

other. He was, to himself, the golden and virtuous mean between proletarian vice and bourgeois corruption. The actual situation is almost unbelievably complicated, and only the narrative historian with plenty of space to command can disentangle it. Contemporary French historians, Communist or at least Marxist in inspiration, have long sought for the true, the devoted core of real revolutionists, proto-Communists. Such have been found in the Hébertists, the *Enragés*, the *bras nus*, or just in *les militants* of the Parisian little people. Most of these groups are real enough; but the best word for them is that old, non-Marxist word, "factions." Both Dantonists and Hébertists, "traitors" and "anarchists," were condemned before the Revolutionary Tribunal, and went to the guillotine in two large and rather miscellaneous batches. For the next few months, the "faction of Robespierre" was in complete control of France.

The victorious Independents in England in 1649 found themselves facing an astonishing variety of sects which had been carried along in the general good work for the cause of complete toleration of all Dissenters. We shall in a moment have a word to say about the doctrinal aspect of these groups. Meantime we may note that not only did Cromwell continue to keep down papists, prelatists, and Presbyterians, but he and his officers saw to it that Fifth Monarchy Men, Diggers, Levellers, Millenarians, Quakers, and the rest were not allowed to try out their wilder schemes in practice. The Diggers could dig no more in this earth. The old tactics of "no enemy to the Left," which had held ever since the beginning of the revolution, were now definitely abandoned. As G. M. Trevelyan has written, "All revolutionists, the moment they undertake the actual responsibilities, become in some sort conservatives. Robespierre guillotined the Anarchists. The first administrative act of the [English] Regicides was to silence the Levellers." There are, then, if you like, those more extreme than the group we have called the extremists. But such men are of the lunatic fringe. They are the impractical people erroneously thought by some conservatives to be typical revolutionists. They definitely do not succeed in attaining power.

The Russian situation is still somewhat obscured in respect to the opposition to official Bolshevism after October, 1917, and this obscurity seems in some ways thicker than ever today. Nevertheless it is clear that even while Lenin was alive, and especially in the year or so after the October Revolution, there were a good many stresses and strains within the Bolshevik party. Lenin and his followers suppressed opposing groups even when they claimed to be more "revolutionary" than the Leninists. There was no nonsense about "no enemies to the Left." Thanks to the excellent discipline of the Bolshevik party and to the particularly pressing nature of the war against the Whites and the Allies, these quarrels were not as public as they had been in England and in France. But after Lenin's death these struggles came out in the open—or as near the open as possible in Russia. Trotsky the "ultra" and Bukharin the "citra" fell before the orthodox Stalin as Danton and Hébert had fallen before the orthodox Robespierre. The Russian trials and confessions of the later 1930's and the accompanying Terror of the Yezhov period seem to belong to a different phase of revolution, or rather, are internal difficulties of a specific society that has gone through one cycle of revolution. In spite of certain superficial analogies, they do not seem to be a part of the uniformity we are here discussing. We shall later return to them.

These little opposition factions are inextricably woven in with various eccentric groups which are not completely stilled until the height of the Terror—if even then. They represent, as we have seen, the lunatic fringes common to any complex civilization, and they are especially active and vocal in the early stages of our revolutions, and during the struggle between moderates and extremists. They are less important in the actual course of these revolutions than conservative historians, and conservatives generally, like to make out. But they are interesting variations in the main body of revolutionary orthodoxy, and they illuminate in many ways the general history of heresy and heretics.

"Never did the human mind attain such magnificent height of self-assertiveness as in England about the year 1650," wrote Lytton Strachey. And certainly what we now