

R. C. ELWOOD

How Complete is Lenin's *Polnoe Sobranie Sochinenii*?

The fifth edition of V. I. Lenin's *Sochineniia* is an imposing piece of work.¹ Its fifty-five volumes, first published by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism between 1958 and 1965, are attractively bound, nicely printed, and reasonably priced. Perhaps for these reasons, they have sold over six hundred thousand copies in Russian alone and are now in their fourth large printing.² In comparison with the preceding four editions, the fifth is far more substantial in content: the first edition of twenty-six volumes (1920–26) contained some 1500 writings by Lenin; the second and third editions of thirty volumes each (1925–32) had 2700 works; the fourth or Stalin edition of thirty-five volumes (1941, 1946–50) included 2927 items;³ and the fifth comprises almost 9000. Much of this expansion has come through greater inclusion of Lenin's letters which give perhaps the best insight available into his character, personal relationships, and candid opinions. Over 3700 letters and telegrams appear in the fifth edition but not in its predecessors, and, of these, 852 are printed here for the first time.⁴ Although the editors acknowledge that the sheer mass of Lenin's writings as head of state has made it virtually impossible to include all of his post-1917 material, they imply that his prerevolutionary writings have been reproduced *in toto*.⁵

Not only are the size, appearance, and sales of the edition impressive, but its editors have endowed it with so much scholarly paraphernalia that the incautious reader is lulled into easy acceptance of what is presented as the complete and accurate word of the first Soviet leader. The editors claim to have compared the present text with earlier printed and, if possible, manuscript versions; they note when and where each item was written and first printed; they provide voluminous notes on publication history, obscure references, and historical background.⁶ Each volume contains

1. V. I. Lenin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 5th ed., 55 vols. (Moscow, 1958–65) (hereafter cited as *PSS*).

2. *Knizhnaia letopis'*, 1977, no. 2, item 771.

3. The fourth edition, while larger than the second/third, reflected Stalin's rewriting of history in that numerous previously published items were excluded. "In accordance with the wishes of subscribers," nine supplementary volumes were issued from 1955 to 1967 restoring much of the excised material and including newly found items (Lenin, *PSS*, 1: viii). For the purposes of the following analysis, this "Khrushchev supplement" will not be considered part of the fourth edition.

4. Publication statistics can be found in the prefaces to Lenin, *PSS*, vols. 1 and 46–55.

5. *Ibid.*, 46: vii.

6. It is often said that researchers should use the second/third edition for its notes and the fifth edition for Lenin's actual writings. It is my own feeling that the earlier notes, while lengthy and refreshingly candid, are frequently inaccurate. The notes in the fifth edition are factually more reliable though repetitive in their analysis of the multivolume *Istoriia kommunisticheskoi partii sovetskogo soiuza*, 7 vols. (Moscow, 1964–70). The real bonus of the second/third edition, which will not be found in the fifth, is the inclusion in the appendixes

preparatory material once relegated to the *Leninskii sbornik*, lists of items from Lenin's pen "which have not been found," cross references to chronologically related items in other volumes of the edition, a day-by-day summary of Lenin's life and work, and an annotated index of publications and persons mentioned in that particular volume. The value of the entire project is enhanced by three supplementary volumes which provide everything from cumulative indexes to lists of Lenin's pseudonyms and revolutionary songs cited in the text.⁷

Much of this paraphernalia is undoubtedly scholarly chaff designed to protect the integrity of Lenin's wheat from overly careful examination. Given the wide acceptance and use of the fifth edition, however, it is certainly valid to examine the accuracy of these editorial procedures and to question the completeness of the final product. Under ideal conditions—a large research grant, computer time, and either access to Soviet archives or a familiarity with all facets of Lenin's work—this examination would encompass all fifty-five volumes of the *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. Since these conditions do not prevail, I shall examine Lenin's published work solely as it pertains to the first seven months of 1914. Not only is this the period of my own research, but it was also a time of considerable personal and political difficulty for the Bolshevik leader and thus a good test of his editors' scholarly standards. Moreover, the belated recovery of Lenin's Galician archives has provided current Soviet scholars with much of the material that their predecessors lacked.⁸ In conformity with the practice of the fifth edition of publishing Lenin's articles and resolutions in the first forty-five volumes and his letters and telegrams in the last ten, my examination will look at these two categories separately. Speeches and preparatory material have been excluded from consideration.

Examination of just Lenin's articles written during the first half of 1914 reveals that the differences between the various editions are not particularly marked. The second/third edition included eighty-two such items, the fourth contained eighty-six, and the fifth has ninety-two. The new items are innocuous: a previously overlooked book review and an article from *Pravda* plus four reports or resolutions from the Galician archives.

It would be a mistake to conclude, however, that the fifth edition contains all of the articles Lenin wrote during the first seven months of 1914. At least nine items are missing. These include three found only after the completion of the *Polnoe sobranie*

or notes of documents which are not by Lenin or even of Bolshevik origin. See, for example, the resolutions of the November 1905 Menshevik Conference, not to be found elsewhere, in V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniia*, 2nd ed., 30 vols. (Moscow, 1925–32), 8: 466–67.

7. Western editors of multivolume sets can learn a lesson from *Alfavitnyi ukazatel' proizvedenii, voshedshikh v polnoe sobranie sochinenii V. I. Lenina* (Moscow, 1966); and *Spravochnyi tom k polnomu sobraniu sochinenii V. I. Lenina*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1969–70).

8. The outbreak of the First World War forced Lenin to leave all of his papers, books, and files dealing with the period June 1912–July 1914 with friends in Ponorin and Cracow. In 1918, the Polish police seized over a ton of this material and shipped it to Warsaw. Despite considerable prodding by the new Soviet government, only a small portion was returned in 1924 and 1933. After a change in the Polish regime, further installments were received in 1951 and especially in January 1954. This material has cast much new light on Lenin's relations with *Pravda*, on the workings of his Central Committee, on his contacts with the Second International, and on his plans for a Sixth Party Congress in 1914. For descriptions of Lenin's Galician archives, see M. V. Steshova, "Krakovsko-poroninskii arkhiv V. I. Lenina," *Voprosy istorii KPSS*, 1957, no. 3, pp. 173–78; and S. M. Goncharova, "Iz istorii Krakovsko-poroninskogo arkhiva V. I. Lenina," in *Lenin i Pol'sha: Problemy, kontakty, otkliki* (Moscow, 1970), pp. 392–401.

sochinenii in 1965, which will presumably find their way into the sixth edition.⁹ Three more manuscripts are acknowledged by Soviet editors to have been written by Lenin but have not yet been found in archival or printed form.¹⁰ Far more interesting is the third set of three articles which were either published by Lenin, or are known to exist in Soviet archives, but are neither included in the fifth edition nor acknowledged in any way by its editors. All three deal with R. V. Malinovskii and with Lenin's unsuccessful efforts in May 1914 to exonerate his close political colleague of charges that he was a police agent. One article—"Konets klevete"—appeared on the front page of the party's legal daily newspaper,¹¹ while the other two were apparently rejected by the paper's less gullible editors.¹² It is worthwhile to note that five months later, after Malinovskii had erroneously been reported killed on the Galician front, Lenin published another article defending the ex-Duma deputy from Menshevik "slander"; and, in January 1917, he publicly rehabilitated Malinovskii for services rendered to the party while serving in a German prisoner-of-war camp.¹³ Neither of these wartime articles is mentioned in any fashion by the Soviet editors, let alone republished in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. On only one occasion are current Soviet readers allowed to read that Vladimir Il'ich was on close terms with an agent provocateur and the bulk of that article, which appeared in *Rabochii* on May 22, 1914, is devoted to reproducing a laudatory Menshevik biography of Malinovskii written in 1912, as if to prove that both sides could be wrong.¹⁴

An analysis of Lenin's prewar letters is even more revealing and significant. There is no question that the fifth edition is an improvement over its predecessors in the number of letters and telegrams it presents. The second/third edition contained only eleven letters from 1914; the fourth included eight new letters but dropped an equal number.¹⁵ In contrast, the fifth edition has ninety-one letters, of which fifty

9. These include a fragment of an article attacking Martov and Bulkin first published in *Leninskii sbornik*, vol. 38 (Moscow, 1975), pp. 138–39 (see also Lenin, *PSS*, 25: 456); "Otkrovennoe rassuzhdenie liberala," published in *Trudovaia pravda*, no. 11 (June 10, 1914), and reprinted in "Novye dokumenty V. I. Lenina," *Voprosy istorii KPSS*, 1970, no. 4, pp. 3–5; and "Pervoe maia i rabochee dvizhenie v Rossii" in *Leninskii sbornik*, vol. 38, pp. 139–41. The latter was first discovered by Leonhard Haas and printed in "Lenin an die Schweizer Arbeiter," *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 16, no. 3 (1966): 412–14 (see also Leonhard Haas, "Grimm und Lenins Mai-aufruf von 1914 an die Schweizer Arbeiter," *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 24, no. 3 [1974]: 410–12).

10. Institut marksizma-leninizma pri TsK KPSS, *Vladimir Il'ich Lenin: Biograficheskaiia khronika*, 8 vols. (Moscow, 1970–77), 3: 202, 240, 256 (hereafter cited as *Biograf. khronika*).

11. *Rabochii*, no. 4 (May 25, 1914), p. 1. Although the article is unsigned, it is acknowledged by at least one Soviet compiler to have been authored by Lenin (see *Pravda, 1912–1914, 1917 gg.: Bibliograficheskii ukazatel'* [Moscow, 1962], p. 56).

12. Fairly detailed descriptions of the contents of these two articles—"K voprosu o Peshekhonove, Malinovskom i dr." and "Eshche k ukhodu Malinovskogo"—appear in the appendixes to the complete works (see Lenin, *PSS*, 25: 630 and 631), which would indicate that the manuscripts are presently in some Soviet archive. It seems likely that "Ot obshcherossiiskago rukovodiashchago uchrezhdeniia marksistov" (*Trudovaia pravda*, no. 3 [May 31, 1914], p. 2) and some of the other unsigned entries which appeared under *Pravda's* general heading "K ukhodu Malinovskago" between May 10 and June 28, 1914 were also written by Lenin.

13. Neither of these articles is signed. That the first (in *Sotsial-demokrat*, no. 33 [October 19/November 1, 1914], p. 2) was authored by Lenin is quite clear from his letter to V. A. Karpinskii (Lenin, *PSS*, 49: 18). The second article is similar in tone and content (see *Sotsial-demokrat*, no. 58 [January 18/31, 1917], p. 2).

14. "Likvidatory i biografiia Malinovskogo," in Lenin, *PSS*, 25: 159–62.

15. All eight letters were restored in the first of the post-Stalin supplementary volumes, volume 36. These included two letters to G. L. Shklovskii, two to A. A. Troianovskii, and

were published for the first time only after Stalin's death. Exactly half of these new letters were written to Inessa Armand. Like the previously unpublished correspondence to L. B. Kamenev for 1912 and to G. E. Zinoviev for 1915–16, these letters, which Lenin wrote to Inessa in 1914, represent a wealth of material for both the historian and the biographer. In them, Vladimir Il'ich expresses his views on such controversial issues as Ukrainian nationalism and feminism; he gives candid appraisals of political rivals and offers questionable political advice; and he reveals more than Soviet authorities wish to acknowledge about his personal relationship with his correspondent. The editors of the second/third edition avoided the issue entirely, perhaps because their categories of correspondents (Old Bolsheviks, members of foreign Socialist parties, journal editors, and so forth) did not include one for persons such as Inessa ("close comrades-in-arms"¹⁶). The availability of the letters prior to the recovery of the Galician archives is revealed by the curious publication of four of them in the fourth edition.¹⁷ The remaining twenty-five letters went unpublished until the appearance of volume 48 of the fifth edition in 1964.¹⁸

The prospective user of the 1914 letters, and those to Inessa in particular, should be aware of certain problems associated with their editing. The most obvious is that many of them are incomplete. The first page or pages of six of the letters to Inessa are missing, while the seventh is merely a postscript to a letter that is unavailable.¹⁹ Eight of the twenty-nine published letters are without his salutation and two lack a closing. In each of these instances, the editors state that the missing portions simply "have not been found" and leave it to the reader to speculate as to the reasons why. In others, it is clear that passages have been suppressed by the current editors themselves. In 1959, a bibliographer with access to the originals noted that one of the letters to Inessa had been published in the fourth edition without its concluding passage and signature. When volume 48 appeared five years later, "Very Truly, Yours V. I." was added, but the text was otherwise identical to that in the fourth edition and the remaining omission was not mentioned.²⁰ Similar abridgment is evident in the editing of a critical "Letter to the Editors of *Trudovaia pravda*," wherein the reader is provided with "extracts" rather than the complete letter. Ellipses are used in this case,

one each to G. E. Zinoviev, V. A. Karpinskii, V. B. Stankevich, and I. A. Gurvich—all of whom were either of the wrong political persuasion or in Stalin's disfavor. A letter to the editors of *Zaria povolzh'ia*, which was also in the second/third edition, has subsequently been judged not to have been written by Lenin (Lenin, *Sochineniia*, 2nd ed., 17: 117; *Alfavitnyi ukazatel'*, p. 482).

16. "Soratniki Il'icha: Inessa Armand," *Agitator*, 1974, no. 9, pp. 47–49.

17. V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniia*, 4th ed., 35 vols. (Moscow, 1941, 1946–50), 35: 100–103, 107–10. An incomplete enumeration of the letters recovered from the Galician archives in 1954 includes mention of only one letter to Inessa (Goncharova, *Lenin i Pol'sha*, p. 272 n.).

18. With the exception of two letters written in the last half of December 1913 (Lenin, *PSS*, 48: 238, 242–43), 1914 marks the beginning of a very extensive correspondence with Inessa that was to last until she and Lenin returned to Russia in April 1917. Many of the characteristics of the letters discussed in this article pertain to the later correspondence as well.

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 248, 251, 252, 256, 272, 280, 285. The first pages of a letter to the editors of *Za pravdu* are also "missing" (*ibid.*, p. 236).

20. Institut marksizma-leninizma pri TsK KPSS, *Khronologicheskii ukazatel' proizvedenii V. I. Lenina*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1959), vol. 1, item 3630; cf. Lenin, *Sochineniia*, 4th ed., 35: 110; and Lenin, *PSS*, 48: 312 (quoted words in English in the original). The editors of the fourth edition were obviously bothered by the implications of Lenin's use of the familiar *tvoi* in closing his letters to Inessa. In two instances, they eliminated his ending altogether; in the other two they simply dropped the word *tvoi*.

but no attempt has been made to pass them off as representing "indecipherable" or "lost" portions of the letter.²¹

There are other problems with these letters which indicate that the quality of their editing has been superficial. Initially, one is impressed that dates supplied to letters are often given as "earlier than . . ." or "between . . ." and thus, when a precise date is appended, the reader has a feeling of confidence in its accuracy. Unfortunately, this confidence is misplaced. The editors sometimes get the sequence of the letters wrong. In one instance, Inessa is told by Lenin about the "possibility" of her being asked to be part of the Bolshevik delegation to the Brussels "Unity" Conference *after* she had already been appointed.²² In another case, internal evidence proves a "precise" date to be wrong by at least one and probably two weeks.²³ It may be reassuring that even Soviet editors are confused by differing Russian calendars. Thus, an unpublished fragment of a letter to Inessa is dated March 13/26, 1914 by the editors of one volume, and March 26/April 8 by the editors of another.²⁴ Joint authors—when these happen to be unrehabilitated "enemies of the people" such as Zinoviev and Kamenev—are denied attribution in letters just as they are in some articles.²⁵ There also are problems of translation. For reasons of erudition, conspiracy, or necessity, Lenin often wrote in German, French, or broken English. When this was restricted to phrases, as in the case of eight letters to Inessa Armand, the editors have reproduced the original and supplied a reasonable Russian translation at the bottom of the page. Six of the 1914 letters to Inessa and five to Camille Huysmans, however, were written entirely in English or in French. For these the editors have supplied only the Russian translation, thereby forcing the reader to consult either the English translation of the fourth edition and its supplement for a reasonably accurate version of the letters to Inessa²⁶ or Georges Haupt's edition of the Huysmans correspondence.²⁷ By providing only the Russian translation, the editors have been able not only to improve Lenin's grammar but also to gloss over some of his troublesome expressions; thus "My dear and dearest friend" Inessa becomes simply "Moi dorogoi drug."²⁸

21. Lenin, *PSS*, 48: 296–97. Ellipses are also found in a number of Lenin's letters to Inessa Armand (see, for example, *ibid.*, pp. 300, 315, 323). It is unclear whether these are Lenin's or his editors'; photographic reproduction of one of the letters (*ibid.*, p. 309) would indicate that they were occasionally part of Lenin's writing style.

22. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 297 and 299.

23. In this letter, which the editors have dated June 29/July 12, 1914, Lenin wrote in English to Inessa that "Today (Sunday) two working men are arrived [*sic*], very good people from our capital" for a meeting of the Central Committee (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 45 vols. [Moscow, 1960–70], 43: 416). One of these new arrivals, however, mentions in his memoirs that he was in Poronin for "over two weeks" and that he returned to St. Petersburg on July 5/18 (A. S. Kiselev, "V iiule 1914 goda," *Proletarskaia revoliutsiia*, 1924, no. 7, pp. 40 and 43). Thus, if he arrived on a Sunday, it must have been June 15/28, or perhaps June 22/July 5, and not the date suggested by the editors.

24. Lenin, *PSS*, 24: 403; *ibid.*, 25: 624.

25. Compare "Letter to the Editor" of *Pu' pravdy* in Lenin, *Sochineniia*, 2nd ed., 17: 197–98, and Lenin, *PSS*, 24: 307–8.

26. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 43: 377, 408, 416–17, 420–21, 424–26. A comparison of the last of these letters with a photostat of the original in the V. I. Lenin Museum in Cracow indicates that the editors of the English edition have taken several minor liberties in deciphering Lenin's handwriting.

27. Georges Haupt, ed., *Correspondance entre Lénine et Camille Huysmans, 1905–1914* (Paris, 1963), pp. 135–44.

28. Compare letter of July 19, 1914 in Lenin, *Collected Works*, 43: 424 with that found in Lenin, *PSS*, 48: 323.

While the editors of the fifth edition are to be commended for having published ninety-one of Lenin's 1914 letters, the fact remains that at least one hundred and ten from this period are not included in volume 48. Seventy-six of these are listed as "not found." Lenin's entire 1914 correspondence with N. I. Bukharin, O. N. Lola, M. M. Litvinov, M. F. Vladimirskii, and A. V. Kazakov—all of whom lived in emigration—has disappeared.²⁹ Soviet scholars have expressed disappointment that much of his correspondence with leading party figures in the underground was also missing from the Galician archives.³⁰ Either someone had reason to remove it or Lenin did not follow his usual practice of having his wife or mother-in-law make legible copies of important letters so that the draft would remain in his files.³¹

Will these missing letters ever be found? In the case of those sent to Western Europe, one can hope that diligent archivists will follow in the footsteps of Georges Haupt and Leonhard Haas, who have recently uncovered sizable caches of letters in France and in Switzerland.³² The Okhrana likewise provided a valuable service to historians by intercepting and copying much of Lenin's correspondence to imperial Russia. Judging from the copies preserved in the Paris Okhrana Archives at the Hoover Institution, however, almost all of the intercepted correspondence has been found and republished by Lenin's editors. Still another source of letters were individuals who answered the Central Committee's call in 1923 to turn in their communications from the first Soviet leader. Some, such as V. M. Molotov, found it prudent to keep potentially incriminating correspondence until after the death of the second Soviet leader in 1953.³³ Since Old Bolsheviks and family archives are now scarce in the Soviet Union, it is doubtful that this source will be as productive in the future. One wishes that all of Lenin's correspondents had been as diligent in saving his letters and in turning them in to the appropriate authorities as was Inessa Armand, who apparently preserved all but three of those sent to her in 1914.

More significant in content if not in quantity are those letters which have been excluded from Lenin's "complete" collected works, even though copies are known to exist in some archive or have been published elsewhere. Inessa's name is prominent on this list, which no Soviet editor has been authorized to compile. No fewer than eight of the forty letters sent to her during the first seven months of 1914 are found only in the Central Party Archives at the Institute of Marxism-Leninism.³⁴ All have been seen by privileged Soviet scholars and have been briefly quoted else-

29. *Biograf. khronika*, 3: 177–266; Lenin, *PSS*, 48: 347–53. The five persons mentioned received a total of eighteen unrecovered letters between January and July 1914.

30. "O rozyske dokumentov V. I. Lenina," *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, 1955, no. 2, p. 183.

31. A. N. Nikiforova, "Dvadtsat' odin' den' v sem'e V. I. Lenina," in *O Vladimire Il'iche Lenine* (Moscow, 1963), p. 168.

32. Haas found twenty-four previously unpublished letters to G. L. Shklovskii or through him to F. N. Samoilov (Leonhard Haas, *V. I. Lenin: Unbekannte Briefe, 1912–14* [Zurich, 1967]), while Haupt uncovered sixty-four unpublished letters to Huysmans (Haupt, *Correspondance entre Lénine et Huysmans*).

33. "Novye dokumenty V. I. Lenina," *Kommunist*, 1956, no. 5, pp. 31–34. This reluctance to turn in Leniniana has been confirmed by recent Soviet scholars. See, for example, V. A. Liubisheva, "Vossozdanie arkhiva Predsedatelia SNK V. I. Lenina," *Voprosy istorii*, 1969, no. 4, p. 41.

34. *Khronologicheskii ukazatel'*, vol. 1, entries 3520 and 3561; *Biograf. khronika*, 3: 189, 261, 258–59, 244; Lenin, *PSS*, 24: 403 and 556. For scholars, Soviet or otherwise, who are more fortunate than I in having access to these archives, the known archival references are Tsentral'nyi partiinyi arkhiv pri Institute marksizma-leninizma (TsPA IML), fond 2, opis' 1, dela 3214, 3221, 3238, 3297, 3335, 3341.

where.³⁵ They appear to deal with significant topics on which Lenin's pronouncements would seem to be of permanent interest. In one of them, written before July 12/25, 1914, he commented on the rising revolutionary tide in Russia and apparently made his only reference to the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and to the fact that tensions in the Balkans might lead to war.³⁶ Others touch on the Brussels Conference, on the nature of the German Socialist Party, and on the publishing of the party's women's magazine, *Rabotnitsa*. One can only speculate as to the reasons for their suppression by Lenin's editors.

There is no need to wonder, however, why a second category of extant letters and telegrams has not been published in the *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. These are either to or about police spy Roman Malinovskii and Lenin's attempts to defend his fellow Central Committee member. The fifth edition includes only one letter to Malinovskii (and this is mistakenly said to be addressed to Stalin³⁷), despite his obvious importance as head of the party's Duma fraction and of the Central Committee's Russian Bureau. As coordinator of much of the Bolsheviks' fund-raising and counterespionage efforts in Russia, Malinovskii surely was in constant communication with Lenin before resigning from the Duma on May 8, 1914. An earlier Soviet compilation included a letter to Malinovskii and Stalin jointly and another to only Malinovskii,³⁸ but neither of these are to be found in Lenin's collected works. Speaking of a later period, Lenin acknowledged that he carried on extensive correspondence with his one-time protégé when Malinovskii was a prisoner of war and that these letters were turned over to the Extraordinary Investigatory Commission set up by the Provisional Government.³⁹ These letters have also remained unpublished. After rumors started to spread in May 1914 about Malinovskii's complicity with the police, Lenin fired off a series of telegrams seeking information or giving orders to his concerned followers. These telegrams—two to Vladimir Burtsev,⁴⁰ two to the party's daily newspaper,⁴¹ and one each to J. S. Hanecki and A. E. Badaev⁴²—are extant but have not been published in the fifth edition, despite the inclusion of many far less significant telegraphed messages in this edition. This policy of implicitly denying Lenin's poor judgment by suppressing his communications to or about a police agent is not restricted to Malinovskii. No letters to M. E. Chernomazov, another provocateur, appear in the *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, even though his position as editor first of *Sotsial-demokrat* and then of *Pravda* would certainly have required such a correspondence.⁴³

35. S. S. Shaumian, "V. I. Lenin i Briussel'skoe 'ob'edinitel'noe' soveshchanie," *Istoriia SSSR*, 1966, no. 2, pp. 41–42; "K istorii izdaniia zhurnala *Rabotnitsa*," *Istoricheskii arkhiv*, 1955, no. 4, pp. 26–27; *Biograf. khronika*, 3: 189 and 244; Lenin, *PSS*, 25: 624.

36. *Biograf. khronika*, 3: 261.

37. Lenin, *PSS*, 48: 126–27.

38. *Iz epokhi "Zvezdy" i "Pravdy," 1911–1914 gg.*, 3 vols. (Moscow, 1921–24), 3: 199–201, 217. The only excuse for excluding these letters, which are dated December 7/20, 1912 and February 23/March 8, 1913, is that they, like so much of Lenin's correspondence, were written in Krupskaya's hand.

39. *Pis'ma P. B. Akse'l'roda i I. O. Martova, 1901–1916* (Berlin, 1924), p. 292.

40. Copies are found in the Hoover Institution, Nicolaevsky Collection, file 132, box 4, no. 27.

41. *Pu' pravdy*, no. 90 (May 18, 1914), p. 2; *Rabochii*, no. 4 (May 25, 1914), p. 1.

42. *Biograf. khronika*, 3: 227 (in TsPA IML, f. 2, op. 1, d. 3273); Lenin, *PSS*, 25: 630.

43. That Lenin wrote to Chernomazov is evident from his letter of October 8, 1913, which appeared in "Lenin i *Pravda*, 1912–1913 gg.: Perepiska," *Krasnaia letopis'*, 1924, no. 1, pp. 78–79. The supplementary portion of the *PSS* (54: 374) contains Lenin's postscript to a letter to the editor of *Za pravdu* (that is, Chernomazov) by Kamenev.

In addition, copies of letters to G. L. Shklovskii, which have not been included in Lenin's collected works, have been in Soviet archives for many years.⁴⁴ Leonhard Haas's discovery of eleven originals dating from 1914 and their subsequent publication abroad in 1967 has led to their inclusion in the most recent volume of the *Leninskii sbornik* and to their probable publication in the next edition of the *Sochineniia*. The reasons for their omission from the fifth edition are unclear. In one of them, Lenin referred to the "action of Mal[inovskii]" in leaving the Duma as being that of a "nervous adventurer. Rumors about [his] provocation are baseness and nonsense on the part of the Liquidators." This passage, significantly, is replaced by ellipses in the *Sbornik* version.⁴⁵ Many of the other letters dealt with Lenin's efforts to recover the money he had been forced to turn over to three German "trustees" in 1910. During 1913 and 1914, he used Shklovskii to contact four different West European lawyers who were instructed to institute legal action against Klara Zetkin unless this money was returned. Three previously unpublished letters to one of these lawyers, Ducos de la Haille, are also reproduced in the new *Leninskii sbornik*.⁴⁶ Although Shklovskii later felt that Lenin never intended these maneuvers to be anything more than threats,⁴⁷ the fact that he appears to advocate the use of a bourgeois court to force money out of respected fellow Socialists does not enhance the image which the editors of the fifth edition wished to propagate. In this context, it is worth noting that during 1914 Lenin exchanged four letters with M. F. Vladimirkii in Paris over the question of pressuring the relatives of N. A. Schmidt, the source of much of the contested money: Lenin's letters apparently have not survived, while Vladimirkii's reside unpublished in Soviet archives.⁴⁸

Still other Lenin communications from this period exist, but not in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*. The editors of the *Leninskii sbornik* recently published a draft of a letter to G. V. Plekhanov as well as one sent to the Regional Presidium of the Polish Social Democratic Party.⁴⁹ A telegram to Badaev and a postcard to Popov are to be found in the Central Party Archives but for unstated reasons have been left out of Lenin's published works.⁵⁰ And *Put' pravdy* contains several telegrams which careful hagiologists should not have ignored.⁵¹

In sum then, although the most recent edition of Lenin's collected works contains ninety-one letters and almost an equal number of articles written during the first seven months of 1914, scholars should be aware that many have been subjectively or sloppily edited, and that the letters represent only 45 percent of his total correspondence. Another seventy-six letters, plus three articles, have never been found; and sixteen letters and three articles were discovered only after the completion of the fifth edition. Even more significant, however, is the existence in print or archival form of twenty-one letters, telegrams, and articles, which have been excluded for a variety

44. See, for example, *Biograf. khronika*, 3: 185 and 226, citing TsPA IML, f. 2, op. 5, d. 337; and f. 2, op. 1, d. 24905.

45. Cf. Haas, *Unbekannte Briefe*, p. 60, and *Leninskii sbornik*, vol. 38, p. 146.

46. *Leninskii sbornik*, vol. 38, pp. 133–38.

47. G. Shklovskii, "Iz moikh vospominanii," *Zapiski Instituta Lenina*, 1927, no. 1, pp. 119–20.

48. *Biograf. khronika*, 3: 234–38.

49. *Leninskii sbornik*, vol. 37 (Moscow, 1970), p. 23; *ibid.*, vol. 38, p. 132.

50. *Biograf. khronika*, 3: 223 and 264, citing TsPA IML, f. 2, op. 1, d. 23820 and 3343.

51. See, for example, *Put' pravdy*, no. 67 (April 22, 1914), p. 5, and no. 68 (April 23, 1914), p. 2.

of political and personal reasons from Lenin's officially sanctioned works. In recent years, Soviet editors have relaxed their selection criteria with respect to Lenin's contacts with persons purged by his successor, and they have indirectly shown his party to have been anything but monolithic before the Revolution. Nevertheless, as this analysis has tried to point out, revelation of his mistaken judgment of police agents is still almost totally prohibited. Moreover, selectivity must still be exercised in publishing material which deals with Inessa Armand and perhaps with Lenin's financial or legal machinations. As a result of these restrictions, his "Complete" *Collected Works* are notably incomplete in several important areas.⁵²

52. John Keep comes to the same conclusion when examining Lenin's correspondence for the 1918 to 1920 period. Comparing the *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* with *The Trotsky Papers* published abroad, he found the former to be 29 percent incomplete but concluded that Trotsky might have been an atypical problem for Lenin's editors (John L. H. Keep, "Lenin's Letters as an Historical Source," in B. W. Eissenstat, ed., *Lenin and Leninism: State, Law and Society* [Lexington, Mass., 1971], pp. 249–52). If one eliminates letters "not found" for the 1914 period, the shortfall for the seven months under examination is about the same—27.2 percent—which would indicate that Trotsky may have been the rule rather than the exception.