

1961

## Book Reviews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

*Book Reviews*, 29 Fordham L. Rev. 783 (1961).

Available at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol29/iss4/14>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in Fordham Law Review by an authorized editor of FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. For more information, please contact [tmelnick@law.fordham.edu](mailto:tmelnick@law.fordham.edu).

## BOOKS REVIEWED

*Metropolis 1985*. Raymond Vernon. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1960. Pp. 252. \$5.00.

One of the most significant phenomena of the twentieth century in the United States has been the development and growth of the metropolitan area. The transformation of our country from a predominantly agricultural to a predominantly industrial society was the significant nineteenth century phenomenon; it brought massive changes in our Nation, altered its position in the world and changed the world itself. From the standpoint of our internal order, the development of the metropolitan areas promises to be its twentieth century equivalent.

The metropolitan area phenomenon is limited to no single locality. The great cities all over the country have become centers of metropolitan areas, and in many cases, the metropolitan areas, spawned by cities, promise to dominate the cities themselves.

Until recent times, there was almost a sharp line dividing the urban centers from the rural areas. The central cities were the areas of teeming populations. The suburban areas which surrounded the cities are now rapidly outdistancing the cities themselves in population growth. The automobile, the growth of electrical power, the development of networks of highways and the spread of industry and trade to the burgeoning suburbs have changed all this radically. Ninety per cent of the population growth over the past twenty years has taken place in the urban regions of our country, which now contain seventy per cent of our population, and this change has taken place, not in the central cities, but in their suburbs. This, as Luther Gulick has pointed out, is just the beginning. "We are now, and for the long future, an urban, industrial people living in a new pattern of expanded metropolitan settlement."<sup>1</sup>

The 1960 census revealed that New York City has been outgrown in population by its suburbs. Between 1950 and 1960, the New York City metropolitan region experienced a population growth of 13.3 per cent and New York City itself has experienced a population decline of 1.4 per cent.<sup>2</sup>

The growth of the metropolitan area generates a host of problems. Transportation systems, educational institutions, public facilities, water and sewage systems must be adjusted to meet the change. Over-all, this is the problem of providing the appropriate governmental patterns and fiscal resources with which to meet them.

It is no longer sufficient, as it was at the turn of the century, to consolidate two adjoining cities like Brooklyn and Manhattan into a single governmental unit. A single government for the vast metropolitan region, even that part which lies wholly within a single state and is, therefore, subject to that state's laws, would be too large to operate efficiently and too remote from the people governed to permit the proper development of a democratic society. Population growth pays no attention to geographical political boundaries, and metropolitan areas cross state lines, further complicating governmental problems.

The metropolitan area has been receiving increasingly great attention over the past generation. It has been the subject of a plethora of studies, surveys, and speeches. The present work, *Metropolis 1985*, is the key volume of a series of separate works undertaken by the Graduate School of Public Administration of Harvard University for the Regional Plan Association. Here is contained a detailed, careful analysis of the origin

---

1. Gulick, Goals for Metropolis, 49 Nat'l Civic Rev. 586 (1960).

2. Slote, Population Changes of Counties and Major Municipalities in the Metropolitan Region, 1950-1960 (Metropolitan Regional Council, Feb. 1961).

and growth of the New York City metropolitan region. Undoubtedly, the study will form the basis for important decisions which, in turn, will affect the future of the New York metropolitan region.

Never before has an urban area been subjected to such close and exhaustive study. A large team of skilled economists, sociologists, demologists, and planners have examined the New York metropolitan region, its population, its industry, and its institutions, with enormous concentration. These factors have been tabulated, charted, analyzed, and compared. Vast quantities of statistical material have been compiled and assayed. A multitude of questionnaires have been processed. All that is lacking in this study is an examination of the impact made upon the growth and development of the region by the human personalities who played a significant roll in its history, from Peter Cooper to Robert Moses.

Yet, despite the enormous resources and the technological devices available to the study, the reader who takes the title *Metropolis 1985* as a promise of the revelation of things to come, is doomed to disappointment. Professor Vernon's predictions are not only modest in scope but tentative in quality, and even the guarded forecasts he makes are limited by a disclaimer almost broad enough to cancel them out.

Cautious as the predictions are, they are related not to the actual New York metropolitan region but to a constructed "model," which presumably is an idealized version of the region. Lest the reader be misled into enthusiasm, there is a final *caveat*: "Wars, depressions, and acts of God are excluded from his model; great unforeseen changes in technology, analogous to the invention of the automobile, are left out of account; massive shifts in public policy, such as accompanied the New Deal, are excluded." (p. 195)

Since the foregoing *caveat* is made up entirely of factors which, on the basis of the past twenty-five years, may be expected within the next twenty-five years, and since most people recognize that we are on the brink of a technological revolution the like of which the world has never seen, the study's prediction of things to come would seem to have a value reaching close to the vanishing point. This, however, should not disturb the reader too much, for the predictions themselves are not of the vast sweep which the title of the work would suggest. They consist of a tentative, qualified promise that by 1985, the population of the region will increase from 15.1 million to 22 million, while the population of New York City itself will continue to decline; the region will experience an out-migration; nonmanufacturing employment will grow far beyond the national rate and manufacturing employment in the central city will continue to decline. (pp. 203-06)

Insufficient attention is given in the work to the enormous adaptability of governmental institutions which has been characteristic of New York. As problems change from city problems to metropolitan area problems, new governmental instrumentalities have been created to deal with them. Since the Port of New York Compact of 1921,<sup>3</sup> out of which the Port of New York Authority arose, dozens of special government agencies and special governmental devices for cooperative effort among the community elements of metropolitan regions in New York State have come into existence.<sup>4</sup> There is at present pending in the New Jersey<sup>5</sup> and Connecticut<sup>6</sup> Legislatures a bill to establish a New York

---

3. 42 Stat. 174 (1921); N.J. Stat. Ann. §§ 32:1-1 to -3 (1940); N.Y. Unconsol. Laws §§ 6401-23 (McKinney 1953).

4. See Leach, *The Federal Government and Interstate Compacts*, 29 *Fordham L. Rev.* 421 (1961).

5. N.J. Senate No. 60 (1961).

6. Conn. Gen. Assembly No. 4435 (1961).

metropolitan regional council, and a similar bill was introduced in the 1961 session of the New York State Legislature<sup>7</sup>, but failed to pass.

Vast programs of urban renewal are underway in New York City itself and a new agency of government, the New York City Housing and Urban Renewal Board, was created only last year to deal with the subject.<sup>8</sup> The federal government, the New York State government, and the New York City government have committed large portions of their vast resources to urban renewal, and, prompted both by the need to rebuild our cities and the threat of economic recession, even larger sums will be committed to this endeavor in the future. To those interested in the future of our urban areas, the most exciting documentation of the present and proposals for the future of the cities is contained in the President's recent special message to Congress on this subject.<sup>9</sup>

It has become obvious that new governmental devices and institutions are essential to deal with the metropolitan areas in general and the New York City metropolitan region in particular. It is recognized that the creation of a super-government which would destroy local autonomy and bring with it the evils of absentee government is not the solution. Some form of federalism among the central city government and the governments of the surrounding communities which make up metropolitan areas to deal with specific problems common to particular metropolitan regions and beyond the control of its individual constituent communities, is suggested. Los Angeles metropolitan county offers an interesting example of how this can operate and so does metropolitan Miami.

This suggestion has been made before, perhaps most persuasively by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, namely:

There is no single formula or pattern of government which is ideal for all metropolitan areas in our country. The reformulation of American political institutions in metropolitan areas is just beginning to emerge. Whatever the eventual forms, the Committee sees the need for modernizing our governmental structures in metropolitan areas. The Committee believes that we must adapt our local governments in metropolitan areas so as to enable them to carry out more efficiently and effectively those public responsibilities which are clearly metropolitan in scope.

There are three basic reasons for advancing this position. First, there are grounds for believing that an integrated approach to area-wide problems such as transportation is, over the long-run, more efficient and economical per unit of service provided. Second, there are a number of problems which are not being met adequately or at all for lack of a metropolitan approach. For example, there are few if any metropolitan areas which have a public policy with regard to the provision of open space for future development and recreational needs. Third, we believe that these problems are of such mounting importance that sooner or later they will compel governmental action.<sup>10</sup>

The pending proposal to afford legislative status to the *ad hoc* New York Metropolitan Regional Council, as a governmental study, consultation and service agency for the region is an appropriate beginning for the kind of joint cooperative effort which the region needs and will need even more in the future.

W. BERNARD RICHLAND\*

---

7. N.Y. Assembly Int. 4993 (1961).

8. N.Y. Sess. Laws 1960, ch. 1069. It has been re-established as a permanent agency by N.Y. Sess. Laws 1961, ch. 375.

9. 107 Cong. Rec. 340d (daily ed. March 9, 1961).

10. Guiding Metropolitan Growth, pp. 42-43 (1960).

\* Member of the New York Bar; former Assistant Corporation Counsel of New York City; Member, Committee on Home Rule, New York State Office of Local Government.

**River Basin Administration and the Delaware.** Roscoe C. Martin, Guthrie S. Birkhead, Jesse Burkhead, and Frank J. Munger. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press. 1960. Pp. xii, 390. \$5.00.

This strikes me as a first-rate book. It is the joint product of three political scientists and an economist, all of whom are members of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. It is written with an almost complete absence of jargon, double-talk, and vague generalities which so frequently characterize such academic team research reports. The materials are well organized, presented in an interesting and quite readable fashion, and reflect thorough research, sound scholarship and a wide knowledge of the subject, politics, and human affairs. The conclusions and recommendations are concrete and realistic.

The book represents a thorough revision of a report made under a 1957 contract between Syracuse University and the Water Research Foundation for the Delaware River Basin (formerly Delaware River Basin Research, Inc.) for a study of "governmental organization for development of the water resources of the Delaware River." (p. v) The study included a review of relevant literature and documentary materials, field trips and interviews, the use of individual consultants, and subcontracts for research by other organizations, such as the United States Census Bureau. The authors cooperated with the United States Corps of Engineers which had also undertaken a Comprehensive Survey of the Delaware River Basin.

The book examines "river basin administration and the functions of water-resource management, and analyzes their import for the organization of government." (p. 4) It is a study of "the concept of river basin administration, of American experience in that field, of the problems encountered and the lessons learned." (p. 4) The authors are convinced that the problem is "national in scope and significance . . . worthy of the time and attention of the representatives of all the people." (p. 4) Their focus, therefore, is on "river administration as a national problem." (p. 4) The authors conclude that "an overwhelming majority of all existing governments are unequal to the tasks of water-resource administration on any save a limited, local basis" (p. 3), but they find in the river basin an area on which the "management of a broad, water-related program may appropriately be centered" (p. 4).

Viewed simply as a river, the Delaware is not impressive. It is but one-sixth as long (330 miles) as the Rio Grande and carries only one-fifteenth as much water as the Columbia. From the standpoint of a basin, its drainage area is comparatively small—about 12,765 square miles, or less than one-fortieth of the Missouri. Its service area is somewhat larger, however, since New York City is now authorized by a Supreme Court decree to make substantial daily withdrawals of Delaware water for use in the Hudson Valley.<sup>1</sup> The states which, therefore, have a substantial interest in its future are Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware.

Actually, in the number of people served by its waters and the economic importance of their activities, the Delaware ranks first among American rivers. The basin's population is about six million, but over twenty-one million live in its service area and provide one-seventh of the employed working force of the country and receive one-sixth of the Nation's aggregate personal income. New York City and Philadelphia both drink its water. Density of population and industrial concentration characterize its basin, although the Upper Valley is dominated by recreation and agriculture and is sparsely populated. The economy is a mature one, whose chief problem is not rapid development but rather maintenance of parity of growth with other sections of the country.

---

1. *New Jersey v. New York*, 283 U.S. 336, 805 (1931). The original decree has subsequently been modified by the Court to allow New York additional water. 347 U.S. 995 (1954).

Today the functions of the river include navigation, irrigation, water supply, waste disposal, recreation, and power. The central problems of the river revolve around quantity and quality control of its waters. There may be either too much (the worst floods in its history occurred in 1955) or too little water (as in 1957) at a given place at a given time. Quality wise, pollution from industrial and municipal wastes is or has been present in many forms.

The authors assert that there is a definite need for administration of the Delaware's water resources by a basin-wide agency with jurisdiction over water and related activities. The new agency would have an overview of basin water problems, plan a comprehensive water program, and assist in effectuating the plan. It would build on and strengthen all existing national, state and local agencies and programs, in particular, attempting to supply the leadership which is now lacking. The existing panoply of government—wide and varied as it is—is “fatally lacking, both in organization and in program scope, in capacity to deal with regional water problems.” (p. 7) The proposed new agency would have important functions in research and data collection, in planning, and in representation and information (the public advocacy of intelligent water use). Its responsibilities would also include the design, erection and operation of major dams and reservoirs and other necessary structures, permitting adjustments for floods, control of withdrawals and diversions, quality control of water, and, to a limited extent, recreation, power, fish and wildlife, and watershed management. Of one thing the authors are confident: “The dominant features of the Delaware Valley and the determinants of its water problems over the next half century will be growth and change,” requiring “dynamic policies and administrative devices.” (p. 89)

The authors point out that water development is not, at present, the key to economic growth in this area. Not until 1980 are there likely to be any serious shortages, so there is time to plan and build wisely, without being forced into ill-considered action by an overpowering crisis. In fact, permanent priorities for water use cannot and should not be set today for the area. Moreover, interagency and intergovernmental conflicts, which so often are immovable blocks to rational action in water development, as in the Missouri basin, have not yet hardened to such a point here. On the other hand, progress to date has hardly been spectacular in area development of the Delaware basin. Attempts to achieve cooperation of the states in the basin-wide program through an interstate compact have so far met with no success. This has been largely because of failure to agree upon allocation of water among the states, which have preferred to rely upon the Supreme Court to handle the matter. In addition, the states have been hostile to the public power potential and to any action by the federal government—the two most promising sources of revenue. Moreover, regional leadership has simply not been as energetic as required. There is no single agency today for management of the basin's water resources, nor any comprehensive plan for use and management of these resources.

The authors are, I think, realistic in their appraisal of the situation. They emphasize that a river basin generally fails to impress people residing there, especially in the humid East, as an entity with important public problems. Regional spirit is not apt to emerge. Indeed, within the basin there may be sharp differences such as upstream-downstream, urban-rural, agricultural-industrial. Strong regional consensus on a given issue is most difficult to achieve. Most leadership is uniformly in favor of the status quo, of preserving the prerogatives and functions of the hundreds of governmental and private units and agencies already operating in the basin. The “forces normally arrayed in opposition to regional action are very strong”—the “bureaucracy, federal, state and local, may be expected to line up almost solidly in opposition,” forming “an almost solid phalanx of official opposition.” (p. 333) There are also difficult legal problems to be faced, growing out of our federal system, which simply does not provide effective recognition for a

regional organization larger than one state but smaller than the Nation. We traditionally look to a local, state, or national agency for action. The dogma of states rights is apt to rear its head. Moreover, the concept of a basin-wide agency is directly contrary to a tradition of "grass roots," of favoring "little government" and rejecting "big government." Indeed, the authors stress that in the past it has taken an actual catastrophe (such as a flood) or economic crisis (the Great Depression), coupled with strong leadership by a public official and a "very considerable windfall" (p. 328), in the form of a substantial financial contribution by the federal government, to bring about effective action on river development problems. The states, thus far, have generally failed to supply the necessary leadership, financial support, and organization (through interstate compacts) to solve these problems. In fact, "the federal government has been the moving force in most significant basin developments." (p. 332)

The authors recommend a "two-phase organizational plan." (p. 341) The first phase is passage of a federal statute to create a new federal agency, the Delaware River Agency for Water (DRAW). This law, they hope, can be quickly enacted. The agency would have both state and federal representatives on it, would collect data, prepare and keep current a comprehensive development plan for water in the basin, design, build and operate water control structures on the river, protect and improve the quality of the river water, and control withdrawals and diversions. It would be supported by both state and federal funds.

The second phase would be a federal interstate compact for a Delaware River Commission (DRC) to replace the foregoing agency. Such a compact would be the specific work of a drafting commission and might require several years for completion and final adoption. It would also provide for an Intergovernmental Advisory Commission (IRC).

What are the chances for adoption of this recommended program? The authors face up to this crucial question in the final chapter, and, in particular, attempt to assess the political factors involved. They recognize that to date the states have not played a major role in water problems, and that almost by default, often without conscious planning, the federal government has assumed many responsibilities for flood control, navigation, irrigation, drainage, and, to a lesser extent, pollution, power, and recreation. Will the federal government act here? Most state officials assume so, but the authors point out that the large congressional delegations from the states interested have not, traditionally, been active in water problems. By tacit agreement, they have let Western congressmen take the leading role here, and it seems unlikely that the West will allow its traditional national policies in favor of public power and a dominant federal role, to be modified or endangered merely to meet the different wishes of the Delaware River Basin.

A far more serious question, in my judgment, is whether the states will act. Will they provide their share of the required financial support needed, or will they look entirely to the federal treasury, in view of other current demands upon state resources which seem far more urgent? True, the states would not be adverse to controlling the development if the federal government paid for it, but will the federal government look with favor on such a solution? And will the states be able to reach the necessary agreements on water allocation so that an interstate compact is possible? One wonders if the second phase advocated by the authors will ever be achieved if the first phase is actually successful.

Some dams will certainly be built and more steps toward further control of the river surely will be taken in the future. Will these steps be taken, as in the past, as a formless pattern of management, or as part of a rational administration? The answer, in the words of the authors, depends upon "leadership within the Delaware Valley able to comprehend and willing to grasp the opportunity offered." (p. 382) This book provides

a penetrating analysis of the problem and a well-conceived plan of possible action for such leaders.

ROBERT KRAMER\*

**The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas.** Robert H. Connery and Richard H. Leach. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Pp. x, 275. \$4.75.

When George Washington was inaugurated President, the Nation's largest urban area was New York City, which contained 33,000 inhabitants.<sup>1</sup> The total population of this vast country numbered less than four million people.<sup>2</sup> Yet Thomas Jefferson confidently predicted that Americans would "settle the lands in spite of everybody."<sup>3</sup>

Between 1790 and 1950 the number of "urban places"<sup>4</sup> has climbed from a bare twenty-four to 4,700, and the percentage of our Nation's population living in urban areas has risen from a meager five per cent in 1790 to sixty-four per cent in 1950.<sup>5</sup> Since 1900, each census has confirmed the suspected fact that an increasingly greater number of Americans are living in metropolitan centers.<sup>6</sup> Presently, we are confronted by the joint phenomena of the exploding metropolis<sup>7</sup> and of urbanism as a growing way of life.<sup>8</sup> In fact, metropolis itself is gradually being swallowed by megalopolis, which, in its basic form, consists of an "urban place" having a population of some thirty-six million, confined within that 600 miles which stretches from the north of Boston to the south of Washington, D.C.<sup>9</sup>

Megalopolis will probably not be the sole dominion of the East. Predictions vary, but if our normal population growth continues for the next four decades, the United States

---

\* Dean, George Washington University Law School; Assistant Attorney General of the United States, 1959-1961; Member of the New York and District of Columbia Bars.

1. II Census of Population, Characteristics of the Population, Part 32-S, Table 4 (1950).

2. 1 Morrison & Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic 790* (1957). The figure for 1790 was 3,929,214, and today, of course, New York City numbers twice that figure.

3. Robbins, *Our Landed Heritage: The Public Domain, 1776-1936*, 91 (1942). Jefferson's words have a grain of universal truth and need not have been restricted to the continental United States. See Cock, *Human Fertility: The Modern Dilemma* (1951). Internationally, the problem is particularly grave for the so-called "underdeveloped" nations. It has been said that "no realistic discussion of economic development can fail to note that development efforts in many areas of the world are being offset by increasingly rapid population growth." President's Comm. to Study the United States Military Assistance Program, *Third Interim Report, Economic Assistance Programs and Administration* 42 (1959). Nor can the problem be likened to the old soldier who simply fades away. At the beginning of the Christian era, world population numbered only 250 million; today it exceeds two and one-half billion, and by year 2000, conservative estimates predict an excess of six billion earthlings! See Shimm, *Foreword to Population Control*, 23 *Law & Contemp. Prob.* (1960).

4. In 1790, an "urban place" consisted of a "place" having a population of 2,500 or more.

5. See Bremer, *The Homes of the New World: Impressions of America* 47 (1854); Connery & Leach, *The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas* 2 (1960).

6. Bogue, *Population Growth in Standard Metropolitan Areas, 1900-1950*, 9 (1953).

7. Fortune Editors, *The Exploding Metropolis* (1958).

8. Wirth, *Urbanism As a Way of Life*, in Hatt & Reiss, *Cities and Society* 46 (1957).

9. See Martin, *Cities Six-Hundred Miles Long*, 2 *Current Munic. Prob.* 65 (1961).

will probably have 320 million inhabitants. By then, America's megalopoli will contain 107 million people—one-third the Nation's total.<sup>10</sup> By the year 2000, urbanites will probably number eighty-five per cent of the total population, which means not only more people, but more people living in a relatively limited number of metropolitan centers.<sup>11</sup> This population growth will require an additional 55,000 square miles of land adjacent to our cities, or the equivalent of the entire land area of the State of Illinois!<sup>12</sup>

It is evident that the current and enduring problems facing our polity stem, in the main, from massive numbers of people living closer together. It is also clear that the denser concentrations of people possess an increasing mobility based on the widespread dispersal of the means of transportation and communication. Bound up together, this package of forces generates staggering political and social problems for the Nation.<sup>13</sup> Too often population growth rates and their implications have been conveniently ignored, while the creative fertility of Americans has been generating some of the most sensitive and potentially disruptive internal problems imaginable.<sup>14</sup> They simply cannot be resolved by imitating the wisdom of the ostrich. A quest to find amenable solutions must involve government, and any answer will require a high degree of cooperation and coordinated effort on the part of all governmental units—federal, state and local. The role of the federal government in relation to local governmental units ought to be examined anew so that we might find new remedies to fulfill the emerging urban needs. This re-examination, coupled with several proposals of their own, is the goal of Professors Connery and Leach in *The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas*.

The authors quickly examine the roles of older lobbies in Washington concerned with federal-local relations regarding specific federal aid programs, and then review the historical growth of such federal programs as urban renewal, highways, water and air pollution, housing, recreation, and civil defense. Underscored is the fact that some programs have grown enormously in scale, generating complex coordination problems, e.g., highways and urban renewal, while other programs have remained at the lip service level, e.g., civil defense. The tragedy of the piecemeal approach inherent in our current federal aid programs is clearly revealed.

The authors indicate that the entire area of federal-metropolitan relations has been unduly complicated by reason that metropolitan problems are not handled by metropolitan governing units with powers equal in scope and authority to the issues. Few metropolitan units have separate corporate existence with the requisite power to deal with the

---

10. Pickard, *Metropolitanization of the United States* 8 (1959); see also Harlow, *The Growth of the United States* (1943); Hatt & Reiss, *Cities and Society* (1957).

11. See Wirth, *op. cit. supra* note 8. "We have grown in the last decade by an amount nearly equal to our entire population one hundred years ago." Schlesinger, *The Big Issue*, *Progressive*, Sept. 1960, p. 9.

12. Assuming an over-all average population density of new growth areas at 2,500 persons per square mile. Pickard, *op. cit. supra* note 10. See Fordham, *Decision-Making in Expanding American Urban Life*, 21 *Ohio St. L.J.* 274 (1960).

13. See Miller, *Some Observations on the Political Economy of Population Growth*, 25 *Law & Contemp. Prob.* 614 (1960); Sulloway, *The Legal and Political Aspects of Population Control in the United States*, 25 *Law & Contemp. Prob.* 593 (1960).

14. See Anonymous, *The Impact of Uncontrolled Birth on Our Democratic Processes*, 21 *The Humanist* 3 (1961). It has also been noted that "the growth of world population during the next twenty-five years, therefore, has an importance which transcends economic and social considerations. It is at the very heart of our existence." U.N. Dept't of Economic and Social Affairs, *The Future Growth of World Populations*, preface (ST/SO/Ser. A/28) (U.N. Pub. Sales No. 1958. XIII. 2).

issues. Hence, fragmented local governments are left to cope with problems transcending their municipal boundaries, and no coordinated attack has been achieved. The result, not too surprising, is often an *ad hoc*, hit or miss solution. Consequently, it becomes clear that only by using a new pattern of local organization—a metropolitan unit invested with adequate power—can real progress be made. (p. 58)

With this foundation established, the authors put forth the book's underlying theme. Reluctantly, step by step, the federal government has been pushed into the limelight on the metropolitan stage. Urban problems have become genuinely national in their scope, and the federal government can no longer retire into the wings. The states simply have neither the proper legislative representation nor the required funds to solve the tremendous problems of slum clearance, transportation, and so on, posed by modern metropolitanism. (p. 199) In addition, the overriding influence of our national tax system has taken us well along the way toward making a single economic unit of the whole Nation. Consequently, "the federal treasury in one way or another will have to bear a substantial portion of the costs of the nation's adjustment to 'the day of the metropolis.'" (p. 61) The federal government must participate and lead the way; therefore, the relations between it and the governments of metropolitan units assume critical significance.

In surveying the already existing relations, Connery and Leach analyze the lobbying activities by representatives of metropolitan interests (p. 63); they then move on to congressional (p. 94) and presidential (p. 129) relations with existing metropolitan areas. They find that the sum of lobbying efforts has culminated in atomized federal policies, responding to individual needs on a piecemeal basis, while neglecting the over-all impact of a federal program. Congress has failed to obviate this difficulty because it has responded to, rather than coordinated, the atomistic lobbying pressures. Dismal, too, is the author's opinion that no recent President has recognized urbanism itself as a major governmental problem requiring a comprehensive approach. Their conclusion and recommendation can easily be captured: "Only by seeing the forest as a whole can the work on each tree have any value in the long run." (p. 93)

The authors make several suggestions. They believe that the need for federal policies on urban areas, qua urban areas, has been amply demonstrated and, therefore, such policies should be devised immediately. The authors contend that metropolitan planning programs must be created and encouraged, and further, that Washington, D.C., ought to be considered as a federal test tube for establishing programs dedicated to solving metropolitan problems. Secondly, they propose a Council of Metropolitan Affairs similar to the Council of Economic Advisors. Thirdly, they reject the notion that a separate federal department of urban affairs ought to be set up, saying that it "does not make political sense" (p. 192) and that its administration would be too unwieldy.

The arguments in the book are certainly cogent; the chapters and verses are clear and succinct. Yet at least one fault is to be noted.<sup>15</sup> The plea is often heard that eighteen million farmers have a Department of Agriculture and, therefore, a hundred million urbanites should have a Department of Urban Affairs with some semblance of equal representation in the President's cabinet. Connery and Leach dismiss proposals along these lines, arguing that they necessarily involve organizing a complete government within a government which would then concern itself with the metropolitan aspects of labor, health, welfare, education, commerce, and the like. Looked upon in this light,

15. The other faults of this book are few. However, the methodology of Connery and Leach has been criticized by Charles Adrian, *Book Review*, 54 *Am. Pol. Sci. Rev.* 765 (1960), as well as the analogy drawn between the Council of Economic Advisors and the authors' proposal of a Council on Metropolitan Areas. Leven, *Book Review*, 26 *J. Am. Inst. Planners* 230 (1960).

they believe the idea politically impossible, because no single department could be vested with all responsibility for all metropolitan affairs. While they are correct in saying that such a department would constitute a government within a government, they, in effect, demolish a straw man. Most serious proposals for a Department of Urban Affairs do not seek to create a sole agency to deal with *all* urban affairs. They are more modest. The proposals usually seek to establish a department dealing only with certain aspects, viz., coordinating federal-local approaches to urban planning, development and housing, including urban renewal, disaster loans and community transit. This narrower package is politically feasible, and with some significant additions, merely formalizes the programs already existing under the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This book ought to be considered, because much thought has gone into it. The volume does adumbrate clues for a proper approach to megalopolis. The authors have produced a readable and significant work deserving the attention of all who are concerned with the federal aspects of meeting emerging urban needs.

ARVAL A. MORRIS\*

---

\* Professor of Law, University of Washington Law School.