

November 27th, 1935

Mr. John M. Hazard,
c/o American Consulate,
Moscow, U.S.S.R.

Dear John:

At Harvard I was told of an Alfred E. Hudson, who is, or has been, at the Institute of Anthropology and Ethnology of the Academy of Science, Leningrad. In any event he is in Russia - possibly in Moscow - perhaps he would be worth your locating.

My experiences with Ware turned out to be rather amusing. He was a good deal of a conundrum. Then I found that Professor Counts and his secretary (Russian) had had Ware to lunch and had found him very disappointing. Then Ware came in to see me again full of enthusiasm and announcing that he was returning to Moscow. I rather timidly asked where he got the money. His face lighted up as he replied: "Oh, my grandmother died and left me some money!"

Enclosed is copy of the paragraph in your #50 as I altered it for distribution. The sentence quoting Lenin seemed to me to be thrown in and to confuse the flow of ideas. I put in the word "once" as a means of avoiding any implication one way or another as to what Lenin, were he alive, might think of possibilities in England and the United States now. And I think the use of parentheses helps in furthering the ideas underlying the paragraph. It is none too clear yet, especially at a casual reading, that you were giving the views of others.

Professor Harper is in town. This noon he is lunching with Consul General Arens. Monday evening Harper addressed a meeting at Princeton University. He and I are to discuss several people recommended to the Institute. One of them is Wayne Bannister of the Harvard Law School. Recently he spent most of an evening with me. His life-long ambition has been to practice law and to enter politics. Now he has an urge to spend a year or two in Russia before doing so. This urge seems to be a reaction to his father's ultra conservatism. His father is one of Hoover's personal friends and admirers! So far as I make out Bannister does not take his "urge" very seriously. He promised to come in to see me again soon.

Can you give me any information about the Marx-Engel-Lenin Institute. Would it be a good place for an advanced American student in philosophy to study for a couple of years?

I have a new job! However it involves only about a week's work. I am serving as chairman of the New York State Committee for the Selection of Rhodes Scholars.

Cordial greetings,

(over)

JNH..WSR...

November 27th, 1935. - #2.

P.S.1 Especially happy to know that your ~~mastering~~ of the language
steadily increases.

P.S.2 The letters are great.

Moscow, USSR.,
November 28, 1935.

Dear Mr. Rogers:

re-The Stakhanov Movement

Are you using Stakhanov methods? Have you **Stakhanovites** in your office? These are the questions of the day. The movement has caught the public imagination and the founder is to the Union what Lindberg was to the States.

Your papers must have given you the basic facts. On August 30th Stakhanov, a miner in the Donetz basin coal mining region achieved a new record in the amount of coal mined in a day. Were this just a slight push above the usual daily output, it would not have been unusually noteworthy, but it was far more than that. It represented a twenty-fold increase in the daily average. Rationalization of work, so as to make the best use of time and tools made possible ^{the} feat. The press was not slow to hold it up to the country as a new goal to shoot at. People in every industry on every farm were told to reorganize their work and try and see what they could do. Thus was coined a new term, Stakhanovite, for those who raised their production out of all proportion to the norm. Under an already established system of graduated premiums for work done in excess of the daily and monthly norm every increase in production means more than a proportional increase in pay. Under this new plan a Stakhanovite raised his wages from an average of 200 Rubles a month to **2,000 Rubles a day**. Needless to say such heroes are still the exception.

But underlying the facts is a deeper meaning. Those who have dealt with Russians can catch it at once. My letters have often been filled with stories telling of the maddening sluggishness of the natives. It takes an unusual occasion to get things to happen. The great holidays of the "October" and May First replace Christmas and Easter, but they are turned to the same old purposes of getting things cleaned up before and after the winter. When spurred on by an ever approaching deadline the workman gets things done, and no one understands this better than the Government. Now comes a new chance to put the hustle-burr under the harness, and it is not overlooked. It provides a handy popular appeal for a program already begun.

Realizing last spring that industry and the production of tools had outstripped the process of training people to use them, the Chief made his now historic speech to the cadets graduating from the Red Army Academy. His three words, "Cadres solve everything", have become the key slogan of the campaign. From then on the emphasis has been

placed upon the developing of a trained personnel. With the Stakhanov movement begins the drive to start these newly trained workers towards an application of their new technique in practice. By so doing, as the Chief points out in his November 21st speech, the workers can make of "socialist competition" an even more effective tool to raise production and thus improve living conditions.

People wonder what socialist competition is. It might be defined as that competition between individual workers and individual factories to surpass their fellows; not to bring glory upon themselves individually but to start a game which will make more concrete the struggle to raise production which means better conditions for the mass. It is said to be, in short, not competition to benefit oneself, but competition to benefit the team, by making everybody else work to keep up and in so doing raise the general average. The method used to make it concrete and understandable to all is not unfamiliar. Premiums are paid for production in excess of the planned norm. The resulting inequality of wages is explained by saying that to pay the loafer and the man working for his country the same amount would not be real equality. The task of the communist state to be is not to pull the technical worker and engineer down to the level of the unskilled laborer, but rather to raise the laborer to the level of the engineer. But only by increasing production all along the line can this be achieved. Along with this premium system of raising production goes education as to the needs of the country and duty of every worker to do his share. This educational campaign is having much greater effect than critics would like to believe.

The raising of the worker to the level of the engineer is pointed out as no longer a dream. Stakhanov and others have showed that workers can earn more than an engineer, and every one knows they had no special training. They merely organized their work, learned how to use the tools assigned to them, and quit loafing. Proof that any one else can do the same is forthcoming in telegrams from all parts of the country--a miner not long ago broke the world's record by mining 778 tons in a six hour shift (with the help of a gang of donkey boys to haul it away); and today comes news that another miner pushed the record to 991 tons.

Some people think the workers increase production with their eyes glued to the pay envelope. To be sure it is far from an unimportant factor, but although it may be hard to believe, the educational campaign has such effect that they are thinking also in terms of what it means for their country. A few moments ago the boy in my house came in rejoicing with the news of the new record. My students do likewise. There is a thrill in good performance which we all know, and it is this which is at last being developed.

Bringing the general explanation nearer home to my students, I daily hear short talks and see announcements of longer speeches telling how a Stakhanovite works in a law school. But students are not forgetting their sense of humor and when we gather for an evening sausage, cheese, vodka party the best drinkers are promptly branded as using Stakhanovite methods, or by a neat play on Russian words are called Stakanovites (drinking glass heroes) which I might add is not an inappropriate term for several of them. A Stakhanovite can dance the night around and wait for the trolleys to start running again at 5.30 in the morning. Those who stop at more decent hours are failing to live up to the spirit of the day.

To be sure the movement is in its infancy, but with the pressure behind it and the popular voluntary enthusiasm of the people it looks as if it were destined to go far.

Greetings to you all,

JNH

P.S. Today has been Thanksgiving Day. By chance the usual lecture from 1 to 3 was postponed, giving me an opportunity to join the Americans at a country dacha for skating and Thanksgiving buffet. Aching legs are souvenirs of a good time.

Moscow, USSR.,
December 10, 1935.

Dear Mr. Rogers;

The Bar Exams.were terrifying,but at least they were in English.Feeling much like a man trying to run with a crutch,I sat down for my first two-hour paper at the Institute. Topics had been distributed a week before, which gave me a breathing spell in which to try and cram permanently into my head the Russian equivalents of escheat, bequest, testator, devisee, etc. which would be prerequisites for my subject, "Inheritance by intestacy and by will under Soviet law."

The gloomy "first day" morning came along, and I sat down with my two dictionaries for what I will long recall as one of the harrowing experiences of the year. The law itself is so complicated, especially in view of its various historical stages that I thought it wiser to budget my time so as to spend most of it on the law itself. I left for a shorter introduction of an explanation of the Marxian interpretation of bourgeois inheritance laws.

A week later I was to find out my mistake. Leaving my paper for the last, our young seminar instructor called out Tovarish Hazard, as a hush dropped over my twenty-three classmates. They were getting their first inkling of whether I had picked up anything. Few people would have taken such pains as this young man for^{me} had written out a critique, explaining that although my exposition of Soviet inheritance laws and their history had been correct, I had erred in not more fully explaining the connection between the law of inheritance and private property; in not doing more than stating that inheritance laws would not exist under communism; in not enlarging upon bourgeois laws of inheritance and how they were altered after the war in view of the financial difficulties into which bourgeois states were thrown; in not explaining why bourgeois states keep increasing inheritance taxes when on the surface such a procedure would seem to be opposed to the best selfish interests of the capitalist barons; in not explaining that Saint Simon in criticizing inheritance laws was doing so as a socialist and not as a writer from the ranks of the bourgeoisie.

Out of our group of twenty-three which includes eight girls, those asked to read their papers as examples of the best work were three girls who in some amazing manner had covered everything in the book and out of it. Howls went up from the boys that the girls had not written on the question, but it was explained that the more you write the better, even

if it goes beyond the requirements of the subject. In that simple sentence is hidden a great deal of the difference between the Slav and the Anglo-Saxon. We spent three years at Harvard learning to write only on the point in as few words as possible. The goal held out to students in our class was quite the reverse. No doubt I have not been driven so far that I cannot catch the new cue, at least for the present purposes.

I could imagine what laughs the instructor must have had when he read my Russian. Memories of chuckles over foreigners' halting steps in English are fresh in my mind. He admitted shyly to a few smiles, but when my language teacher corrected the paper, she could not contain herself. Spelling and failure to choose correctly the required aspect of the verb were the chief stumbling blocks. I see that there is still a very long row to hoe.

While on the subject of the Law Institute it has occurred to me that you may be interested in a few figures as to social origin and nationality of our students and other figures on their party affiliations. The figures are those of last year's student body, but they vary little from year to year.

Social Origin: Student body (1934-35)--515 persons

From families of workers	59.1%	(304 students)
" " " individual		
peasants	15.5%	(80 students)
" " " office workers		
(whitecollarites)	25.4%	(131 students)

Party Affiliations

Members of the Communist Party	50.7%	(261 students)
" " " Com. Party Youth		
(Komsomols)	37.7%	(194 students)
Non-Party Members	11.6%	(60 students)

Nationality

Great Russians	57.7%	(395 students)
Jews	22.8	(156 students)
Ukrainians	04.5 *	(31 students)
White Russians	02.4	(17 students)
Armenians	01.6	(11 students)
Georgians	00.4	(3 students)
Assitines (Caucasus)	03.1	(21 students)
Uzbeks	00.6	(4 students)
Tadjiks	00.4	(3 students)
Tartars	00.6	(4 students)
Poles (soviet citizens)	00.3	(2 students)

*It should be stated that there are Law Institutes in the Ukraine, Georgia, White Russia, and Armenia, each teaching in the native language of the area. The Moscow Institute only takes key students.

(nationality-continued)

Turkmens	00.2%	(1 student)
Bashkirs	00.3	(2 students)
Esthonian(Soviet citizen)	00.2	(1 student)
Koretsi	01.3	(9 students)
Miscellaneous tribes	<u>03.6</u>	<u>(24 students)</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>684</u>

You will note a large discrepancy between the figures in the first two tables and in the nationality list. The first two tables are published in the organ of the State Prosecutor and are thus of an official nature. The nationality figures are those from the wall newspaper published during the middle of last year. The difference may be that spring examinations weeded out the balance and reduced the total to the official figure. This hardly seems possible, but other explanations do not come to mind, nor are they offered.

Official figures for the faculty are: Total faculty-35.

Professors	18 persons	51.4%
Assistants(Dotsents)	17 "	48.6
Members Com.Party	15 "	42.9
" Com.Part.Youth	1 "	2.
Non-Party Members	19 "	54.3
Having other work besides teaching	26 "	74.3
Not having other work besides teaching	9 "	25.7

The figures will serve to explode some myths which are floating about the world. They will point out the importance of affiliations.

May this letter bring you greetings and best wishes for a Merry Christmas.

JNH

December 10, 1935

I was delighted to receive your No.15 of November 27th. I wish you would write more often. I like to keep up with all that is going on.

First of all my congratulations on your appointment as Chairman of the New York State Rhodes Scholarship Commission. A cousin of mine used to serve on the Rhode Island Committee, but when they changed the system of selection I believe R.I. lost its vote. I know what exacting work it is and also how difficult it is to size up men on such short acquaintanceship. You may in the course of the interviewing run across some likely candidates for other work.

I heartily concur in your rearrangement of my No.50. It reads much better in its new form, and makes better sense. Please feel free to do the same at any time to other letters. I write them pretty quickly and send them off before I have time to think over their composition adequately. If I kept them around, they would lose their timely character.

I shall try and look up Hudson, but at the present time I have heard nothing of him, and I do feel that I keep in pretty close contact with people going through who are digging deeper than the tourist.

Wayne Bannister was at Harvard when I was, and he happened to be in the same Moot Court arguing club, the Scott Club, of which you may have heard. I was always impressed by his industry and his ability to work long hours without weakening. That is one of the reasons we had him in the Club--a sort of exploitation I am now moved to admit. At that time he came to us from a small Colorado school and when faced with the worldly-wise Princeton and Yale boys, he was a bit taken aback. As a result we all felt at the time that he lacked confidence and was inclined ever so little towards intolerance, which is ~~not~~ a helpful attribute in a world which is never very near the upright approach to life. In spite of it we felt that he would make good, and he worked with us for one year. You are now in a position to judge how he has matured. My estimate of him can be nothing more than reminiscing. I feel sure, however, that he cannot have lost his industriousness.

I shall look up information on the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute. My language teacher is one of their advanced students in dialectics. Language barriers would be the largest single hurdle I should think. As to its standing, there is nothing better for Marxian theory in the country.

May I again ask for a book--this time for a manual on how to dance the fox-trot, tango, etc., as done in the USA. Our Dancing Class at the Institute wants one, and I can help a great deal by providing it. I hope Ben is resourceful in hunting one. I am anxious for it the soonest possible.

(over)

I had dinner with Henry Ware the other night. He seems much pepped up since his trip home. You are correct in finding him somewhat of a conundrum, although time lessens the impression of such an enigmatic state. He brought me good news of you and said you seemed to be in good spirits and health, which is reassuring.

Do write me again, this time with criticism of the letters and advice here and there.

J. W.

May I make an apparently queer request. A friend who has done a great deal for me is making a collection of childrens fables for use in teaching English in the schools. Aesop is already well-known, and other things must be found. Could you send me The Three Little Pigs, Uncle Remus Stories, Peter Rabbit (any of set), and if you have ideas of your own on the subject anything else. The story must have a moral of a character in keeping with the program over here.

When I got your cable about the rr. expenses of the Prof., I almost guessed you had been Chicago. The date line belied the idea. I can see objections as one always can if he looks far enough. If those wiser than I council against it, their opinion had better be followed. My personal relations are of such a friendly nature that it would be perfectly understood between us--but I do not know how other reactions would be.

Sorry to bother you for the labor case book. I need it in my course in Labor Law, for I know very little about our own law, and am constantly being asked.

Moscow, USSR.,
December 16, 1935.

Dear Mr. Rogers;

In your No.15 you ask me for information about the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute as a place for an advanced student in philosophy.

The M-E-L. Institute is not a training school for philosophers. It is primarily a reservoir of all documents and books dealing with the writings, lives, and effect of these three men. It is credited with having the richest library in the world on these subjects, and as such it offers the foremost place in the Union for research work in the field covered by these men. It has no courses of lectures or regular seminars. There are discussion groups which meet occasionally in the evening composed of Professors and research students, but these groups are not arranged according to a plan, nor is a certificate or diploma given.

The Communist Academy also offers the facility of a reputedly excellent library. It is here that a student from the University of California has been doing research for two years, having made arrangements with a Professor to discuss the material with him at intervals. Party membership is a convenience in this latter place, although I hear that it is not a prerequisite for admission.

The study of philosophy in a regular manner is provided by the Istoriko Filosofsky Institut (Institute of the History of Philosophy) which offers a four year course to beginners taking them from the regular middle schools. Thus the first years are the same as in the Law Institute in that they are devoted to cultural and class educational subjects. The last two years are devoted to a study of philosophy in all its phases. I am told that the work in this institute exactly parallels the method in my own, with which you are by now pretty much familiar.

In any work in this field, I need scarcely add that the Russian language is essential. Advanced students in any field are sometimes unable to accustom themselves to the terrific chore presented when one attempts to learn the language after childhood. I suggest that any candidate for the task read that part of my Report which deals with the study of the language.

You asked last summer for information on what is being done in the realm of Arabic culture. Perhaps you will be interested in my findings.

Leningrad and Moscow each have an Institut Vostokovedeniya (Institute of Oriental Studies) in which there is a department given over to Arabic language, culture, political importance, and relations with the Soviet Union. These Institutes train students for the Foreign service whether it be Diplomatic or Trade and the emphasis is on developing a person fully trained in the field in which he is to work. Thus there are lectures and libraries. The Moscow Institute is said to have the better physical equipment although the personnel of the Arabic Section is said to be better at the Leningrad Institute.

In addition to these two Institutes there is the Meshdunarodny Agrarny Institut (International Agrarian Institute) which has an Arabic section. A student in my Institute who comes from a sphere of Persian culture tells me that this Institute provides excellent contact with Arabic culture. It is, of course, primarily interested in agrarian problems.

If one comes to Moscow to visit these institutes, he should bring a letter of introduction to the All-Union Society for Cultural Relations with Foreigners (VOKS). Such a letter might come from Professor Harper or Boris Skvirsky. I cannot overemphasize the importance of a letter, for even after I had been up there off and on and gotten permission from them to study at my Institute, they said that I ought to bring with me the next time a letter of introduction, since they had nothing for their files, my first introduction having been oral. As such seemed to be going pretty far, I have not yet acquired such a letter, although I may do so if I come across Prof. Harper some time and remember it.

Recently I met here in Moscow the representative of the Soviet-American Investment Co. of New York, a Mr. Sharover. You may remember him at Chicago's conference last summer. I have enjoyed talking with him, and on his expression of a willingness to report my health to you I gave him your address. He is now on the way back to N.Y.. My contacts with him have been very pleasant, but I feel obligated to pass on to you the comments of others who see in him primarily a high pressure Wall Street bond salesman. There is a possibility that he thinks he has found an Institutional investor. With this in mind you will be fully informed, although I personally have never seen evidence of this trait and like him for his clear understanding of what is going on and his knowledge of

the historical background. He is also a great story teller which always livens any evening tea drinking. Have I given you both the credit and debit side?

A new idea has come into my head in connection with our interest in the Professor. I agree that to handle any direct communications might not be convenient. But what do you think of this? Since I should rather enjoy if possible attending the lectures in Paris for which the Prof's invitation was issued, you might think it possible to write to that Institute, explain that I would like to attend; that I understand that funds are needed by the Professor for RR fare and expenses, and that Incwa would consider making a grant of \$200.00 to cover these expenses and to be transferred to the Professor for his use, after deducting such sum as may be necessary to pay my tuition charges for the lectures in question. The person with whom the Prof. has carried on his correspondence is M. Alexandre Alvarez, Institute Des Hautes Etudes Internationales, 12 Place du Pantheon, Paris. He no doubt would be the person best informed on the whole affair. The lectures carry a stipend of some \$80.00 which will do little more than cover hotel expenses in Paris.

May I ask you to give special consideration to this plan, for I am so deeply indebted, that I am anxious that something be done. I am enough ahead so that you could send my January check to them if it is a question of allotting the funds. As to principle, I think this method obviates all of our troubles. Time is getting short, and so I do hope that a decision can be made within a very short period.

All good wishes,

JNH

P.S. I enclose a snapshot of our house, My window is on the right side of the door as you look at the picture. The Embassy is in the background. Also a shot of the family, reading from l. to r. -- cook, landlady, friend, and another friend with the dog (Alma) in front.



December 19, 1935

MSR - JWH

Dear John:

I have your letter No. 53 and your cablegram referring to your No. 54.

Professors Harper and Robinson are urging on Consul-general Arens the need for some special arrangement with regard to exchange being made for the benefit of students. No special favors are being sought but the idea is advanced that it would be desirable all around if it were possible for a student to live in Soviet Russia for about what it would cost ~~for~~ him to live at a first-rate American college. Just what will happen of course is not known here. In any event I am certain of the desirability of your continuing as you are at least through the present academic year. If it turns out that you will need additional funds just let me know the amount. Certainly the family you are with should not be permitted to suffer any loss owing to your presence.

Ben has sent a dictionary and a flock of children's books.

I enjoyed my work as chairman of the New York State Committee of Selection for Rhodes Scholars. There were forty-one applicants who required serious consideration. The Committee recommended two. A few days later one of them was approved by the district committee. Personally, I think they chose the wrong one. Seemingly what really happens is that as result of consideration by a series of committees appointments go to high-grade respectable mediocrities. The exceptional person - exceptional in mental power and personality - seems destined to be passed by, not as being dangerous necessarily but as being an odd fish not likely to fit into the Oxford milieu.

Season's greetings and best of luck to you.

Moscow, USSR.,
December 24, 1935.

Dear Mr. Rogers;

A wedding is a gay occasion in any land-- the more so when they are few and far between. I was driven off last week to be a witness at the marriage of one of my friends to another American. Although the law provides that a marriage need not be registered to be legal, there are those who prefer having a certificate; thus complying with their own and the government's interest in recording as a means of ensuring accuracy of records and avoiding later confusion and disputes.

A far different setting today's registration bureaus (ZAGS) present from that of five years ago. Then I found a bare dark room on the second floor of the Central Militia Building. Getting registered then was about as eventful as was the getting of my bicycle license this year in a quite similar room. But now each district has its own ZAGS; ours occupying an attractive suite of rooms done in the Victorian manner with potted rubber trees and massive grey betassled portiers.

Pushing through the room where they record deaths and divorces into the recording office for marriages and births, we found ourselves being greeted as curious tourists out to see how they do it in Soviet Russia. It took no little persuasion to convince the clerk that two of our number really wanted to be registered, and even then her curiosity prompted her to ask why foreigners should want to do such a thing.

Procedure follows familiar lines--reading of passports, residence permits, and certificates from the respective house committees that the applicants reside under their jurisdiction. Both were asked whether they had married before, and the bride whether she wished to retain her maiden name. Then the great rubber stamp of the office was affixed by the manager in another tiny office. A Third Secretary from the Embassy bore witness in another official United States Government certificate to the fact that a marriage had been performed, and the affair was over. This latter certificate is not, of course, necessary, but it saves the later inconvenience of proving in American courts the existence and validity of foreign documents.

With a bottle of champagne donated by the Third Secretary we retired to the Hotel to drink their health, and later on in the evening most of the colony dropped in to wish the couple well.

This marriage served as a demonstration of the application of some of the sections of the Family Code. This Code has had quite a history, perhaps worth retelling in view of the comments abroad during the past few months. Immediately after the Revolution the laws on marriages and divorces were radically changed, but not to the extent often thought abroad. The law of Dec. 18, 1917 required that all marriages be registered to be valid. Without such a provision the Church could have gone on performing marriages which would have been valid without the registration by the State. The Code of Dec. 22, 1918 repeated this provision. Not until the Code of Jan. 1, 1927 was it changed. By that time the influence of the Church had been sufficiently weakened to make possible the abolition of the requirement that a marriage be registered. The new Code provided that a court might recognize a marriage as valid if a common home and factual marriage relationships were proved. To have permitted this earlier would have left open to believers the route of the Church marriage without registration, as they could have later proved the common home and marriage relationships to establish their marriage in the eyes of the law. Under the broader provisions the number of registrations has fallen, until, as statistics now show, more than half the marriages are not recorded.

Divorces have likewise gone through a series of changes under the law. At first, although a recording bureau might register a divorce at the request of both of the parties, only a court could grant a divorce at the request of one of them. There was, however, no hearing or decision on the merits. The 1927 Code made the act entirely administrative, even in the case of divorce at the request of one of the spouses. Even under this system disputes as to the arrangements for the children were heard by a court after the divorce had been registered at ZAGS. But such a method of handling the affair too often left a deserted spouse with the children and little chance of finding a husband who had left town after the divorce. To get alimony from him became a real problem. Cases began to increase and have now reached 180,000 for the RSFSR alone during the past year. A change in the laws seemed necessary in the interest of the children, and now we have news of the new project requiring both spouses to appear before the recording bureau for the divorce. It is deemed sufficient if the absent spouse makes a formal appearance by way of a document consenting to the arrangements for the children which the parties have agreed upon. But there is not to be a contest. The appearance of both spouses is only to simplify the arrangements for the care of the children. Should one spouse refuse to appear actually or formally, the divorce will be granted in any event and the problem of the children will be brought before a court immediately, before the defaulting spouse can leave. The court may issue

an order requiring the defendant to pay up to 50% of his wages. Execution may be had against his wages at their source.

It is apparent that the reports in the foreign press to the effect that the laws are being radically changed in requiring both spouses to appear are misleading insofar as they give the impression that the Soviet Union is returning to the contest theory. Divorce will be just as easy to get as ever, although the more costly nature of such in having to pay for the care of the children may cause a person to think twice.

This project has not yet been published as a law, for the authorities of the RSFSR are waiting for the approval of all of the republics so that publication may be simultaneously made in all parts of the Union.* When the law is finally published and we can determine its exact text, it will be possible to make more than an analysis of the reasons for it as they have been presented in lectures at the Institute.

A sociologist would have a fertile field for the study of the effect of law on family life were he to work over here. That to me is one of the most engrossing of problems, but unfortunately one for which I have not been equipped.

All good wishes for the New Year to you and the Staff.

Very sincerely yours,

JNH.

*Students of comparative Constitutional Law would be interested to know that the Central Government of the USSR is one of granted powers, as is that of the USA. Thus the powers of the Central Government are limited to those set forth in the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court. The Constitution provides that the Central Government may set the general principles for the laws. By failure to go further the Constitution leaves it to the various Republics to enact these principles into Codes. Thus almost all codes are limited in their application to the Republic which has enacted them. In a few cases, however, such as nationality laws, the Constitution gives to the Central Government the power to make an all-Union Code. If amended, the Constitution could permit such all-Union codes in all fields. Such amendments, however, would have to be considered in the light of the policy to be pursued on autonomy of national minorities. For the reason of the limitations of the Constitution there cannot be an all-Union family code, and therefore each Republic must enact one separately, although such codes will have the same general principles and in fact probably the same wording.

WSR..JNH...

December 31st, 1935.

Dear John:

I now have your No. 54 (cabled correction has been made) and your No. 55 (two sections).

Years ago I had some experience with the Taylor method and other plans designed to further industrial efficiency, so I have read with peculiar interest about the Stakhanov movement. Your statements have thrown additional light on the subject, but still I have a feeling that there must be some original twist to the movement which distinguishes it from efficiency methods in use here in the more up-to-date establishments. Just what the difference is, if any, eludes me. It may lie deep in the difference between conditions here and in the USSR.

What is the best record in the law institute? Has any one as result of the adoption of Stakhanov methods doubled his mental intake or output?

Now as to your No. 55: I regret and rejoice in the gruelling experience you had to go through in connection with the written examinations. I rejoice because you were able to undertake such a test and I rejoice because I feel that the experience will add to your stature a cubit or so.

The day your letter arrived a man came in to see me - recommended by Dean Freeman of Johns Hopkins Medical School. The man had been in Russia for a while with one of the Friends famine relief groups. He knew Russian. He had picked it up and could get on very well. No formal study of the language, but with a little brushing up and a few weeks study would have the language down pat! Maybe.

The classifications of the students are extremely interesting and give a much sharper picture of some aspects of the school than I had had before.

Thanks particularly for the second section of No. 54.

Shortly after the first of the year I plan to start off on a systematic hunt for two or three men for the staff. I have in mind seeking the type you described in one of your letters several months ago.

Best greetings and I hope that 1936 will prove to be the most interesting and profitable in your life.

Sincerely yours,

WSR/FC

*Ben is sending a
book about modern
dances.*

Moscow, USSR.,
December 31, 1935.

Dear Mr. Rogers;

New Year's Eve--and all is bustling around the house as the New Year's tree is being decorated. What a contrast it all is to last year's quiet observance! Then every one thought a tree was not good taste, and they kept stored away the decorations which had already been in the attic for ten years. But now out they come to be dusted off. Tinsel is being combed to remove the crushed look, and candles are tied on the branches with cord as the old holders have been lost. The tree will be a rallying point for the children of our courtyard and of our friends.

Nor are we alone, for there are trees going up in many Institutions. Our Law School's Communist Youth League is putting up a huge one for the children of students, faculty, and workers in the restaurant and cloak rooms. Pravda reminds us that people have made a mistake in discarding this festive symbol of the holiday season merely because it had bourgeois associations with Christmas holidays. The article goes no further than to point out the error and ask all to put up trees for the children, but perhaps one may state the reason for this new attitude thus:-

Decorated pine trees were a pagan custom long before Christians began decorating them with the star of Bethlehem and making of them a Christmas symbol. They do not have an inseparable connection with Christianity, and now that the struggle with the old religious customs is no longer a matter for general concern the trees may be reintroduced to serve the purpose for which they are peculiarly fitted--making decorative and gay an otherwise drab period of the year. More and more the Union is realizing that many customs and forms are not bourgeois in essence, merely because they are common in bourgeois society. When the old connotations are removed, and the period of reaction to all that is bourgeois has ended, the old form may be reintroduced with the appropriate orientation to the new society in which they are now to be used. This has been the case with jazz, dancing, army titles, and now with decorated pine trees.

One notices that Americans here are not forgetting the holiday season no matter what their stage of political thought. Our Chargé invited us all to an informal reception Christmas Eve to see a moving picture and share with the Staff a Christmas buffet of turkey, cranberries, and ice cream. It was a cheerful informal gathering coming as a fitting climax after the huge batch of Christmas mail brought over by the Europa and your cable of greetings.

Only an evening previously several of us had

already caught the spirit when we listened to Verdi's Requiem as given by the State Philharmonic and the Kapella Choir. Ranking with Bach's B-Minor Mass this historic composition had us shouting with enthusiasm, for the Austrian Conductor, Eugene Senkar, had trained his orchestra, chorus, and the soloists from the Bolshoi to give us a very finished performance. As the Holy Story was chanted in the ponderous Latin phrases I caught myself wondering how this could be Moscow.

Christmas Day was like any other day on the calendar for my Institute, but classes finished in time to let me rush off to a huge goose dinner and later a turkey supper with two American families. I should have hesitated at such eating in America, but often I feel like a camel storing up for another long run of beef and potatoes.

Last night a friend gave me a ticket to a special concert given at the Club for Scientific Workers, and I had my first formal introduction to Soviet music.. A composer gave an explanation of the concert as one of a series being given to a select group of composers and music lovers in an effort to give to composers an opportunity to have their works performed and criticized, the belief being, that, as in any other field of endeavor, progress is the result of competition and criticism. We were to be treated to concertos and quartets from the works of composers of the three groups now familiar in the Soviet Union. Each is telling the new story of the liberation of the proletariat, but they are telling it in the mediums with which they can best work. A classification was proposed which would divide the group into three types--the classicists; the impressionists (who take a bit from the past and a bit from the future); and the outright modernists who break all connection with the rules of the past.

It all meant that we heard a very unusual concert with selections from the three types. Grouped around in the white and gold ballroom of the former merchant's home now serving as the club were some thirty composers and friends of the musicians. We were treated to some very intimate chamber music. The modernist had to do some real defending of his composition when the critical discussion began. I was relieved to find that ^{not} I alone had ~~not~~ thought the selection too modern and meaningless.

Tonight I rush off to a New Year's Eve party with most of the young student element among our colony. It will mark the end of our holiday season which has been a queer combination of the holiday spirit without the holidays in fact.

All best wishes for the New Year,

JNH

Moscow, USSR.,
January 6, 1935.

Dear Mr. Rogers;

Dr. Moulton's article in the November issue of Fortune has inspired a goodly number of letters in the January number which has just come. On reading those comments, I am tempted to copy off my margin notes to the original article, for they appear to present an approach somewhat different from that of Fortune's correspondents which criticize: (1) what they allege is a faulty presentation and tabulation of the facts recorded; or (2) the failure to collect additional facts; or (3) the failure to consider Marxian principles; or (4) the conclusions drawn from the material collected. When I pencilled my notes I never intended that they should be transcribed, but since they deal with none of the above I am ~~tempted~~ moved to send them along in the hopes that I may some day hear your reactions.

Assuming, as I do, at the very start that the Brookings Institution is one of the organizations most ably qualified to make such an analysis of the American picture and draw conclusions meriting attention, I am prompted to take without question as my starting point the factual picture and the conclusions presented--the more so since I, myself, am no economist. My interest comes in trying to analyze these conclusions to see how they help us in our comparative study of life and the future, on each side of the Atlantic.

If I have not misread the article, the conclusions seem to amount to this: The American system **might** (could?) save itself by following this program:--(a) Pass on to the consumer in the form of lower retail costs the benefit of technical advances in the means of production. (b) This reduction in retail costs will broaden the market. (c) This broader market will make possible increased production. (d) Increased production will in turn make possible further reduction in costs due to the resulting mass production. (e) Thus the retail cost structure will spiral downward, at every step broadening the market, and thus making it possible for the consuming masses to attain a position of which the system may be proud and from which the masses will not need or wish to be lifted.

The key step is the passing on to the consumer of the benefits of technical advances in the means of production. In the past these advances in technique have meant lower cost of production, and when the retail price could be kept from falling proportionally, they meant greater profits during the immediate future. If the executive is now to change his approach from what we may label **as** the narrower short-sighted view of the highest immediate profits to what we may again label **as** a long-range view concerned with the rounded development of the national economy---a view which Dr. Moulton's suggestion seems to involve---he must be willing to forego the immediate profits so as to save the system under which he lives.

The basic question~~s~~ seems to be:--Can this executive overcome a tendency to selfishness and shortsightedness(which is postulated) by means of education as to what is needed to safeguard the future. Sidney Hook in his letter commenting upon the article presents the Marxist viewpoint that such is impossible, for the very nature of the stampede to monopoly is determined by the contradictions within the system itself, contradictions which can never be ironed out and can only be overcome by revolution. There is no question but what that is the orthodox point of view.

It is hardly my ~~intente~~ to argue that point, and I go beyond it for the sake of probing the issues and assume for the purpose that that such a change of attitude--from the short-sighted selfish to the long-range national, or better,--world point of view--might be a possibility if educational forces can be put in motion. The problem then becomes one essentially of education (assuming as we have for the purpose of analysis that no immovable barrier in the nature of the system itself stands in the way of such a program).

Does one not face the conclusion that Dr. Moulton poses the identical problem which faces the Union--educating the people to think in terms of the national and world good, and not of their own selfish desires? If the ultimate goal may be considered the same in both systems--the development of a prosperous unexploited people as a whole in contrast to what Marx analyzed as the development of an ever smaller exploiting group of wealthy persons and an ever enlarging group of exploited poor--and the means of reaching this goal ~~is~~ also the same--education, the only remaining question is: Which system would get there faster?

If one could prevail upon a citizen of the Union to make the assumption that the goal might be achieved by education under the existing American system (which ~~is~~ probably could not do as it is directly counter to any principles of Marxism), he would then say without any doubt that the system under which the Union operated would reach the desired goal first.

He would point out the following considerations: Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the individual is deprived of ownership in the means of production. He must take the long-range view as the only one possible, for he has not the means of turning his selfish desires to increased profits at the expense of others. He is being educated to that point where he will take the long-range point of view by preference, at which point the dictatorship will no longer be necessary. This process of education is facilitated by the fact that any hostile elements in the population ^{will} have been removed and the naturally conservative and ~~older~~ elements will not be in governing positions. Thus youth will be free to surge ahead unhindered either by old people or hostile elements.

But what would be the picture in America under the plan the article suggests. I can do no more than suggest elements involved in the problem leaving the evaluation to others. There might exist a goodly number of persons who could not be educated, either because

they would refuse to or because they would be too long schooled in the old methods to swing over. There might be a great mass who could change but would move slowly and cautiously. This might produce a lag which would hang over several generations, for children reared in the homes of hostile or conservative elements might take on some of the family colors, and they in turn might pass them on to their children. As a result arrival at the final goal might be delayed some generations beyond the time needed to reach it under the system now rolling along in the Union.

When a person has made up his mind on this point--as to which moves faster, he may be able to decide which team he will bet on or join, bearing in mind, however, the added considerations involved besides speed, such as the position of one class of people over the period during which education is going on--or the position of another class found in the route of quick liberation. The answer might be different when one talks of Persia or China or Abyssinia; or America, or England or France.

JNH

JNH...WSR...

January 10th, 1936.

Dear John:

Just a note, supplemental to my cable of today, to catch today's steamer.

After consultation with Carnegie officials, I decided to entrust the \$200. problem to Dr. Horatio Kraus, 173 Boulevard St. Germain, Paris, their representative who has had much experience in such matters. Draft has been sent.

Greetings.

WSR/FC

Mr. John N. Hazard,
c/o American Consulate,
Moscow, USSR.