pecially helpful. Within Gandhi's discussions of war and peace there is his treatment of the Indian Army fighting in the fall of 1947 to hold the Vale of Kashmir against invaders from Pakistan, following the Indian government's response to an urgent call from the Kashmiri authorities to defend the area and their declaration of accession to India. About his countrymen in battle Gandhi said that, although his pacifist values did not permit him to approve of violence, he did admire the bravery of the Indian soldiers. A standard interpretation is that Gandhi's position is to be explained by his long-standing judgments that bravery is always to be preferred over cowardice, that those who have not adopted nonviolence should be honest and consistent until converted to the truth of pacifism. Others suggest that in this case Gandhi's nationalism overcame his ethics.

Woodcock adheres in part to the bravery over cowardice explanation. But he also suggests that after 1940 Gandhi had to face violence inside and outside of India on a scale and in forms that he had not experienced and which he could do little to control, as in the partition carnage. The implication is that Gandhi's treatment of the Kashmir struggle means that he decided not to protest against the righteous violence used by Indian soldiers against the invaders' wrongful violence, which he had not been able to prevent after years of preaching nonviolence and of Hindu-Muslim unity. On this reading, one may imagine Gandhi responding in a similar way to the Indian Army's 1971 penetration of East Bengal to end Pakistani repression.

Toward the end Woodcock pictures Gandhi becoming isolated from associates and increasingly hated by those who rejected his message. Gandhi prefigured his own assassination and martyrdom. Does all of this add up to "Mahatma Gandhi—Superstar"? Yes, probably. The posthumous Gandhi has been drawn into India's popular culture. The masses wore Gandhi buttons in celebration of his centennial in 1969. There are worse outcomes for greats.

Will the Revolution Succeed? Rebirth of the Radical Democrat by Edward Schwartz

(Criterion Books; 200 pp.; $5.95)

Marc K. Landy

Imagine a tour of modern-day America taken by Andrew Jackson, Patrick Henry and William Jennings Bryan. They pass through cities distinguished not by their architecture but by the color of the air: Los Angeles, off-white; Gary, blue-grey; Pittsburgh, black. They search for communities and find subdivisions; instead of politics, media and medicine shows. Bryan pays for their plane tickets with BankAmericard, and Jackson grins sardonically, "I thought I did away with that a long time ago."

Why would these men, whom Ed Schwartz calls radical democrats, feel so alien in this world which they did much to create? They were not men to be easily shocked by physical changes. Jackson lived to see the development of the steamboat and the railroad, Bryan lived to witness that masterpiece of military technology, World War I. What these men would see in the suburban sprawl and urban ooze of America, 1972, is not merely environmental disaster but spiritual death. In this excellent book, Schwartz attempts to restore focus to contemporary movements for social change by summoning forth the prophetic vision supplied by the radical democratic tradition in America.

Today there is a bull market in prophecy. Our bookstores and cocktail parties bulge with "Consciousness III," "spaceship earth," "the dictatorship of the proletariat." Schwartz throws these infidels from the temple. JUSTICE, he declaims. The distinctive characteristic of modern prophecy is its unconcern with justice: not simply fairness, which like liberty merely tells us what we should not do, but justice, an ideal notion of a people held together by mutual concern, where the life of each is enhanced through interaction with the others.

Schwartz identifies three sources of the American radical democratic tradition: the Anti-Federalists, the Jacksonians and the Populists. Conventional analyses have concentrated not upon their stated goals but upon what were the immediate objects of their attack: centralism, the banks and the railroads. Since excesses of those institutions were curbed, these movements have been depicted as being of an essentially reformist nature. Their quick demise is attributed to the success of their mission. But if, like Schwartz, we grant them the decency of taking seriously what they *said* they wished to accomplish, their radical nature emerges.

The term radical derives from the word root. The radical vision of these men stemmed from their rootedness in a political community that was being subverted by the unbridled spread of commercialism, technology and centralism. Their mission had nothing fundamentally to do with bank or railroad reform. They sought rather to implement their vision of justice. In this they failed. Their defeat was cultural as well as temporal. They are portrayed to us in history books as obstructionists (Anti-Federalists), spoilsmen (Jacksonians), and the forerunners of McCarthyism (Populists).

To understand this cultural obliteration, we must examine the perverse power of the creed that triumphed over the radical democrat—liberalism. Liberalism shares with radicalism a belief in the equality of men. However, this equality derives not from a transcendent belief in man's capacity for moral action but rather from a "realistic" ap-

praisal of his dogged pursuit of his own interest. To keep the wolves at bay, society must get bigger and better, dishing out more things more cheaply. The value of freedom is replaced by efficiency, justice by moderation, and community by mobility. In a welter of reforms and improvements, the purpose of politics is forgotten.

Although critical of Marx, Schwartz is in complete sympathy with his famous dictum, "the point is not to understand the world but to change it." He formulates a strategy for action based upon the radical democrat's concern for justice. The starting point is found in another maxim, this time from a thinker with whom Schwartz would have less sympathy, the aristocrat Rochefoucauld: "hypocrisy is the gift that vice renders to virtue."

We have the good fortune to live in the world's most hypocritical nation. Our institutions are based not on custom but on ideals. Our courts proclaim their dedication to justice, our schools to equality. Even our corporations purport to act in the public interest. A radical movement must begin by holding a mirror up to our institutions. It should start by questioning their *fidelity* (if what is good for G.M. is good for the country, how come you make such lousy cars?). When infidelity is exposed, the radical must be able to pose a *visionary alternative* that is both just and practical. If the excuse for destroying a neighborhood to build an expressway is that the city needs better transport, the radical must be able both to point to alternative modes of transport that would neither destroy neighborhoods nor increase congestion, and to show who *should* pay for them.

A radical movement's goal is *political*, not expressive. It seeks to win, not to demonstrate its purity of heart. It must therefore define issues in such a way as to appeal to the concerns of other disaffected groups. One does not attack workers in a defense plant as warmongers. Rather one seeks to convince them (at their convenience, by asking to speak at their union meetings) that conversion to production for peacetime use will increase both world stability and the stability of their own jobs.

Schwartz analyzes a number of social change movements in terms of their ability to operate within the radical democratic framework. Perhaps his most trenchant critique concerns the problems of representation and participation—Washingtonitis, and John Gardnerism for short:

"You go to Washington as an advocate for a specific constituency. Soon you discover that you exist as part of a community of advocates. . . . To advocate Student Power meant to deal with these groups. I would attend their conferences . . . and participate on panels as a spokesman for the student point of view. . . . Those of us who shared the platform at a seemingly endless round of conferences might have enjoyed each other's company, but we had our differences, and, more important, the people for whom we spoke had *their* differences—serious ones. . . . Gradually to resolve the tension, each of us carved out roles not so much as advocates but as *mediators* between the 'boys back home' and the 'boys in the District.'

"John Gardner has developed an analysis of our system that suggests that it needs reconstruction from the bottom up . . . then he has created a top-down, non-participatory pay-$15 - and - watch - me - tell - the - House - of - Representatives - what - it - ought - to - be - doing organization to achieve this objective."

Schwartz does not shy away from the illiberal implications of his theory. The similarity of "liberty" and "liberal" is no accident of language. A radical interpretation of freedom and justice implies constraint and authority. He illuminates this complex relationship by alluding to the "freest" of all musical forms, jazz!

"To play jazz, one requires an image of what a good jazz musician is supposed to be. . . . He imitates an idol. . . . The agony of the medium in fact lies in the artist's continuing inability to translate the sounds that weave in and out of his consciousness into real musical notes —an agony that drives him to . . . learn the structure of musical theory. . . . Tell a jazz musician that the free expression of his soul has evolved independently of the forces that have excited it, that his music entails little more than a release of 'natural feelings' . . . and he will tell you that you don't know what you are talking about."

The question that a radical educator must ask is not how can I liberate the founts of creativity and virtue locked in every student, but, rather, how can I provide a legitimate form of authority to which he or she can react? A free school cannot be a liberal one.

The crunch of constraint is perhaps even more deeply felt with regard to mobility. The average American changes his address once every five years. How then can we *do justice* to a community that we know we will shortly leave (I love ya baby, but they're transferring me to Detroit)? This tentativeness in private and public relations is one of the bitterest legacies of corporate liberalism. Yet how many of us are sufficiently free of respect for the free market to deny a corporation (or a public agency) the right to transfer an employee to another city in order to "increase efficiency"? How many of us who proclaim our adherence to "neighborhood control" cherish our liberty to "go out to the coast" if things don't turn out? It is in this area, more than any other, that the radical imagination needs nourishment.

After reading the book the question remains, will the revolution succeed? The evidence is mixed. Everywhere attempts are under way to reassess and redefine institutions: family, church, school. Communes burgeon, but community remains an elusive goal. Only the need for and desirability of change have remained unchallenged assumptions of the American creed. Yet data banks, multiversities, hospital complexes and television networks are part of the landscape from which Henry, Bryan and Jackson recoil. The key to the revolution's success will be its ability to weld action to vision. A careful reading of this book is a good start.