

BOOK REVIEWS

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT. By Victor Jones, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. xxiv, 364. \$4.00.

There has been much talk in recent years but little action on the problem of consolidation, integration and governmental simplification in metropolitan areas. The chaos, the confusion, and the conflict resulting from several governments attempting to meet problems in such areas which are common to the whole region and call for unified treatment have received increased attention during the last decade. Local government journals, civic clubs, and textbook writers have all pointed to the need of unified effort to meet these common problems. Studies of particular functions in the Chicago region have been made at the University of Chicago pointing out the undesirable results where several governments have jurisdiction over a common problem. The present study may be considered a synthesis of these specialized studies made at Chicago and elsewhere—an attempt to look at the problem generally as it has developed in metropolitan areas.

The interest and agitation have led to definite attempts to do something about the metropolitan problem in a few cities. The plans proposed in Pittsburgh and St. Louis during the last decade are illustrative of such efforts. The results have been disappointing, in fact, we might say there have been no results and that no progress has been made. Two important questions, both considered by Dr. Jones, are, why haven't we done more, and what is needed to secure positive results in the future. Why has the program thus far been one of talk rather than action?

The advantages (at least theoretical) of cooperation and unified action in meeting common problems in metropolitan areas appear obvious. Unified attack rather than diversity of effort should prove to be a means of improving governmental services. The argument is generally advanced, but not universally accepted, that integration should not only lead to better service but at less cost. While the author has made no unique contribution in presenting the weakness of the present situation and the advantages of integration, he has rendered a service in restating the case in an effective manner, supporting his views by specific cases. He next considers solutions and those presented have been stated or tried before. The restatement is well done, however, and the author contributes an evaluation of the various methods, such as annexation, the use of the federal principle, city-county consolidation, and intergovernmental agreements.

In his chapters on the politics of integration the author seeks to find out why nothing has been done about the problem of metropolitan government. What groups have in actual campaigns been for and against integration and what techniques of appeal have they used. The study indicates that the blame should be placed on the doorstep not only of the politician but of business, labor and civic organizations. The economic factor has played an important part in the slow progress of integration. Groups or individuals oppose integration because as groups or individuals they stand to lose special advantages. They look at the results from their own view-

point rather than from that of the region as a whole. As long as human nature continues unchanged this will be true. Is there any way to meet this situation and overcome the power of these minority groups which have been vocal and effective? The author makes some suggestions which he believes will enable advocates of integration to become more successful in the future. He emphasizes the need of, and places great faith in symbols charged with high emotional voltage. Advocates of integration must replace symbols such as "economy" and "efficiency" with others having a greater popular appeal. One difficulty is that the author doesn't suggest the symbols but only gives illustrations of the type that have been effective in other cases, such as "local self-government," "home rule" and "un-American." There is the further question as to whether he hasn't overemphasized the point. Again he recommends the use of "various propaganda techniques" and cautions that an "academic presentation of the case for integrated local government" will continue to be ineffective. We are not told, however, what new techniques are to be used, but only that they should be used.

Dr. Jones is least helpful in suggesting how we can do better in the future. We can all agree, and many will say they already knew, that "campaigns for a metropolitan government must be well planned, the details carefully executed by technicians, and the proposal systematically and persistently sold to the public and the politicians." Many persons who have been active in campaigns for integration will say that is what they attempted to do and think they actually did. They may feel the present study is not sufficiently definite to help them in actually selling integration to the voters.

Further progress in solving the problem of governing metropolitan areas may be expected. The study by Dr. Jones will contribute to the much needed action. It is a challenging and stimulating study. One who reads this account will become more determined that something must be done; and he will gain some helpful suggestions as to what might and should be done and how it can be accomplished.

CHARLES M. KNEIER†

CASES AND MATERIALS ON TRIAL AND APPELLATE PRACTICE. By Edson R. Sunderland, Professor of Law and Legal Research, University of Michigan. Second Edition. Chicago: Callaghan and Company, 1941. Pp. xxx, 775. \$6.50.

In the first decade of the twentieth century most American law schools offered courses in Common Law Pleading and Code Pleading. (In some schools the Code Pleading course was called New York Practice.) The two courses were presented separately and in many schools through different teachers. Trial Practice was not listed as a part of the curriculum. That subject was generally believed to be so narrow, so local, so dependent on statutes, as to make it unprofitable for law school instruction. A great

† Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1926; J.D., University of Michigan, 1937. Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois.