

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Managing Editor of the *SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW* (American Series) regrets to announce the death, in line of duty, of Mr. Harold R. Weinstein, Harvard 1927, the author of a well-documented article on "Language and Education in the Soviet Ukraine," which appeared in our first American issue. Mr. Weinstein left his teaching post at Brooklyn College to enter the service of the U. S. War Shipping Board, and met his death in an air attack on the convoy with which he was proceeding to Archangel in May, 1942. Mr. Weinstein was a promising student of minorities in the U.S.S.R.

The Managing Editor of the *SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW* (American Series) regrets to announce the unexpected death, on January 18, 1943, of Professor Samuel Northrup Harper, of the University of Chicago. Professor Harper's distinguished services on behalf of Slavic studies, and particularly in the dissemination, throughout the United States, of a sympathetic knowledge of the Russian people, their institutions, and their language, are familiar to every scholar in the field, both in this country and abroad. An appreciation of Professor Harper by Sir Bernard Pares is printed below.

PROFESSOR SAMUEL NORTHRUP HARPER

I write under the first but indelible impression of the loss of an essential piece out of my own life. It is ill that, at this moment of all others, American scholarship can spare the work of Samuel N. Harper, but he goes at a time when that work has received its most solid justification.

President Harper, builder of Chicago University, must have been a man of very rare insight. Going to Russia with Mr. Charles R. Crane well before that country had caught the limelight, he decided that here was the best field for his son's scholarly labors, and in his last illness he wrote to Samuel that the one thing he wanted was that

they should continue without interruption. From his Mother, a lady of great character and judgment, he always received the same active encouragement, and they lived together till her death not long ago.

Harper began his special Russian apprenticeship at Maxim Kovalevski's Higher School in Paris. He was early the American adapter of the substantial *Russian Reader* of Boyer and Speransky, and this, like all that came from him, was a sound piece of work. He got a short taste of the mother university of Russia, that of Moscow, and, like myself, came straight in 1906 to the first Russian Duma of which we attended practically all the sittings. We were students of history, not newspaper correspondents, and I suggested that we should live and work together for a week. This close partnership, in one form or another, continued up to now. I have received several invaluable letters from him since I came over here this time, and next Sunday we were to have played a duet on the Chicago radio.

We worked out a curious procedure of our own. Together we approached everyone who seemed to be taking an important part in the public life of that stirring time, not as interviewers but as students of history. This appealed to Russians, and they told us without reserve what they stood for and what part they had played. Milyukov, I remember, gave us ten sittings. We were really capturing their memoirs before they were written, with the great advantage of cross-examining the future writers, which was never resented. We were both rigorously non-party, we kept all their confidences, and I am sure they spoke to us with a freedom which they could hardly have used with those who were participators in their battle. We even received cards from the most various leaders to tell their friends that we could be trusted. Every conversation we copied out in précis before we went to bed, each of us serving as recorder of the other's work. In the more important cases we made our visits together, so that we could correct each other's impressions. When we wrote, we claimed to speak only on our own authority. As may be imagined, by the time we met say, the fifth participant in an important conference, it was possible to suggest corrections which were accepted. Maurice Baring of England and Harold Williams of New Zealand also worked closely with us, and there were occasions of crisis when we invited the regular correspondents for a pooling of our common knowledge.

Harper and I also travelled extensively together in the country.

We were always happiest when we had turned our backs on the swamp of St. Petersburg and were voyaging casually through some county by cart with our queer luggage, seeing everyone in it who could have any interest for us — squire, priest, doctor, school-mistress, or peasant elders. Apart from his fresh and boyish enjoyment of all the things we saw and all the people we met, he was in every way the ideal travelling companion and the most practical of partners. At Saratov on the Lower Volga I had reason to think I was in for the endemic cholera — it was really my first attack of appendicitis. Harper found a doctor, and his travelling medicine chest did the rest.

We shared plenty of amusing experiences. There was the time when Milyukov brought us the secret political record of the professional associations, which were the first Trade Unions in Russia: we put off all other work till the expected moment when we were called upon to give it back at once. Harper was particularly strong in the preservation of records, and after the forcible dissolution of the Second Duma we put on our best clothes and as “historical investigators” visited in turn the various party-headquarters to take over what might otherwise have been destroyed before the inevitable visit of the police. Together we studied on the spot the anti-Jewish pogroms and the agrarian riots and beginnings of independent self-government in the chaos of 1905. Sometimes, in our objective evening recordings, we stopped to smile at the fantastic experiences through which, as observers, we could not help passing. Anyhow, our school for the understanding of Russia was life itself.

For a time, Harper came and worked with me in Liverpool University during the period of its exceptional bloom, the days of John Macdonald Mackay, Charles Sherrington, Kuno Meyer, Oliver Elton and Charles Reilly — all great builders in their prime. “Harper carries guns” was what one of them said of him. He was lecturer in Russian legal and institutional history. Later, he returned to Chicago as professor of Russian language and institutions. He built up a sound department with the highest standard of thoroughness and accuracy. He never himself attempted anything which he could not do really well. Of the language, though he was not a philologist, he had a complete knowledge, and spoke Russian with the same ease as English. He did not travel far into Russian literature; that he left to others. In the institutions he was entirely at home; of Russian economics

his knowledge was more than competent; his understanding of Russian history and of the Russian people was exceptional. In all his many activities — for his advice was constantly sought — he was the true and faithful servant of two great peoples, the Russian and his own. He may be said to have signally realized the ideal best defined by another American scholar, Professor Theodore Collyer, of “bringing a remote and unknown subject under the best standards worked out for the known ones.” All his work will last, and his students could not fail to be scholars. He was not a copious writer. His sketch of the second Russian electoral law (of 1907) was a complete monograph. He also analyzed the all too extensive system of “exceptional laws” which superseded the practice of the Statute Book. Later, his *Civic Training in Soviet Russia*, though a little overloaded, is a standard work. His *Making Bolsheviks* is lighter and more suggestive.

Ordinarily Harper was very cautious; and this was all the wiser in view of the bewildering changes through which the Russia of our time was passing. Nearly all the chief figures of Russian politics disappeared from public life with the Revolution, and Harper rendered a genuine public service by his continued visits to the country and his patient and thorough investigations of the new regime and its working. It was these that enabled him to sense so well in advance those developments which to less-equipped students have come as a surprise — in particular the reversion to a healthy patriotism with the defeat of Trotsky by Stalin and the magnificent resistance of the Red Army in the last 18 months. Harper could see these things coming because, while always maintaining his freedom from parties and prejudices, he was a devoted but intelligent friend of the Russian people.

Harper was from the first a contributing editor of this REVIEW, then published in London. It was that teacher of teachers, Professor Archibald Cary Coolidge, who designated him for this role.

BERNARD PARES

Montreal,
January 24, 1943.

