviet Union came to be perceived as an apolitical method of educating 'good people'.

In search of Soviet subjectivity

My starting point in this discussion is recent historiography devoted to the study of Soviet subjectivity. As Anna Krylova and Alexei

Yurchak have remarked, this field of knowledge was long founded on the philosophical postulates of Western liberalism [Krylova 2000; Yurchak 2006], as a result of which Soviet citizens' resistance to total state control (open, covert or, as Kotkin calls it, 'creative' [Kotkin 1995: 154]), was regarded as their sole manifestation of selfhood. Recent research in the field of Soviet (and primarily late Soviet) subjectivity has shown that a number of the postulates customarily regarded as manifestations of liberal rights and freedoms, such as the recognition of the person's individual qualities [Krylova 2017: 333–41], support for initiative and independent action [Pinsky 2019], and the right to free choice [Khuper 2018: 40], were at the same time part of the state and Party policy for educating the new Soviet man. From the beginning of the 1960s the USSR set out on the course of 'socialism with a human face', which presupposes an explicit rejection of repressive policies in favour of support and encouragement of the initiatives and enthusiasms of ordinary citizens [Pinsky 2019]. Anatoly Pinsky, borrowing the concept of subjectivity as a 'field of action, <…> or a space with boundaries' in which different types of leadership, reaction and behaviour can take place from Foucault and Kotkin, likewise notes that after Stalin individuals 'themselves searched for new prescriptions, which they believed they as individuals had the right to discover and — in another post-Stalin paradox — disseminate and dictate' [Ibid.: 81–2].

The proclaimed rejection of the binary approach in defining Soviet subjectivity allows the focus of attention to be shifted from attempts to evaluate the level of subjects' loyalty or resistance to the history of their practical realisation of the state project. Research into Soviet pedagogical projects is particularly interesting for the solution of this problem, since school pedagogues, and especially organisers of 'parallel' education (the network of which expanded considerably at the beginning of the Thaw [Dimke 2018: 62–95]) were mainly responsible for putting into practice the state idea of the new Soviet man. The educational projects of the Thaw supposed that children, like adults, should regain the activity and independence that they had lost under Stalinism, and that pedagogues should set about elaborating a renewed understanding of this category and the definition of its borders. An analysis of the pedagogical practices that grew up in the context of the translation of ideological dogma into the social reality of the juvenile collective shows that in practice the interiorisation of Soviet ideology could do no less harm to the system than conscious resistance [Kukulin, Mayofis, Safronov 2015].

Among the pedagogical experiments of the Thaw, the most important for my research is the history of the 'commune of young Frunzeites' set out in the pages of Darya Dimke's book [Dimke 2018]. The author's detailed analysis of the pedagogical practices developed by Professor Igor Ivanov of the Herzen State Pedagogical

Institute in Leningrad for the Komsomol branch of the Frunzensky District in Leningrad, set up in 1959, shows that even though all Ivanov's inventions were in complete accord with the state trends of the sixties, the members of the commune were subject to persecution. The main reason for their falling into disfavour were their attempts at a literal realisation of the ideas of 'socially useful labour' and the 'feat' of the self-governing juvenile collective, accompanied by a transfer of ideological slogans into everyday life, which broke the law of 'diglossia' that was normal for the functioning of Soviet society (the separation of ideological slogans, the utterance of which was relevant only in particular ceremonial situations, and everyday practices governed by other ideals and values which were sometimes opposed to them). The methods of the members of the 'Frunze commune'[1] were known to the pedagogues of the late Soviet model camps and are now hailed as one of the foundations of the pedagogical tradition of Orlyonok [Kupriyanov 2018]. The conflict with which this article will deal is very similar to that between the members of the 'commune' and their schoolteachers. The only difference is that Dimke's analysis is mainly founded on the evidence of former members of the commune and their perceptions (i.e. reflections on the effect of the educational technology), whereas my research concentrates on the previous stage: the pedagogues' reflections and their search for means of making possible the effect of juvenile 'independence' within the territory of the Pioneer camp.

The analysis of the pedagogical practices of Artek and Orlyonok offered below will be based on Michel de Certeau's thesis that using anything (including the slogans of official ideology) presumes a creative interpretation of it. Using de Certeau's toolkit, I shall call the practices developed at Artek and Orlyonok 'tactics', since they were determined by the 'strategy' put forward by the Party, i.e. the requirement to educate 'activists'. In my opinion, the process of reinterpreting the ideological categories and the instructions of the Central Committee of the Komsomol addressed to the leaders and Pioneers of Artek and Orlyonok is very similar to the mechanism described by de Certeau for using the systems imposed on consumers by power structures. In just this way (and often involuntarily) the pedagogues of Artek and Orlyonok proved able to 'subvert the fatality of the established order <…> by using a frame of reference which also proceeds from an external power' and filling them with their own meanings [de Certeau 1984: 17].

[1] The 'Frunze commune', created in 1962, was a Leningrad club for young people that emphasised the participation of members in their own moral education and the inculcation of initiative. It is generally considered to have laid the foundations of the 'Young Communard' movement, whose methods in many ways resembled those of the 'free education' movement in the 1910s and 1920s [Eds.].

Evidence of Soviet practices and its pitfalls

My analysis is primarily based on two types of source: material from Russian state archives and the local archives of Artek and Orlyonok (both of which continue successfully to function as children's centres to this day), and fifty in-depth interviews with former leaders and planners at Artek and Orlyonok in the late Soviet period. I shall give brief comments on each of these types of source. Since Artek and Orlyonok were from the end of the 1950s immediately subordinated to the Central Committee of the Komsomol and sent reports of their work to its representatives, there is a good deal of information, both about the state requirements themselves and about how they were put into practice, in the youth organisations collection of the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History (Russian RGASPI). The local archives of Artek and Orlyonok helped me to acquaint myself with the methodical recommendations and pedagogical outcomes of the camp employees in the Soviet period, and with the leaders' reports at internal conferences on academic and practical subjects, etc. Some of these archival materials are in active use by present-day children's centre planners, but the rest (the greater part) is a dead weight of the Soviet documentary heritage, stuffed haphazardly into thick archival volumes. The use of documents with varying degrees of official status when trying to reconstruct pedagogical practice naturally requires caution, because it is not easy to find out with total accuracy how the discursive projection of what was happening in the camp corresponded to the activity of the Pioneer troop leaders. Firstly, the pragmatics of official sources as a rule adheres strictly to the conventions of the genre (report on work, denunciation, pedagogical diary) and to a large extent determine the contents of what is written. Secondly, those practices which could not be read within the framework of the ideology of educating for 'independence' that had appeared during the Thaw probably did not find their way onto the pages of the reports (although it is not impossible that they continued to be used as before, and that the constant criticism of the 'formal' approach to work that is repeated in report after report at Artek, starting in the middle of the 1940s, confirms this). Most of the interviews with former leaders were collected during the visits which I made to Artek and Orlyonok in 2015 and 2018. Most of the people I talked to had come to Artek and Orlyonok as leaders at the age of eighteen to twenty-five in the 1960–80s and are still working there today, as teachers, leaders of children's circles, planners, librarians, tour guides or porters. For example, the oldest of the people I talked to became a leader at Artek at the age of twenty in 1960, and is now working at Artek in charge of the sick bay. It is a problem that the time when most of my informants were working was the late Soviet era, whereas the changes on which I am concentrating took place significantly earlier, during the Thaw. However, they define themselves (and, as the analysis

shows, they are) as continuing of a tradition the foundations of which were laid in the 1960s.

Even though Artek is thirty-five years older than Orlyonok, their evolutionary paths during the Thaw were very similar. While Artek was given the status of a 'school for Pioneer activists' in 1957 (i.e. it was orientated towards children from ten to fourteen), Orlyonok (which the Soviet media often called 'Artek's younger brother') was entrusted with the education of schoolchildren in the upper forms, Komsomol members from fourteen to seventeen. There were close links between Artek and Orlyonok, and competition between them for the title of best camp. The permanent collectives of the model camps, who were the people that I had most to do with, often interacted. The first leaders of the summer of 1960 were sent to Orlyonok from Artek. If we can believe the recollections of the former leaders, the first stage of training for the profession of leader for the future employees of Artek and Orlyonok was often organised jointly in Moscow by representatives of the Central Committee of the Komsomol, conferences for the sharing of experience and friendly sports competitions between leaders were also conducted jointly, and there were reciprocal visits between groups of leaders at the end of the summer season. However, by virtue of the aforementioned competition for the right to call themselves the 'best' camp in the USSR, both the pedagogues and the campers at both camps maintain their right to a strongly expressed identity. But the distinguishing characteristics that they use to accentuate their own uniqueness or to deprecate their rival often turn out to be very similar. As a rule, in these reminiscences, talking about the 'specifics' of either of them is reduced to a search for proofs of its status as the most 'democratic' camp in the USSR and accusing its rival of conniving at the 'parade-ground' and ideology (to the point that each calls the other 'the school for Pioneer activists', an expression which has evidently acquired negative connotations in the post-Soviet era).

Regrettably, since the archival evidence for the work of the camps is very fragmentary, it is a hard task to judge how similar or different the pedagogical practices at Artek and Orlyonok during the late Soviet period were in reality. It might have been possible to speak of the specifics of the leaders' collectives (for example, the Lesnaya (Forest) company at Artek, led for almost forty years, from 1964 to 2003 by Evgeniy Vasilyev, had the reputation of a testing-ground for innovative pedagogical methods), but after talking to leaders who had worked at Artek and Orlyonok for decades I discovered that there was frequent change-over in the make-up of the pedagogical companies[1] of the camps, the leadership would change (even the

[1] Here and below, the term 'company' is used to translate *druzhina*, a term that was originally used in the Communist movement during the early twentieth century to refer to campaign organisations of workers,

Evgeniy Vasilyev mentioned above worked as the head of the Almaznaya (Diamond) company during the winter season, since the Lesnaya company operated only in summer), and almost every one of the people I spoke to had, in the course of their pedagogical career at the camp, changed company three or four times (and one informant had experience of working as a leader at both Artek and Orlyonok).

Lacking the necessary instruments for calculating the specifics of Artek and Orlyonok and the companies of which they consisted, but finding many resemblances in the representational strategy of both camps, both in official documents and in reminiscences, I decided to analyse their pedagogical practices as variants of a single tradition. On the one hand, this tradition only allows a complete assessment of the pedagogical principles of the specific group of leaders who decided to spend their lives in 'the capitals of happy childhood'; and even if these principles really did determine their activity, on the scale of Artek and Orlyonok, with their many thousands of campers, it may not have been noticeable. On the other hand, my informants' careers allow them to be regarded as the basic experts on the pedagogical tradition of Artek and Orlyonok in the Soviet period.

Using interviews as material for reconstructing pedagogical tactics involves a number of limitations resulting both from the communicative situation and the actual field context. First of all, it should be noted that by no means all the interviews I conducted can be characterised as confidential and in-depth, because many of them were recorded at the workplace, which, naturally, meant that the people being interviewed had to maintain their professional image (although a significant number of the conversations took place in a more favourable 'domestic' setting). Since most of my informants are still involved in pedagogical activity at children's centres, they may be suspected of an involuntary reassessment of the Soviet pedagogical tradition from the point of view of the present democratic values, made in order to present both the history of the camp and their own past activities in a favourable light to the investigator. My own chosen position may also have affected their attempts to show the Soviet history of the centres in a more attractive light. In order to establish contact, as a rule I would begin the conversation by stating my desire of understanding all the practical details of the Orlyonok and Artek pedagogy, demonstrating a respectful and 'serious' attitude towards it. The desire to bring the Soviet experience up to date probably introduces some inaccuracy into the material. However, one is prevented from acknowledging its influence on the former leaders' oral narratives as total by the new course of evaluation of

but in the Pioneer movement signified an administrative unit comprised of different 'troops' (*otryady*), i.e. several hundred Pioneer members overall [Eds.].

the Soviet heritage pursued by the directorates of Artek and Orlyonok at the time when the interviews were recorded (2015 and 2018). During my field research the centres' development programme (specially devised by the new Russian directorate of the Artek International Children's Centre in 2015) was directed towards reforming 'obsolete' pedagogical technologies. The stigmatisation of the Soviet tradition, and in the case of Artek also the biographical experience of working in the camp in the Soviet period, which became the current background context for most of the interviews, made my informants more often talk about the Soviet past as irrevocably lost than see the present approach to the child as rooted in it. Nevertheless in formulating my questions I tried to start from specific biographical stories about the Pioneers, the troops and seasons, and relationships within the pedagogical collective, and to avoid those concepts that are encountered in the documentation of the time of the Thaw and which might evoke associations with the post-Soviet pedagogical discourse (such as the 'individual approach', 'children's interests', 'the personality of the child and the leader', etc.).

Despite the limitations of both kinds of source, combined use of archive and retrospective material makes it possible to show that the oft-repeated passages in interviews today about 'the ideology of democratic relations' directed towards educating 'an autonomous developing personality' [KhTL, Pioneer leader at Orlyonok, 1980–2] are not merely discursive constructions of the post-Soviet period that aim to reconcile past and present paradigms of values (although this motive cannot be entirely discounted), but reflect concepts that gained popularity in the time of the Thaw and late socialism. At the same time, of course, there are absolutely no grounds for affirming that an approach orientated on the child's personality was universally employed in the Soviet Artek and Orlyonok or that it was highly effective. It is primarily a matter of the beginning of pedagogical reflection connected with the search for its practical implementation.

The (pre-)Thaw[1] reassessment of 'children's autonomy'

As is known, children occupied a central place in the Soviet project for constructing the new man, and, according to ideological slogans, should educate themselves by means of self-management within a juvenile collective properly organised by adults [Dimke 2018: 39–

[1] Maria Mayofis has pointed out that a number of the tendencies in Soviet pedagogy which are held to have arisen in the period of the Thaw in fact appeared earlier. She shows, for example, that the development of the 'individual approach' was favoured by the necessity for reform that confronted Soviet pedagogues in their attempts to overcome the consequences of the War [Mayofis 2015]. My research confirms the existence of 'harbingers of the Thaw', inasmuch as, according to the documents, the thought of a need for a reform of the Pioneer organisation was also first formulated in the second half of the 1940s. However, since the real changes directed towards solving the problems of the organisation of the Pioneers only took place in the second half of the 1950s, I use the term 'pre-Thaw'.

40]. But most of the research into the practice of providing Soviet children with room for independent action, be it the right to compile their own textbooks [Senkina 2018] or to take decisions in the school soviet [Maslinsky 2020], concerns the 1920s and shows that by the middle of the 1930s the reformers of Soviet pedagogy had found arguments for ultimately taking full control of children's autonomy. Since the beginning of the 1930s the Pioneer organisation, where the principle of autonomy and initiative was one of the basic declarative laws, had firmly established itself in schools and copied the vertical hierarchical model of the relationship between children and adults [Dimke 2018: 73]. The gulf between the democratic slogans of Pioneer autonomy and the conservative, sometimes repressive educational practices of Soviet schools in the second half of the 1940s was explicitly raised as a problem in official Soviet documents:

In Pioneer work there is a lot of routine, formalism, officialdom. In many companies, troops and squads the work is carried out without taking account of the children's healthy aspirations and interests, without taking account of the Pioneers' different age groups, and in forms that are inaccessible to them and do not correspond to their interests and ages. Many Pioneer organisations blindly copy the methods of the teaching work of schools. The meetings are boring, not interesting to the children, and take place exclusively in the school buildings. At the meetings there are long and wearisome reports and speeches that have been written and learnt in advance. There are hardly any hikes, excursions, war games, sports, competitions or shows of the pupils' art or technical activities. There is no organised reading or discussion of books, plays or films for children. A large number of Pioneers are not involved in the work of the squads, troops and companies, which lessens the role of the Pioneers' independence, initiative and self-discipline [Khanchin 1959: 85].

Although the same resolution of the Central Committee of the Komsomol (issued on 13 March 1947) affirmed that the Pioneer organisation's role was 'to assist the teaching staff in educating schoolchildren' (i.e. the foremost position in education was still assigned to the school), it was noted in the passage cited that the predominance of school methods in the Pioneer organisation had turned the members of the organs of juvenile self-management into nothing more than obedient followers of the will of adults. In this way the school was, not directly but obliquely, accused of having, during the period of 'High Stalinism', 'distorted' the idea of children's independence. This in turn opened the way for a search for alternative places and methods for educating Pioneer 'activists' — independent, enterprising children, who could organise interesting work in their troop. Over the next decade the discourse of the critique of the subversion of the principle of independence in the Pioneer organisation probably mainly existed at the level

of pedagogical thought, because it has not been possible to find any evidence of noticeable pedagogical initiatives during the pre-Thaw decade. However, once the Thaw began, places for 'out-of-school' education of Pioneer activists began to appear everywhere: at the regional Houses of Pioneers (as, for example, the 'Frunze commune' opened by Professor Igor Ivanov of the Herzen State Pedagogical Institute in Leningrad, 1959), clubs where they lived (the famous Karavella (Caravel) troop organised by Vladislav Krapivin in Yekaterinburg, 1961) and Pioneer camps [Khanchin 1959: 138]. In 1957 Artek became the first Pioneer camp in the country to be given the official status of a 'school for Pioneer activists', and in 1960 its subsidiary, Orlyonok, was opened on the Black Sea coast of the Krasnodar Krai to prepare Komsomol activists. But was the camp a more successful place for educating activists?

'The children's camp and sanatorium at Artek' in the context of the history of the development of organised children's holidays (1920–60s)

It is worth noting that although in the denunciatory discourse of the collective memory of Soviet times it is accepted that Artek and Orlyonok (and other Pioneer camps) are to be regarded as allegories of the totalitarian regime, the Pioneer camp was not a Soviet invention. The idea of educating children in the open air was born in Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century, gained popularity all over the world at the beginning of the twentieth, and, to judge by the majority of descriptions, lost its universal and mass character at the outbreak of the Second World War. There were two main reasons that guided the adults who organised summer camps: the struggle against tuberculosis (see: [Bryder 1992; Bakker 2010; Vanobbergen, Vansieleghem 2010] and others) and the rapid growth in urbanisation (see: [Gold 2002; Paris 2008; Wall 2009; Mechling 2013: 420] and others). And although these two reasons were closely connected, that is, physicians' concern about child mortality from tuberculosis to a large extent brought on a panic about the pernicious effect of airless and dusty towns on children's physical and mental development (see: [Albisetti 2020: 83] and others), they gave rise to two models of organising children's holidays. The first model, which I shall provisionally call the 'sanatorium' was proposed by the doctors (although pedagogues also took an active part in such medical projects). The means of the treatment of soul and body in organising collective holidays for children in sanatoria was a strictly regulated regime (of sleeping and waking, of nourishment, of physical procedures, etc.) both in countries with a liberal democratic way of life and in those where totalitarianism was establishing itself [Vanobbergen, Vansieleghem 2010: 339; Mechling 2013: 425]. The other tradition of organising children's holidays in natural

surroundings, which became popular in America [Paris 2008] and Canada [Wall 2009], for instance, was also a response to urbanisation, but on the part of pedagogues. They were concerned that children in towns, spoilt by the latest technical inventions and free from the necessity of physical labour at home, were growing up passive and unhealthy [Ibid.: 5]. In the ideologists' opinion, living in natural surroundings would help children to achieve independence by mastering antimodernist practices such as making fires, canoeing, determining their location, and manual labour.

In the Soviet Union the 'sanatorium' and 'camp' models were not always strictly demarcated, and this lack of definition often led to tension between the medical and educational elements of the programme of children's leisure. The struggle between the doctors, who saw the child primarily as the object of treatment, and the pedagogues, who were for stimulating children's initiative, played an important role in the history of Artek. Although Artek appeared at the dawn of the Soviet regime, in 1925, the development of its project was a sort of reassessment of a type of Pioneer camp popular at the very beginning of the 1920s, which was a tented encampment set up and provided for by the Pioneers themselves. They were supposed to spend their summer holidays there being entirely self-sufficient. In 1925 this principle of organising children's summer holidays was accused of following the 'primitive' [Bolotnikov 1925: 1] and 'Red Indian' ['Edem v lagerya' 1926: 1] Boy Scout traditions (popular in prerevolutionary Russia, but persecuted in connection with the formation of the Pioneer organisation), which, in the correspondents' opinion, hindered the education of 'civilised Soviet man' [Bolotnikov 1925: 1]. The organisation of children's holidays on the model of the American camp, based on the predominance of the practices of self-sufficiency and manual labour, was rejected not only on the basis of a growing antagonism towards the Western world, but also because its antimodernist ethos cast doubt on the celebration of the technical progress of the first five-year plans and the policy of civilisation that was the instrument for disciplining the new Soviet urban dwellers [Volkov 1996]. The 'health service' doctors took an active part in the organisation of Artek, a sanatorium of the new type, attentive not only to improving children's health, but also to raising sanitary and hygienic provision for them to a new level. The very first publication about Artek mentions that the children lived in 'large, convenient tents of the American type', and that by the head of each bed stood 'a little table for two people, with two drawers, and on the table are tooth powder, a brush, soap and a mug' [Arlyuk 1926: 2]. Red Cross patronage of the camp entirely excluded elements of self-sufficiency from its everyday life (children were no longer burdened with the need to prepare their own food or tidy up the tents). The daily timetable was subject to a strict medical regime

which limited the possibilities for children's initiative. Once the threat of tuberculosis had died down, and being sent to Artek became a reward, and not a treatment for the sake of one's health (in the middle of the 1930s ['Oni edut v "Artek"!' 1934: 4; Saltanov 1934: 1], etc.), the universal medical supervision of the activities of the Pioneers and their leaders did not disappear, but came to be interpreted by the ideologists of children's summer holidays as a feature of their 'cultural style' [Shif 1936]. So doctors were supposed to accompany the leaders and children everywhere to make sure that they did not sit on cold, damp earth, did not breathe in the smoke from the bonfire, did not set out their picnics in places that carried health risks, and so on [Ovchukov 1936].

At the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century, with the revival of ideas about educating 'initiative and independence' in children, the camp model abandoned in the 1920s began to regain its popularity. By the beginning of the Thaw the state of educational work at Artek was being criticised, just like the work of schools, by the Central Committee of the Komsomol for 'the lack of any interesting, lively work' and 'tedium and monotony in the work of the Pioneer troops' [RGASPI, f. M-1, op. 3, d. 450, f. 65]. In 1956 the authorities finally found the organisation of the premier camp of the country as a sanatorium unacceptable: Khrushchev compared Artek to a bourgeois resort and criticised it for the lack of self-sufficiency and labour activity in the camp [RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 18, f. 17]. In 1959 a project of a new 'Order for the Pioneer Camp' was put forward for examination at the Central Soviet of the All-Union Pioneer Organisation. When it was discussed, the idea that health camps for young people 'resembled badly organised rest homes' was distinctly heard, and it was proposed to change their profile from health camps to camps for 'the Komsomol and young people', where 'people from the senior classes of school will have good holidays, and spend time on sport, tourism and labour.' Darya Dimke has analysed the first work camps for 'the Komsomol and young people', which appeared in 1959, and notes that 'the schoolchildren took an active part in organising the camp and therefore felt that the camp was their own achievement' [Dimke 2018: 66]. The Orlyonok camp for Komsomol activists was opened in the summer of 1960 as a small tented (!) encampment with places for 520 people. And although two dormitory blocks with places for 1,040 people were built by 1964 [RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 77, f. 1], in the Solnechnaya company the children lived in tents from its inception till the end of the 1990s, and in the Komsomolskaya company (opened in 1966) they lived in iron 'barrels'.[1] This sort of democratic architectural solution, which reflected

[1] 'Barrels' or 'barrel houses' was the slang term used in the camps for metal buildings with domed roofs resembling Nissen huts [Eds.].

the peak of the popularity of domestic 'wild' tourism in the USSR of the Thaw, also symbolically resurrected the idea of the first Soviet tented camps, and at the same time returned certain practices of self-sufficiency to the camp.

But 'socially useful labour' was not the only novelty in the organisation of the way of life at Pioneer camps at the beginning of the 1960s. After Artek, Orlyonok and a significant number of Pioneer camps were transferred from the Ministry of Health to the Central Committee of the Komsomol and the Ministry of Education of the RSFSR, it was no longer medics, but pedagogues who determined how people should live there. This was the impulse for the formation of a pedagogical tradition in camp conditions, which, in accordance with the new requirements of the period, had to be directed towards the education of creative and independent 'activist' pioneers.

Artek and Orlyonok in the 1960s: Control and / or independence?

Irina Kaspe, citing the research of her predecessors Juliane Fürst and Mikhail Rozhanskiy, points out the tension that lay at the root of the policy of forming the new Soviet subjectivity of the generation of the Thaw. In formulating it she notes that 'characteristics of social activity and individual initiative are firmly attached to the very image of "the sixties generation",' but that 'the strictness of the limits within which the activity expected of "young people" was supposed to accommodate itself is equally evident today' [Kaspe 2018: 210–1]. In her opinion: 'The gravitational field between absolute subordination and free initiative that grew up in the conditions of totalitarian mobilisation could take quite different forms in the course of Soviet history; the means of not noticing this contradiction and rendering it invisible were similarly diverse' [Ibid.: 212]. In this and the following paragraphs I shall use this precisely formulated generalisation as I turn toward the analysis both of the strategically established 'limits' and of the pedagogical methods used to explain, smooth over or level out these limits when the ideas of educating the independent child in Pioneer camp conditions were put into practice.

It is not hard to guess that the role of the limits within which the pedagogues of Artek and Orlyonok operated during the Thaw was, of course, played by the camp regime. Educating 'the man of the future' within institutions which had some features resembling what Erving Goffman has suggested calling a 'total institution' [Goffman 1961] was, overall, a typical feature of the imagination of the pedagogues of the Thaw. Maria Mayofis, for example, analysing the beginnings of the Soviet system of boarding schools in 1954–64, has noted that in the opinion of the pedagogues of the new educational institution, '"[t]he man of the future", the product of the activity of the

whole boarding school system, was not supposed to be formed spontaneously, but thoughtfully, according to plan, as a result, as they used to say then, of purposeful pedagogical influence ['Shkola-internat …' 1961: 4–9]' [Mayofis 2016: 316]. The presence of the 'framework' provided by the regime seemed to the camp pedagogues to be a necessary condition for bringing about the educational process. The leaders perceived the regime (and explained it to the children) as a safety standard, but, as may be seen from the quotation that follows, its existence made it possible for the pedagogues also to introduce other limits on, for example, personal choice:

Svetlana Andreevna [S. A. Polozkova (Vasilyeva), the head of the Polevaya company, 1981–98] *said at the organisational meeting, when the whole camp was assembled, she said: 'What can you do at Artek? You can do anything at Artek!' Everyone: 'O-o-o-o-o-o-o-o-o!' Well, because, how would children take that? 'You can do anything' — what does that mean? Go and swim in the sea, run off into the woods, or anything else. But then she continued: 'You can do anything at Artek, so long as it isn't a danger to life or health.' And that way she set up a sort of framework. You can do everything else! You can love each other, respect each other! You can do what you want, because 'you're going to plan it yourselves.' The children themselves drew up a plan to change the programme (that is, of course, they thought they were drawing it up themselves, the programme had already been drawn up in advance, but the children wrote down their suggestions, then the camp soviet met and processed them, and it turned out that it all fitted into the programme that had already been drawn up). That was all, and that is how the children lived, and they thought that they were living exactly as they themselves had wanted to* [MAA, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1982–4].

At the same time the idea of educating free and enterprising Pioneers within the strict regime of a Pioneer camp made the pedagogues at Artek and Orlyonok reflect on how this tension might be relieved. Thus, in the interview fragment cited above it can be observed that in explaining the camp rules to the newly arrived Pioneers, the director placed the stress not on prohibitions, but on the opportunities for independent action within the permissible limits. In the rest of the article I shall concentrate on an analysis of the basic pedagogical tactics that the pedagogues of Artek and Orlyonok developed in reply to the state order (or 'strategy') to inculcate 'independence and initiative' within the Pioneer camps.

Obtaining freedom within the regime

The people who carried out the state order to produce supervised autonomy had to explain the paradox of the task that they were undertaking not only to the Pioneers, but to themselves. Jochen

Hellbeck has suggested calling this process '[r]ationalisation — the ability to see a rational logic in the random manifestations of state policy' [Khelbek 2002: 242]. I shall look at the pedagogues' interpretation of a few aspects of everyday life which the scholarly literature is accustomed to interpret as imbued with the semantics of subordination and deprivation of agency.

Thus, the beginning of a stay required the children to pass through a 'reception point', which meant handing in your personal possessions for safekeeping, a compulsory shower, putting on a uniform and being assigned to a troop without any say in the matter. It should be noted that in archival documents as early as the mid-1930s one may find the camp employees' reflections on the need for leaders to show particular 'care and tenderness' during the passage through the 'trials' of the reception, which Erving Goffman defines as 'obedience test' [Goffman 1961: 17]:

The reception of children at the camp, as we know, consists of the bathhouse, the medical examination, the registration and other unavoidable 'trials'. Oh how often does this turn, in our camps, into a thorny path, a sort of 'St Patrick's Purgatory'! Endless waiting for your turn with the doctor, a careless wash in the bathhouse, exhausting waiting in the changing-room, and so on — how unpleasant this all is, especially for a child who is among strangers for the first time in his life!

At Artek this is all done as easily as possibly, and is even somehow fun. The buses that bring the children are met by cheerful leaders, who try to get to know the children immediately, meet them kindly and make sure that each of them has their care and attention. Look, it's not such a bore having a wash in the bathhouse if the leader is telling you funny stories there. Look, it's not so exhausting at the doctor's if a leader has sat down beside you and is asking you about your home, your parents and Bobik the rabbit whom you've left behind there. And the best thing of all is that they don't let you get bored, they draw you into the collective at once [Shif 1936: 44].

In the late Soviet pedagogical tradition this practice is offered as a means of liberation from the material capital (positive, but more often negative, for example, poverty) that, in the opinion of some former leaders, might hinder the self-expression of the personality or become the cause of social distinctions or bullying within the children's collective. According to the practical ideology of the employees of the model camps, a child who arrived at Artek or Orlyonok left its material inadequacy or social disadvantage at the porter's lodge together with its suitcase.

One of my troops, a very strong troop, such a good one, its commander was such a fine lad! Time to go home. That is, when we were all

in uniform, it made no difference who his mother and father were. Time to go home. When they all got their suitcases, put their own clothes on, and tomorrow they would all be going home. Their best clothes, of course, they all put their best clothes on. And along comes my commander. That outstanding boy! He's wearing oilskin boots, yes, oilskin boots with the tops turned down, he's got a padded jacket (nowadays that might be in fashion, all zipped up), but a padded jacket, the ordinary sort that you can buy in shops for lumberjacks, and <…> a satchel with a long strap. An ordinary school satchel — that was his suitcase. When I saw that — how he'd arrived and how he lived at home <…> I said 'My God!' Well, he might be a Gagarin, he might be a Lomonosov, but he sits in his hole like that, and would we make him wear that here? Nowadays nobody would come near him. All in all, the uniform played a colossal role in its time [KLA, Pioneer leader at Orlyonok, 1970–3].

Of course, the leaders at Artek and Orlyonok did not invent that interpretation of the uniform: pedagogues in various countries of the world have in various periods of history evaluated the significance of the uniform in very much the same way. When assigning uniforms the capacity to reveal the 'essence with its external husk removed' [AAN, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1989–91] — Soviet leaders and planners were most probably inspired by the idea of Anton Makarenko, who burnt his charges' personal possessions, thus giving them the opportunity to begin life at the institution with a clean sheet [Kharkhordin 2002: 261]. But whereas for Makarenko being brought up in a collective whose members had no past meant that his charges absorbed the norms that this new collective approved [Ibid.: 249–65], in the pedagogical tradition of the model camps putting on a uniform was interpreted as an important instrument for creating favourable conditions for discovering new abilities. This is how this fact is interpreted in the candidate's dissertation on educating Pioneer 'activists' in a temporary juvenile collective by the head (1971–6) and planner (1976–7) of the Komsomolskiy camp (Orlyonok):

In the permanent school collective the schoolboy occupies a particular place due to the stereotype that has grown up: for example, a schoolboy who has been active is expected to be active in his subsequent behaviour. <…> Our observations also show that older schoolchildren in the temporary collective often discover qualities in themselves that they had not previously suspected [Ivanov 1979: 79].

Judging by the interviews with former leaders, in the educational system of Artek and Orlyonok the collective played no less a role that in any Soviet school, but the leaders were not supposed to make it an 'end', but a 'means' of developing the personality. This attitude favoured its being used, as the leaders said, as a condition for

developing individual qualities of the children's personalities, and not for criticism of their shortcomings.

The collective is not an end in itself, d'you hear? The collective as an instrument for developing the personality. Do you understand the difference in stress? The child's personality above all. You have seen that child. But how have you presented him to everybody? Have you let him fulfil himself in the collective or haven't you? Have the others noticed him and seen his worth? If he sings, well that would have been in the foreground, he'd certainly have got up on the stage in front of the whole camp, if not in front of all Artek. If he does something with his hands... Has he fulfilled himself or hasn't he? And if you've got yourself a writer, one who writes verse, and so on? What has the result been? Have you let him fulfil himself or haven't you? [PNA, head of a Pioneer company at Artek, late 1970s — early 1980s]

This sort of reinterpretation of the concept of the collective as 'a means that allows the needs of individual children to be fulfilled in a special way' has been noted in late Soviet pedagogical thought by the Hungarian theoreticians of preschool education Zsuzsa Millei and Robert Imre [Millei, Imre 2010: 142]. Being in a collective of children who had not previously known each other and who had the same initial possibilities on entry was regarded as giving them the chance to experiment with their own 'permanent' identity, trying themselves out in unaccustomed types of activity. There are many stories told by former leaders in the interviews about gifted but repressed pupils who were able to present themselves in a new way in new conditions, or, conversely, about 'hooligans' who found the possibility of trying on a new role.

There was a child who was a real speccy nerd in his own class, where he was bullied, but here in some quiz or something he just knew everything, and wasn't afraid to show it, because he had new friends, and they didn't mock him the way, for example, they did at school, here everyone is equal. He was such a success story: 'You're a hero! You're brilliant! You're a babe!' [MAA, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1982–4]

There was one of my children, we were working at Kiparisnaya [Cypress] *company then, the next year, he was such a great helper, helped me so much, he was a drummer <…> he gave me his drumsticks, and then afterwards, when it was time to go home, he said to me 'Larisa Pavlovna!' I said, 'You're wonderful, you always helped me so much,' and he said, 'Imagine, Larisa Pavlovna, you don't know what I'm like at school. I'm a real hooligan. I even once set fire to the school, and that's not all...'* [FLP, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1978–82]

Although the tactics of rationalisation did nothing to alter the existing order, they did determine the vector of pedagogical thought,

which, as may be concluded from the examples cited, was directed towards equipping the territory of the Pioneer camp to call forth 'creativity and initiative'. The explanation of the 'framework', that is the education of a collective 'equalised' by putting on a uniform in an enclosed area, as the conditions for drawing out the personality formed the models for the leaders' behaviour, which protected them from the appearance of the 'practices of humiliation' which, according to Goffman, such social structures often provoke. Pedagogues following Makarenko's system acted in just the same way: asserting that this was what their educative principles were based on, the former leaders shifted the stress in their interpretation of its basic ideas (the collective is not an end in itself, but a means of developing the personality).

The creation of space for independent choice

As they stress the abundance of practices connected with control and supervision in children's summer camps, researchers often point out at the same time the 'cracks' which both the campers and the personnel create in the regime [Mechling 2013]. To mitigate the regime, the leaders at Artek and Orlyonok used the state order to educate 'initiative' in Pioneers and Komsomol members. Even though the primary purpose of the order issued by the Central Committee of the Komsomol was educating 'activists' with traditional duties (such as buglers and drummers, the press and radio centre, leaders of the Little Octobrists, etc.), during the Thaw the concept of 'activists' came to include the most diverse categories of successful schoolchildren, whose abilities were far from always suggestive of a firm social position. The 'Pioneer Instructor's Booklet', which was to be given out to people at Artek and Orlyonok at the end of their stay at the camp, included a list of 'essential Pioneer skills and knowledge', but there were not many compulsory items on it: 'knowing how to do morning exercises and doing them with your comrades, knowing how to play the drum and the bugle, knowing how to sing and learn Pioneer songs together with the others' [RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 126, f. 7], while the rest of it was taken up with listing skills 'optionally acquired by the children' [Ibid.]. The wish to create comfortable living conditions for the Pioneers and to start from the principle of taking account of their interests led to the formation of specialised troops, diversification into special activities, as a result of which the Pioneer 'activist' became a vague, abstract concept which most Pioneers and their leaders could not understand (a ritual formula which, like so many others, was supposed to be discussed at themed debates and around the campfire: 'What should a Pioneer activist be like?', '"Organiser" means...' [Archive of the Museum of the History of Artek, f. 1, op. 1, d. 925, f. 8]). The main task of Artek and Orlyonok became the

development of children's initiative, and the leaders of the model camps preferred to do it by starting from the child's enthusiasms. During the so-called 'school for Pioneer activists' there were organised troops of 'young sailors with squads of shipbuilders, hydrometeorologists, and lifeboat coxswains; young builders, border guards, squads of motorcyclists, cameramen, referees for various sports, cooks, young embroideresses and seamstresses, local studies experts, organisers of mass entertainment, etc.' [Archive of the Museum of the History of Artek, f. 1, op. 1, d. 925, f. 8]. The diversity of types of activity favoured the 'professionalisation' of the 'ideological' line of work, which came to be understood as one of the possible (but not obligatory) directions of work with the Pioneer 'activists', alongside tourism, sport or theatre. Sometimes it could even be lost sight of (as a type of special activity).

A situation emerged whereby the winners of the physics and maths olympics, who were busy in their circles, disdainfully noticed that the secretaries [the chairmen of the soviets of the village school companies] *were not at that time engaged in any social activity. When seminars are held for the secretaries they should not only be taught theoretically, but practically, with specific creative activities. It is to be wondered at that the Central Committee of the Komsomol had completely lost sight of the question of work with secretaries in the camp. Or how could it be explained that considerable scholarly forces were mustered for leading the circles, while work with the secretaries was left entirely up to the camp?* [RGASPI, f. M-9, op. 1, d. 196, f. 39]

The ideological order to take 'comprehensive account of the children's peculiarities, their tastes and level of development' [Museum of the History of Artek 1954: 13] in the leader's work at Artek and Orlyonok allowed room for manœuvre between different kinds of activity, thus giving a certain elasticity to what was at first sight a rigid camp regime. The possibility of refusing one kind of socially important work in favour of another can be traced both in the leaders' diaries and in their interviews. For example, in the following fragment from a leader's diary for 1964, the 'conversational' elements (evidently including meetings and debates on ideological topics) and parades are opposed to active and engaging ones:

Review and considerably enlarge the amount of time spent by the children 'in nature': at sea, in the woods, hiking, in the park, etc. This should be done at the expense of the mass troop and company events, 'conversational' moments on the veranda and in their rooms, and constant rehearsals and too frequent mass demonstrative and parade events [RGASPI, f. M-8, op. 1, d. 448, f. 150].

Of course, the right to choose what a troop should do still remained not with individual children, but with their leaders, who had to bear in mind the network of the season's plan of activities, which had

been thought up long before the children had arrived and the leaders had got to know their peculiarities. Nevertheless, the possibility of individualising the format and contents of the planned activities in accordance with the children's interests still has an emotional resonance for the former leaders and is assessed as the possibility of personalising pedagogical activity.

You know, I remember one troop, from Georgia and Sebastopol. And I remember very well that there was a boy in it called David Bagrationi. He was a descendant of that very Bagration who fought in the war of 1812. You could feel his ancestry! And this was an unusually cultured troop. Such children, as if they'd been specially selected! And we, I forget what the event was called, but my children, the girls from Sebastopol, Svetochka (I remember her as if it were just now!) made these wonderful candelabra! We prepared everything as if it were in the old days. The dresses we made out of old curtains, we got hold of them, there wasn't any of that sort of luxury then, and the children were so creative! Do you understand? Yes, we enjoyed that, and we chose ourselves an event that we could prepare ourselves. Not just what we'd been given. So. And according to the children's inclinations, what they could do, what they knew how to, as directed by the leader [VAN, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1972–4].

'Not to direct, but to guide': New rules for contact between children and adults

An important feature of the arrangements that prevented people from displaying 'independence and initiative' in sanatorium conditions was the strict hierarchical ladder in the organisation of relations. Without going into details, one might describe it in this way: the head of the main directorate of the whole camp stood at the apex of the pyramid, under him / her were the heads of companies, they were in charge of the leaders' troop, and they in turn led the Pioneer troops. The formula 'leader = comrade', where 'there was an evident emphasis on the lack of distance between the leader and the Pioneers' was discovered by Artem Kravchenko in the Pioneer press of the 1920s and 1930s [Kravchenko 2015: 56]. In the period of the Thaw the principle of comradely relations between children and adults came to be used by the camp pedagogues not only to smooth over unpleasant moments of everyday life, but also to give children the feeling of being the agents of the activities that were going on. In just the same way, Igor Ivanov proposed using a relaxation of vertical relations in the 'commune of young Frunzeites', as Dimke notes. According to him, 'the education of 'properly involved members of society' was only possible through 'the community of generations' (that is a relationship of equality between children and adults)' [Dimke 2018: 57].

In the late Soviet camp pedagogical tradition the idea of children's 'self-management' is not as clearly formulated as it was, for example, in the 1920s. Most of the former leaders that I talked to answered the question about children's self-management with a slight smile, hardly ever calling it a 'formality', but rather 'the pedagogues' craft' [ZOB, Pioneer leader at Orlyonok, 1983–4], 'a sort of toolkit' [BZS, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1980–3], 'clever leadership by adults' [MAA, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1982–4]. In organising regulated self-management the leader was assisted by the increasingly popular method of the game, which supposed the idea of 'the collective creativity of adults and children, soft leadership' [Kozlov 2015: 463]. Relations between adults and children had been determined in a similar manner in camps in other countries. For example, Laura Lee Downs, the author of a monograph on the colonies de vacances in France (1880–1960), points out that 'subtle manipulation on the part of the scoutmaster' [Downs 2002: 208] helped to disguise the hierarchy that existed in the colonies, and Leslie Paris points out that in many American camps in the first half of the twentieth century the children were supposed to call the adults 'Aunt' and 'Uncle', and although this form of address 'remained bound by hierarchy and power relations <…> the regular social order had been temporarily reoriented, and much seemed possible' [Paris 2008: 105]. In the instructions on method for leaders at Orlyonok (written between 1964 and 1972), the leader's position in the troop is treated as 'the hidden position of an educator' [CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 35, f. 253], and the methods of authority ('of the teacher') — giving orders, raising one's voice, issuing punishments — are taboo. Acknowledging and noticing the unavoidable hierarchy between the pedagogue and the child, the leaders saw their aim as to preserve subordination while masking it, rejecting those manifestations of the adult's position of power to which the children were accustomed. In order to educate an active subject, the leader was recommended to create, wherever possible, the illusion of equality: to carry on a dialogue, to behave like an equal participant in the conversation when going over the events of the day (raising one's hand before asking a question or saying something, referring to the opinions expressed by the children themselves), to avoid laying down the law and theoretical forms of work like instruction in favour of interaction.

The older Pioneers (13–15 years) are encouraged to form their own point of view. This is important for the leader, giving him the opportunity for reasoning instead of 'preaching' [CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 35, f. 158].

The leader's role <…> is unusually complicated. <…> From question to question (and before asking a question or saying anything, the leader must raise his hand and ask permission from the duty

commander), drawing the children's attention to some details or other, or to the most remarkable of the day's events, to help them imperceptibly draw the right conclusion from what they have said themselves. The children's attention must without fail be drawn to these events, but through what they have said themselves [CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 33, f. 9–10].

In the nostalgic interviews among the practices that the dialogue brought to the fore the former leaders and Pioneers remembered the evening 'lights' / 'camp fires' / 'cafés' at Orlyonok, and the discussion of films, which were perceived as 'difficult' and 'intellectual' (Andrei Tarkovsky, Mikhail Romm, Gleb Panfilov, Sergei Solovyov and others),[1] in the form of debates or the 'free microphone' in the Lesnaya and Polevaya companies of Artek. The form of the regulated discussion, which became part of everyday life at the camp from the time of the Thaw, embodied the political course of 'socialism with a human face'. While offering the right to self-expression, it was supposed to guard against the dangers of 'digging too deep' by virtue of the 'censorship of the collective' in the formation of one's own opinion. Nevertheless, in the leaders' recollections the main purpose of the debates was teaching the skills of oral self-expression ('They hadn't learnt how to speak: that isn't taught in schools' [VZ, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1978–87]), which assisted the development of the personality.

The main thing is that this wasn't forbidden here. Lord! That is, there was a field of battle. Discussion was one of the most fashionable forms of work. Today we would talk, say, discuss one of [famous singer Vladimir] *Vysotsky's songs, Lord, so to speak, spontaneously. You remember Vysotsky's song: 'If your friend suddenly turns out not to be your friend or your enemy, if you can't make out whether he's bad or good, take the lad to the mountains, drag him along, go, let him be roped together with you,' and so on. Just the verse of a song which let us have such discussions! So — wouldn't you help him? Would you put him to the test? And based on that verse such debates, which helped to develop the personality. If that's putting it rather strongly, sorry* [KLA, Pioneer leader at Orlyonok, 1970–3].

The regime at a time of romanticism

Attention to the child's interests also undermined another feature of the social order which the camp had in common with a total

[1] With the exception of Romm (1901–1971), these were all younger-generation directors responsible for some of the most controversial movies of the post-Stalin years. The Romm film that had inspired most discussion was *Obyknovennyy fashizm* (Ordinary Fascism), a documentary compilation of original footage from the Third Reich that was widely interpreted as a critique of totalitarianism more broadly [Eds.].

institution, namely the strict observance of the timetable, according to which the child should not have had a minute of spare time that (s)he could plan for independently. The pedagogues of the Thaw subjected the concept of the regime to reflection. The archive of the Central Soviet of the Pioneer Organisation has preserved the reflections of Comrade Sidorenko, the deputy headmaster of a secondary school in Nalchik, date 1959, on the need to create a 'new type' of camp, in which he dares to call the worship of the regime 'formalism':

Worshipping the sanatorium regime like some almighty fetish has deprived the Pioneers of many fine experiences that they would have remembered all their lives, and stopped them from being able to have a series of interesting adolescent adventures that only the camp could give them. There are so many mysteries that the night holds for young people! A dawn fishing trip, hiking and sleeping out of doors in the woods, by the camp-fire or by a haystack on the bank of a slumbering lake; watching the sunrise and breakfast on the grass! At the age of ten to fourteen you want to see and experience all this for yourself; but the iron veto of the regime demands that ten o'clock is bedtime! And you can't hear the trickling of the nearby brook, or the cries of the night birds, through the thick walls of the dormitory; you can't even tell stories in a whisper: you must sleep! [RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 122, f. 8]

Comrade Sidorenko's declaration called upon the reformers of the running of the Pioneer camps to sacrifice the daily regime, which confined the young peoples' activities, in the name of giving them the unique experience of a disrupted order, which is essential during the period of maturing and the development of the personality. I have not succeeded in finding any similar passages in the Artek and Orlyonok documentation, but in the interviews occasional departures from elements of the regime (with the administration's permission) can be observed quite often.

I'll tell you a secret. We could break up the boxes that they brought apples in for the canteen, put the bits together, store them under the huts, dry them out while it was raining, so that in a couple of days we could have a bonfire. Then we'd get armfuls of this wood and go to the swimming base and light a bonfire at four o'clock in the morning — this happened. But, of course, that is, seriously, well, the administration knew about it, but the children thought that we were all doing it in secret, that it was all so romantic, and then as if butter wouldn't melt in our mouths, as if nothing had happened, we'd come down unwashed, sleepy, for exercises on the camp-fire site, as if we'd only just got up. That is, no one in the camp knew where we'd come from, but we were all present and correct — for exercise, and then to tidy up our rooms and the site, and then go in to breakfast. That is,

I remember a lot of romantic things like that [BZS, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1980–3].

I should note that solidarity with children's culture of resistance and the incorporation of certain of their 'forbidden' desires into the camp rituals were widespread around the world. Leslie Paris describes the tradition of having a 'Topsy-Turvy Day' in American camps in the first half of the twentieth century, when the campers had the chance to swap roles with their eaders, which 'allowed for (while muting) the expression of dissent' [Paris 2008: 146]. As in the American educational tradition, 'clandestine nocturnal bathing' and 'secretly' greeting the dawn at Artek, Orlyonok, and other Pioneer camps did not become acts that undermined the existing order, they only modified it, but still, this was a bold move by Soviet pedagogues towards respecting children's unofficial culture.

From the 'school of activism' to the 'school of humanity'[1]

It may appear that the pedagogical system reconstructed after the interviews and documents shows that the leaders of the model children's camps of the Soviet Union had succeeded in developing and bringing into being a project for producing controlled autonomy, i.e. a technique for teaching active and enterprising Soviet children who were at the same time loyal to the regime (and that was indeed the mission that the Central Committee of the Komsomol had set the employees of Artek and Orlyonok). But today the former leaders do not often draw any connection between the necessity of fulfilling the ideological requirement of bringing up 'activist' Pioneers and the principles of the system of education at Artek and Orlyonok; to the latter they ascribe properties of 'innovation' and sometimes even resistance to the classical line of Soviet pedagogy, which, as customarily defined, assumed that the interests of the collective should predominate over the interests of the individual [Fallace 2018: 40–56]. It is not impossible that the idea of the 'subversive' activity of the showcase camps of the Central Committee of the Komsomol was formed under the influence of the resolution of a commission of the Central Committee of the Komsomol which visited Orlyonok in 1966. In the inspectors' opinion, the pedagogical methods directed towards restoring the ideal of children's autonomy that had been lost in the period of 'high Stalinism' were subversive,

[1] I first encountered this description of Orlyonok in the text of the scenario for the final parade of the 1972 season: 'We meet for the last time for the final parade. For thirty days we have been sharing the sun, the sea, Orlyonok songs and Orlyonok friendship. Never again shall we stand in the Orlyonok circle or put our hands on the shoulders of those who have become our dear friends. And for all those thirty days we have had with us modest, cheerful, kind and caring people, who brought us joy. Orlyonok is the school of humanity, and it is you who have taught us — you, the leaders, you, the cooks and doctors, you, the nurses, all the grown-ups of Orlyonok. You have given us kindness and care for the whole season, and today we give them to you' [CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 41].

'ignoring in practice the rich and diverse experience and traditions of the Pioneer and Komsomol organisations of the country' [RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 77, f. 15], and critical of 'the work of the Komsomol and of schoolteachers' [Ibid., f. 17].

This accusation was partly connected with the withdrawal of support in 1965 from the communard movement, which, as Dimke writes, had 'very quickly come to be regarded by Komsomol leaders as a "sect"' [Dimke 2018: 229]. Dimke explains the conflict which served to formulate this verdict by the communards' neglect of the gap between ideological discourse and practice, as a result of which the law governing the functioning of the system (which Yurchak has called 'the performative shift') began to be broken. Orlyonok, which became one of the bases of the communard movement in the 1960s, was also accused of 'sectarianism' [RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 77, f. 5]. But, in contrast to the 'Frunze commune', in which life, as Dimke's research has shown, was subordinated to a system of values shared by all its members, it becomes clear from the accusations scattered throughout the verdict on Orlyonok that the fulfilling of the order to educate for 'initiative' in the camp allowed a large number of readings which were not always in accord with each other. Thus the camp was reproached for reading difficult works by Lenin that were not suitable for children or adolescents [Ibid., f. 7], and that the children had not learnt anything new about Lenin while they were at the camp [Ibid.], that instead of meeting the delegates to the Third Congress of the Komsomol the leaders had conducted discussions of Romain Rolland and Jack London [RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 77, f. 8], and for the large number of discussions dedicated to political questions [Ibid., f. 6], for the provocative nature of the questions raised by the 'Komsomol and You' club [Ibid., f. 16], and that 'many holidays and troop activities take the children out of the world of real life' [Ibid., f. 11]. One of the most serious crimes condemned in the verdict of the commission that had visited Orlyonok was 'in the camp there is a systematic and methodical preference for educating in such psychological qualities as kindness, gentleness, stability, affability and frankness,' and this, in the accusers' opinion, 'will not do anything but a great deal of harm to the work of bringing up real fighters for communism' [Ibid., f. 5].

This verdict has much in common with the discussion that broke out a year later, in 1967, on the pages of *Uchitelskaya gazeta* around the '"abstract humanism" of V. A. Sukhomlynsky' [Dmitriev 2015: 331], a Soviet pedagogue whose ideas had much in common with the methods developed at Artek and Orlyonok. The accusations against Sukhomlynsky are very similar to those made against Orlyonok by the commission of the Central Committee of the Komsomol. Thus Sukhomlynsky was attacked because 'his mythical classless humanity' is 'harmful in contemporary conditions',

since '[c]ircumstances are still such that we are forced to show severity towards the enemies of society, the enemies of the world and of communism' [Likhachev 1967, cited from Dmitriev 2015: 332].

It was precisely this motif of 'moral' versus 'ideological' education that is perceived and proclaimed as the 'mainstay' of the Soviet educational programme of the model camps by their former leaders today.

Because if they said that there was ideology at Artek, and that everything there was for the young Leninists, those who would become Party and Komsomol members, they bow down to it in spite of everything — that is not the truth. The truth is that they were all accompanied by the idea that they should become better people, that they should be kinder in this life. That is all! Moral values were the mainstay of all this. Everything else was secondary [ZEG, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1975–80].

Even though both the comminatory document and the leaders, in their retrospective interviews, are inclined to oppose 'humane pedagogy' to 'ideology', it seems to me that there was a direct connection between the state requirements and the Soviet version of child-centred pedagogy invented at Artek and Orlyonok. Admittedly, the appearance on the Thaw's ideological agenda of 'initiative and creativity' in children encouraged the pedagogues of the model camps to pay attention to 'the interests and requirements of the children', as the ideologists had advised [RGASPI, f. M-1, op. 3, d. 413, f. 65], and ultimately to the child's personality without regard to his / her ideological convictions. Let us remember that the 'Komsomol secretaries' and 'winners of the mathematical olympics' were presented as equally valid ways of self-realisation in the Orlyonok leader's report (for 1969!). More than that, under Perestroika it became possible to reinterpret the mission of the camp season at Artek and Orlyonok as the re-education of convinced 'secretaries' into people 'with heads on their shoulders'. Thus in the following story the behaviour of the representatives of the Komsomol organisations is assessed as contradicting the norms of morality and in need of pedagogical 'work'.

[And were the young people who came really responsible and right-thinking, or not all of them?]

Yes, you know, we worked with them. For example, we began preparing for the assembly of secretaries for 1990. Our main idea was that they were all becoming such blockheads. <…> So, for example, there were 650 secretaries sitting there, and who should appear (we'd been hiding him for three days) but a punk. He was something — purple hair and earrings. And so there was a meeting: non-standard

organisations and representatives of the Komsomol organisations. They very nearly spat, very nearly attacked him: 'What are you, just look at yourself!' They didn't know him, only his external appearance, not what was in his head. He spoke to them politely, and they poured dirt upon him. And he had only just come out! Then he went away, quickly took off his make-up, and came out again with a guitar. He was the winner of an international competition for singer-songwriters, a second-year student. He sang, and they were all in love with him. But it was the very same person! That situation passed, and immediately out came a psychologist, with a higher degree, and interpreted the situation, what had happened. He told them. And they understood that they were fools. They saw something, and that is all. <…> You asked the question, were there really people like that. Yes, but we quietly tidied them up, and showed them the situation. And they began to think. That is, ideology is all very well, but you have to have a head too [IVD, head of a Pioneer company at Orlyonok, 1989–91].

Did the 1966 resolution affect the Orlyonok pedagogical tradition? According to the former leaders who worked there in the 1970s and 1980s, not significantly. The main change that took place in the camp after its 'crushing', if my informants can be believed, was the unification of its terminology, which had been revised during the Thaw, with the usual language of the Pioneer organisations (for example, 'commanders' once again became 'chairmen of the troop soviets', 'squadrons' reverted to 'companies', 'patrols' to troops, and the Oreshek leaders' troop changed its name to Yunost, more usual in Soviet official discourse, etc.), but there was no change in its practices, and the new head of the main administration of Orlyonok helped to preserve them, as did the succession from one generation of leaders to the next.

At that time Yuri Vasilyevich Burakov came to power, that is, he became the head of the administration. And he worked eight years at Orlyonok, and he understood the pedagogy, the essence of the pedagogy, what the men of the sixties had created, and he was able to camouflage it and show the people in Moscow something completely different, what they wanted to see. Because in those days you had to do what the Komsomol and the Pioneers told you, but he was able to camouflage everything that was continuing to be developed here and preserved, and only thanks to that person, otherwise we might have destroyed it all, and there's no telling how Orlyonok would have evolved or according to what canons. That's the first thing, and the second is that the people, still, who stayed here, who were brought up on that pedagogy, the pedagogical methods that started here, and on the understanding of that philosophy, and who accepted it, they carried on working at Orlyonok and thanks to them it all continued to develop [KhTL, Pioneer leader at Orlyonok, 1980–2].

The proposition that there was no serious retreat from the techniques of the Thaw towards the activities of the Pioneer organisations and schools is reinforced by the fact that the problem of the successful transfer of experience from Orlyonok and Artek into the schools (and that was precisely the mission of the 'school for pioneer activists') was regularly discussed in the leaders' papers at pedagogical conferences. The leaders regretted that what children told their schoolfellows in their troop or company about the time spent at the camp 'is reduced to reminiscences of what they have experienced and laments that Orlyonok is impossible in the wider world' [CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 1088, f. 30]. And indirect evidence that the tradition of Artek and Orlyonok during the Thaw was founded on 'humane' values may be seen in the fact that, according to the former leaders, the camp did not require any serious revision of its principles of pedagogical activity in the 1990s. The collectives of the personnel of both camps that came together from the 1960s to the 1990s remained faithful to the traditions of the sixties, which, in their opinion, fully corresponded to the requirements of the new democratic era.

Foreseeing the observation that the pedagogy of Orlyonok always and at all times worked on the personality, let us point out that we fully share that point of view. More than that, we are delighted with the intuitive pedagogical discoveries of the personal approach made in the work of the first leaders at Orlyonok. It means a lot to call a leader by his first name, like an equal, and so does the tradition of being nice to people. There is even a human being in the camp logo. And they did try to draw the Orlyonok [lit. eaglet. — Trans.] *as a bird. All this was from the very beginning. Even in the seventies, in the period of stagnation, the individual child was valued: from the leader's first greeting, which sounds naïve today, 'the best Pioneer in the whole Oblast' to serious debates about the meaning of life in the Komsomolskiy camp. The personality was the essential character of Orlyonok. It found its way through the prohibitive resolutions of the Central Committee of the Komsomol, it was cherished in the leader, in the driver, in the nurse. The camp was famed for its personalities, it was orientated towards the personality, and created a pedagogy that was meaningful for the personality* [CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 1614, f. 22].

And even if one discerns a certain contrivance in these formulations, and a desire to make one's past relevant and bring it up to date, the lack of a requirement for any radical reform of the methods of the camp in the 1990s nevertheless speaks of the accomplishment of a gradual reform of the system from within in Soviet times.

Child-centred pedagogy in the Soviet Union?

At the same time, of course, the 'democratic' principles of educating the personality that appeared in the USSR had their limitations and

differences from the understanding and application of the personality-oriented approach among pedagogues in Europe and North America during the twentieth century. Thus from the point of view of Kathleen Beger, '[t]he pedagogical frames of reference in the Khrushchev era <…> were only "lightly reversed versions of Stalinist originals",' in accordance with which '[c]hildren and adolescents were expected to be disciplined and to subordinate their own interests to those of the collective' [Beger 2019: 84]. Beger illustrates this with an example from a report on the first international seasons at Artek in 1956–7, in which the deputy director of Artek comments disapprovingly on the leaders of the Belgian delegation for 'kissing children and tenderly stroking the children's heads', and also on pedagogues from Yugoslavia, West Germany, Austria and Sweden for 'leaving all decisions up to the children themselves' [Ibid.: 83]. Evidently, when the methods of Artek and Orlyonok are located within the context of twentieth-century pedagogical thought, the Soviet version, in which although the leader was supposed to act in accordance with the interests of the Pioneers, (s)he was also given the task of reducing them all to a common denominator, still looks a long way from 'democracy'.

Moreover, I had the good fortune to discover a document that reflected the views on the condition of the camp in 1989 of a group of expert pedagogues, psychologists and architects from Tallinn, prepared under the leadership of Mati Heidmets, who was at that time Vice rector of the Tallinn Pedagogical Institute. The work of the group of experts was to identify any problems in the camp accommodation and to prepare recommendations 'both for the reconstruction of the camp and for the improvement of the system of educational work' [Museum of the History of Artek 1989: 1]. The experts' report pointed out the problems of 'activities organised minute by minute', which 'just exhausts the children, especially if that activity does not originate with them' [Ibid.: 117], called upon the pedagogues 'not to put a brake on the children's activity and not to turn them into puppets,' but to think of how to organise 'the possibility of a choice of activities' in the camp [Ibid.: 118]. The experts required the elimination of 'over-politicised content in events' [Ibid.] and the uniform, which was 'often too big', so that the children 'were afraid of looking silly in it' [Museum of the History of Artek 1989: 119], and also to think about the need to 'take account of the children's wishes and interests' [Ibid.: 118] when forming the troops. The need to personalise the space (providing the rooms with little personal cupboards, mirrors and plywood boards for sticking up pictures, diplomas, etc.) was indicated, alongside reducing the number of children per room, and getting rid of rooms designed so that 'they can be seen into through glass side-walls (at the Pribrezhnyy and Morskoy camps)' and of 'little

glass windows in the corridors, through which anyone passing by can look into the rooms at any time' and which 'make it look like an interrogation block' [Museum of the History of Artek 1989: 127]. In a word, the group of experts was worried by the same problems that, according to the leaders of the 1960–80s, the pedagogical techniques of the Thaw and post-Soviet period were intended to overcome. It is possible (and very probable) that the appearance of this document in 1989 indicates that at the scale of Artek, the activity of the group of pedagogues on whose experience this article is based could get lost. However, most of all it only reflects the concern experienced by anybody who reflects on the idea of educating for 'initiative' in the conditions of an 'organised' institution. This was the position of the pedagogues of the sixties, and of the experts of the eighties, and my own.

* * *

Studying the techniques of American children's camps of the interwar years, Kenny Cupers suggested that 'freedom' at the camp 'cannot be understood in opposition to discipline, since it is an element in the service of governing' [Cupers 2008: 196]. According to his conclusions, though offering children, through organised leisure in the open air, freedom from their parents, school and unpleasant elements of everyday life, the camp was at the same time 'spaces of formation, normalization and disciplining — to create well-functioning citizens or national(ist) subjects' [Ibid.: 195]. The Soviet project was imagined in very much the same way. The state order to educate 'activists' within the framework of the Pioneer camp is a good illustration of the search for new methods of control on which the policy of creating Soviet subjectivity of the Thaw and late Soviet period was based [Pinsky 2019]. The wish to breathe new life into the idea of children's autonomy favoured the search for ways of liberating the Pioneer and Komsomol organisations from the oppression of schoolteachers and the organisation of means of out-of-school education. A similar rejection of 'suffocating' and 'conservative' school education in favour of summer camps in the fresh air was effected by the progressive pedagogues of Spain and France at the beginning of the twentieth century [Downs 2002: 15–8, 32; Moreno Martínez 2009]. At the same time attempts to get away from the school 'formalism' which, according to official documents, infringed the principle of the independence of the Pioneer organisations led ideologues to another institutional space which was at first sight no less controlled: the social order of the Pioneer camps of the mid-fifties cannot be called successful in stimulating children's 'initiative', since it was dominated by a strict sanatorium regime and medical supervision. Reforms to change the status of many of them from 'health camps' to 'camps for Pioneer and Komsomol activists'

(with Artek and Orlyonok as the flagships) allowed the emergence within these institutions of a pedagogical tradition that had a great deal in common with the working principles of twentieth-century American and European children's summer camps (attention to the child's interests, mild leadership, incorporation of unofficial culture into the daily regime).

In this article, I have made an attempt to show that the child-centred tradition of Artek and Orlyonok was invented within the framework of the state order to educate for 'independence and initiative' in the strictly regimented space of the camp (which is examined here as the 'strategy of power'). The attempts by the directors, planners and leaders of the camp to relieve the tension inherent in this task generated tactics of reinterpretation and mitigation on the part of the regime, which led in the end to a definition of the mission of Artek and Orlyonok by their employees not as the education of 'young Leninists' but as 'helping them to become better and kinder in this life.' It cannot be affirmed that these principles were definitive for all the large and constantly changing staff of Artek and Orlyonok, but the leaders who worked at these camps over a long period during late Soviet times (some of whom are still working there now) do define themselves as their adherents or followers.

Embodying the Soviet utopia of the Thaw, the education of a subject that was both autonomous and committed, required the people carrying out the project, the camp leaders, to make constant efforts towards the harmonisation of official democratic ideological proclamations (about the education of free and independent people) with the existing conditions in the Pioneer camp (very similar to that place which Goffman had defined as the total institution). The contradiction between the proclaimed democratic values and the real (and often repressive) social order was very widespread within the Soviet Union, but only a few pedagogues attempted to neutralise it and thus make the Soviet utopia not a declarative, but a working model. For example, declarations about the child as an independent subject or about children's self-management were proclaimed in every Pioneer group, but in most schools the adults regarded them as formal, empty ideological slogans. By contrast, the group of leaders at Artek and Orlyonok whose experience forms the basis for this article was interested in working out a special technique, invisible to the children, which would help bring these declarations to life. Thanks to their pedagogical methods, many of the children who visited Artek and Orlyonok remember them as islands of genuine democracy, freedom and warm human relations. But a trip to one of these camps was only a brief experience, after which the children went back to their schools or went to 'ordinary' Pioneer camps where the values of children's autonomy were proclaimed, but where there were no pedagogical instruments for effecting them

(we might remember the famous passage in Elem Klimov's film, *Welcome, or No Trespassing* (*Dobro pozhalovat, ili Postoronnim vkhod vospreshchen*, 1964), where the camp director proclaims 'Children, you are the owners of the camp' while demanding strict discipline from them). To all appearances, on account of that gap, the majority of Pioneers who had experience of socialisation in other camps and schools in the Soviet Union remembered their visit to Artek or Orlyonok as an experience of 'alienation' which helped them to discover the falsity of the principle of the autonomy of the Pioneer organisation in their schools, and to notice the conservatism and inertia of their teachers' approach, and, consequently, gave them the perspective of critical thought, making them notice both the painful problems of everyday Soviet life and the insufficiently democratic character of Soviet society in general.

Abbreviations

CMO Orlyonok Archive — Archive of the Central Methodological Office of the Orlyonok All-Russian Children's Centre

RGASPI — Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History

Archival materials

Archive of the Museum of the History of Artek, f. 1, op. 1, d. 925. Report on the teaching, educational and medical work of the camp for 1979.

CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 33. Collection of methodical material on work with Pioneer and Komsomol activists, 1964–1972, vol. 2.

CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 35. Collection of methodical material on work with Pioneer and Komsomol activists, 1964–1972, vol. 4.

CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 41. Collection of methodical material on work with Pioneer and Komsomol activists, 1964–1972, vol. 10.

CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 1088. Documents from a theoretical and practical conference on the subject of 'Interaction between the Orlyonok Pioneer camp and schools throughout the country in the development of the social and heuristic activity of Pioneers and schoolchildren' held on 23–24 September 1982, vol. 2.

CMO Orlyonok Archive, f. 1, op. 1, d. 1614. Documents of the Scholarly and Practical Conference 'Concepts of Personality Development in the Modern Child, with Reference to Conditions in the All-Russian Children's Centre Orlyonok', 1995.

Museum of the History of Artek. 'Attention to Individual Characteristics of Pioneers When Working with the Pioneer Troop (from the Experiences of Pioneer Leader at Camp no. 1 A. I. Koroleva)]', Artek, 1954, no. 6. Manuscript.

Museum of the History of Artek. Heidmets M., The Psychological Environment and Problems of the Reconstruction of the Artek All-Union Pioneer Camp. (Report of the Expert Working Party). Manuscript. Tallinn, 1989, 143 pp.

RGASPI, f. M-1, op. 3, d. 413. Material attached to minutes no. 435 of a session of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Komsomol.

RGASPI, f. M-1, op. 3, d. 450. Protocol no. 455 of the meeting of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Komsomol. 1946.

RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 18. Information, proposals, notes, reports and other material on the work of the Artek All-Union Pioneer Camp, January — October 1957.

RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 77. Notes and information of the Central Party Soviet of the All-Union Pioneer Organisation and other materials about the work of the Orlyonok All-Russian Pioneer Camp.

RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 122. Notes by Sidorenko, headmaster of secondary school no. 7, Nalchik, member of the Bureau of the Regional Soviet of the Pioneer Organisation of the Kabardino-Balkarian ASSR, 'On a New Type of Pioneer Camps', December 1959.

RGASPI, f. M-2, op. 1, d. 126. Information, notes, reports and other material of the Central Soviet of the All-Union Pioneer Organisation on the work of the Artek All-Union Pioneer Camp; planning meeting for drawing up a project for building a children's sanatorium of the Artek type, January — September 1959.

RGASPI, f. M-8, op. 1, d. 448. Report on the work of the Artek All-Union Pioneer Camp for 1964.

RGASPI, f. M-9, op. 1, d. 196. Report on the work of the Orlyonok All-Union Pioneer Camp for 1969.

Sources

Arlyuk M., 'Pionerskaya zdravnitsa (Artek)' [The Sanatorium for Children (Artek)], *Pionerskaya pravda*, 19 June 1926, p. 2. (In Russian).

'Artek prazdnuet 80-letie' [Artek Celebrates Its Eightieth Anniversary], *BBC Russian*, 26 August 2005. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/russian/talking_point/newsid_4163000/4163994.stm>. (In Russian).

Bolotnikov, 'Doloy palatki!' [Away with Tents!], *Pionerskaya pravda*, 9 June 1925, p. 1. (In Russian).

'Edem v lagerya' [We're Going to the Camp], *Pionerskaya pravda*, 4 June 1926, p. 1. (In Russian).

Ivanov V. D., Formirovanie aktivnoy zhiznennoy pozitsii lichnosti starshego shkolnika v usloviyakh vremennogo komsomolskogo kollektiva [The Formation of an Active Life Position in the Personality of the Older Schoolchild under the Conditions of the Temporary Komsomol Collective]: Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences dissertation. Moscow, 1979, 249 pp. (In Russian).

Khanchin V. S. (comp.), *Direktivy i dokumenty po voprosam pionerskogo dvizheniya* [Directives and Documents Relating to the Pioneer

Organisation]. Moscow: RSFSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences Press, 1959, 307 pp. (In Russian).

Likhachev B., 'Nuzhna borba, a ne propoved' [We Need Action, Not Sermons], *Uchitelskaya gazeta*, 18 May 1967. (In Russian).

'Oni edut v "Artek"!' [They're Going to Artek!], *Pionerskaya pravda*, 22 June 1934, p. 4. (In Russian).

Ovchukov B., Kak my ozdorovlyaem detey [How We Make Children Healthy]. 1936. Manuscript held in the Museum of the History of Artek. (In Russian).

Polyukhovich D., 'Angely-khraniteli Arteka' [The Guardian Angels of Artek]', *Artekovets*, 2005. <http://artekovetc.ru/artek80angely.html/>. (In Russian).

Saltanov S., '200 luchshikh edut v Artek!' [The 200 Best Are Going to Artek!], *Pionerskaya pravda*, 12 June 1934, p. 1. (In Russian).

Shif A., Kulturnyy stil 'Arteka' [The Cultural Style of Artek]. 1936. Manuscript held in the Museum of the History of Artek. (In Russian).

'Shkola-internat — vysshiy tip uchebno-vospitatelnogo zavedeniya' [The Boarding School Is the Highest Form of Educational Institution], *Shkola-internat,* 1961, no. 1, pp. 4–9. (In Russian).

References

Albisetti J., 'Sending City Children to the Country: Vacations in "Nature" ca. 1870–1900', *Paedagogica Historica*, 2020, vol. 56, no. 1–2, pp. 70–84. doi: 10.1080/00309230.2019.1675729.

Bakker N., 'Fresh Air and Good Food: Children and the Anti-Tuberculosis Campaign in the Netherlands ca. 1900–1940', *History of Education*, 2010, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 343–61. doi: 10.1080/00467600903173386.

Beger K., 'The Artek Camp for Young Pioneers and the Many Faces of Socialist Internationalism', Pedersen S. B., Noack C. (eds.), *Tourism and Travel during the Cold War: Negotiating Tourist Experiences across the Iron Curtain*. London: Routledge, 2019, pp. 77–95. (Routledge Studies in the History of Russia and Eastern Europe). doi: 10.4324/9780429201127-5.

Bryder L., '"Wonderlands of Buttercup, Clover and Daisies": Tuberculosis and the Open-Air School Movement in Britain, 1907–39', Cooter R. (ed.), *In the Name of the Child: Health and Welfare 1880–1940.* London; New York: Routledge, 1992, pp. 72–95. (Studies in the Social History of Medicine). doi: 10.4324/9780203412237-ch-3.

Cupers K., 'Governing through Nature: Camps and Youth Movements in Interwar Germany and the United States', *Cultural Geographies,* 2008, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 173–205. doi: 10.1177/1474474007087498.

de Certeau M., *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. by S. F. Rendall. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984, XXIV+229 pp.

Dimke D., *Nezabyvaemoe budushchee. Sovetskaya pedagogicheskaya utopiya 1960-kh godov* [Unforgettable Future. Soviet Pedagogical Utopia of the 1960s]. Moscow: Common Place, 2018, 264 pp. (In Russian).

Dmitriev A., 'Serdechnoe slovo i "respublikanskiy uroven": sovetskie i ukrainskie konteksty tvorchestva Vasiliya Sukhomlinskogo' [A Heartfelt Word and the 'Republican Level': The Soviet and Ukrainian Contexts in the Works of Vasily Sukhomlynsky], Kukulin I., Mayofis M., Safronov P. (eds., comps.), *Ostrova utopii: Pedagogicheskoe i sotsialnoe proektirovanie poslevoennoy shkoly (1940–1980-e)* [Islands of Utopia. Pedagogical and Social Design of the Postwar School: 1940–80s]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2015, pp. 317–59 (In Russian).

Downs L. L., *Childhood in the Promised Land: Working-Class Movements and the Colonies de Vacances in France, 1880–1960*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002, XV+411 pp. doi: 10.1215/9780822383963.

Fallace T. D., *In the Shadow of Authoritarianism: American Education in the Twentieth Century*. New York, NY; London: Teachers College Press, 2018, VII+215 pp.

Goffman E., *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961, XIV+386 pp.

Gold K. M., 'From Vacation to Summer School: The Transformation of Summer Education in New York City, 1894–1915', *History of Education Quarterly*, 2002, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 18–49. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-5959.2002.tb00099.x.

Kaspe I., *V soyuze s utopiey. Smyslovye rubezhi pozdnesovetskoy kultury* [In Alliance with Utopia. Semantic Frontiers of the Late Soviet Culture]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018, 431 pp. (In Russian).

Kharkhordin O., *Oblichat i litsemerit: genealogiya rossiyskoy lichnosti* [Reveal and Dissimulate: A Genealogy of Private Life in Soviet Russia]. St Petersburg; Moscow: European University at St Petersburg Press; Letniy Sad, 2002, 511 pp. (In Russian).

Khelbek Y. [=Hellbeck J.], 'Intervyu s Igalom Khalfinym i Yokhanom Khellbekom (perevod M. Mogilner)' [Interviews with Igal Halfin and Jochen Hellbeck (Translated by M. Mogilner)], *Ab Imperio,* 2002, no. 3, pp. 217–60. doi: 10.1353/imp.2002.0016. (In Russian).

Khuper S. [=Hooper S.], '"Novomu sovetskomu cheloveku" sluchaetsya oshibatsya: vmesto geroicheskikh figur — obyknovennye grazhdane, neuverenno ishchushchie schastye' ['New Soviet Man' Sometimes Does Mistake: Ordinary Citizens Uncertainly Looking for Happiness instead of Heroic Figures], Pinsky A. (ed.), *Posle Stalina: Pozdnesovetskaya subyektivnost (1953–1985): Sbornik statey* [After Stalin: The Late Soviet Personality (1953–85): A Collection of Essays]. St Petersburg: European University at St Petersburg Press, 2018, pp. 39–74. (In Russian).

Kotkin S., *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as Civilization*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995, XXV+639 pp.

Kozlov D., 'Neofitsialnye gruppy sovetskikh shkolnikov 1940–1960-kh godov: tipologiya, ideologiya, praktiki' [Unofficial Groups of Soviet Schoolchildren from 1940–60s: Typology, Ideology, Practices], Kukulin I., Mayofis M., Safronov P. (eds., comps.), *Ostrova utopii: Pedagogicheskoe i sotsialnoe proektirovanie poslevoennoy shkoly*

(1940–1980-e) [Islands of Utopia. Pedagogical and Social Design of the Postwar School: 1940–80s]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2015, pp. 451–94. (In Russian).

Kravchenko A., 'Vozhatyy v pionerskikh zhurnalakh 1920–1930-kh godov: ideologicheskiy kontsept i khudozhestvennaya reprezentatsiya' ['Vozhatyi' in Soviet Magazines for Pioneers in the 1920–1930s: Ideological Concept and Representation in Art], *Shagi/Steps*, 2015, no. 1, pp. 46–73. doi: 10.22394/2412-9410-2015-1-1-46-73. (In Russian).

Krylova A., 'The Tenacious Liberal Subject in Soviet Studies', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 2000, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 119–46. doi: 10.1353/kri.2008.0092.

Krylova A., 'Imagining Socialism in the Soviet Century', *Social History,* 2017, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 315–41. doi: 10.1080/03071022.2017.1327640.

Kukulin I., Mayofis M., Safronov P. (eds., comps.), *Ostrova utopii: Pedagogicheskoe i sotsialnoe proektirovanie poslevoennoy shkoly (1940–1980-e)* [Islands of Utopia. Pedagogical and Social Design of the Postwar School: 1940–80s]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2015, 715 pp. (In Russian).

Kupriyanov B., 'Kommunarskaya legenda "Orlenka"' [The Story of Non-Totalitarian Education in the Summer Camp 'Orlenok'], *Sibirskiy pedagogicheskiy zhurnal*, 2018, no. 4, pp. 13–21. doi: 10.15293/1813-4718.1804.02. (In Russian).

Maslinsky K., 'The Spectre of Paedocracy in the Puppet Theatre: On School Self-Management and the Limits of Children's Agency in the First Years of Soviet Rule', *Forum for Anthropology and Culture*, 2020, no. 16, pp. 139–61.

Mayofis M., 'Predvestiya "ottepeli" v sovetskoy shkolnoy politike pozdnestalinskogo vremeni' [Portents of the Khrushchev Thaw in the Soviet School Policy of the Late-Stalin Period], Kukulin I., Mayofis M., Safronov P. (eds., comps.), *Ostrova utopii: Pedagogicheskoe i sotsialnoe proektirovanie poslevoennoy shkoly (1940–1980-e)* [Islands of Utopia. Pedagogical and Social Design of the Postwar School: 1940–80s]. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2015, pp. 35–106. (In Russian).

Mayofis M., 'Pansiony trudovykh rezervov: formirovanie sistemy shkol-internatov v 1954–1964 godakh' [Boarding Houses of Standby Labor: The Formation of the Boarding School System in 1954–64], *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie*, 2016, no. 6 (142), pp. 292–324. (In Russian).

Mechling J., 'Children in Scouting and Other Organizations', Fass P. S. (ed.), *The Routledge History of Childhood in the Western World*. London: Routledge, 2013, pp. 419–33. (Routledge Histories).

Millei Z., Imre R., 'Rethinking Transition through Ideas of "Community" in Hungarian Kindergarten Curriculum', Silova I. (ed.), *Post-Socialism Is Not Dead: (Re)Reading the Global in Comparative Education*. Bingley, UK: Emerald, 2010, pp. 125–54. (International Perspectives on Education and Society, 14). doi: 10.1108/S1479-3679(2010)0000014008.

Moreno Martínez P. L., 'De la Caridad y la Filantropía a la Protección Social del Estado: las Colonias Escolares de Vacaciones en España (1887–1936)', *Historia de la Educación*, 2009, no. 28, pp. 135–59.

Paris L., *Children's Nature: The Rise of the American Summer Camp*. New York: New York University Press, 2008, XI+364 pp. (American History and Culture (New York University Press)).

Pinsky A., 'Subjectivity after Stalin: Guest Editor's Introduction', *Russian Studies in History*, 2019, vol. 58, no. 2–3, pp. 79–88. doi: 10.1080/10611983.2019.1727714.

Senkina A., Uchenik kak avtor uchebnika: iz istorii sovetskikh pedagogicheskikh eksperimentov 1920-kh — nachala 1930-kh gg. [A Student as the Author of a Textbook: From the History of Soviet Pedagogical Experiments of the 1920s — Early 1930s]: Paper presented at the interdisciplinary seminar '"Through Children's Eyes": The Subjectivity of the Child in Social Research and the Public Sphere'. European University at St Petersburg, St Petersburg, 21 December 2018. (In Russian).

Vanobbergen B., Vansieleghem N., 'Repairing the Body, Restoring the Soul: The Sea Hospital of the City of Paris in Berck-sur-Mer and the French War on Tuberculosis', *Paedagogica Historica,* 2010, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 325–40. doi: 10.1080/00309230903109206.

Volkov V., 'Kontseptsiya kulturnosti, 1935–1938 gody: sovetskaya tsivilizatsiya i povsednevnost stalinskogo vremeni' [The Concept of 'kulturnost', 1935–8: Soviet Civilisation and the Everyday Life in Stalin's Time], *Sotsiologicheskiy zhurnal*, 1996, no. 1–2, pp. 194–213. (In Russian).

Wall S., *The Nurture of Nature: Childhood, Antimodernism, and Ontario Summer Camps, 1920–55*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 2009, XX+369 pp. (Nature, History, Society).

Yurchak A., *Everything Was Forever, until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006, X+331 pp. (In-Formation Series).

Informants

AAN — f, b. 1967, Gurzuf settlement, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1989–91

BZS — f, b. 1962, Gurzuf settlement, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1980–3

FLP — m, b. 1956, Gurzuf settlement, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1978–82

IVD — m, b. 1949, Gurzuf settlement, head of a Pioneer company at Orlyonok, 1989–91

KhTL — f, b. 1960, Novomikhaylovsky settlement, Pioneer leader at Orlyonok, 1980–2

KLA — f, b. 1950, Novomikhaylovsky settlement, Pioneer leader at Orlyonok, 1970–3

MAA — m, b. 1956, Gurzuf settlement, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1982–4

PNA — m, b. 1953, Gurzuf settlement, head of a Pioneer company at Artek, late 1970s — early 1980s

VAN — f, b. 1948, Gurzuf settlement, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1972–4

VZ — f, b. 1958, Chelyabinsk, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1978–87

ZEG — f, b. 1952, Gurzuf settlement, Pioneer leader at Artek, 1975–80

ZOB — f, b. 1960, Novomikhailovka settlement, Pioneer leader at Orlyonok, 1983–4

Translated by Ralph Cleminson