

Future of Government in the United States, The: Essays in Honor of Charles E. Merriam. Edited by Leonard D. White.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. xvi, 274. \$3.50.

This collection of essays, written in honor of Charles E. Merriam by a group of his former students, is a striking tribute to the range of interests and the stimulating imagination of the man who taught them. Each scholar properly pays a debt, in his or her own particular field of work, not only to the teacher who guided the student, but to the thinker who has made some significant contribution to that particular aspect of the study of politics.

The first essay is autobiographical; Merriam traces the course of his thought and experience from early schooling through his first scholarly work in the field of political theory, and on to his experience in practical politics and administration. The present-day student of politics must note with admiration, perhaps with amazement as well, how the tale of these activities parallels the development of new methods of study and research in political science, and indeed, in the whole realm of the social sciences. The remaining essays in the book likewise reflect this expanding range of interests, and show the solid fruit of the new purposes and methods.

The substance of the book as a whole may be described in a few categories. The classic subject of political theory is represented by Hyman Cohen's discussion of sovereignty, which sets forth the present status of the concept in the face of the growth of ideas of a world order, and the shift of authority within the state itself. Closely related to this field of philosophy is the analysis of the psychological factors in political behaviour, always a particular concern of the faculty of political science at the University of Chicago, and represented here by Harold Lasswell's essay on "The Developing Science of Democracy."

The field of public administration receives attention in all its important aspects. Albert Lepawsky brings his long study of the problems of urbanism to bear upon the prospects for the future organization of metropolitan communities; John A. Veig assesses the structure and functions of planning agencies; Joseph P. Harris studies the function of the manager in the modern state service; Leonard White, the editor of the volume, forecasts the organization, training, and functions of the public service, with attention to the possibilities of a civil service for international organization; V. O. Key tackles the knotty and eternal problem of the relation of politics and administration.

The party system and the techniques of party action are subjected to analysis. Harold Gosnell reviews the economic and social groupings that will affect the major American parties; and Louise Overacker makes a shrewd estimate of the sources from which the party war chests are filled, and the purposes for which the treasure is expended.

Two essays escape classification, but they nevertheless reflect the alertness of the author honored by the whole volume. Leo Rosten contributes a brief but suggestive analysis of the function of the press in the modern democratic state; Frederick Schuman makes a plea for American recognition of her obligations to the establishment of a stable world order.

Any reviewer must shrink from an attempt to evaluate this collection of essays.

* Professor of Public Administration, University of Chicago.

Collectively the twelve authors outnumber overwhelmingly the single critic; individually each is an expert of substantial reputation. The general subject, however, perhaps opens the way for some comment. It is the Future, and however many and distinguished these prophets, this reviewer will inhabit that future at least one-twelfth as much as they!

The marshalling of facts—even though the limitations of space require summary statement—that is shown in Miss Overacker's essay, bringing her earlier studies up to date, seems a valuable way of estimating future trends. The same method is admirably exercised by Professor White in his study of the public service, by Professor Gosnell when he examines the salient features of the parties, and by Professor Veig when he assesses the work of planning agencies. These sections of the book bring solid information to the reader at the same time that they suggest ideas. The other authors have written suggestive and penetrating commentaries, and it is doubtless this reviewer's misfortune that the elaborate terminology of Lasswell's social psychology, and even the appropriate eloquence of Schuman's forecast of America's place in world affairs, suggests less to him than do the other short studies.

These are, however, mere statements of prejudice. The book as a whole is provocative and stimulating; and is an appropriate and valuable tribute to the great scholar to whom it is dedicated.

PHILIP W. BUCK†

A Study of the Law of Opinion Evidence in Illinois. By Willard L. King and Douglas Pillinger.* Chicago: Callaghan & Co., 1942. Pp. xii, 389. \$6.00.

The writer of a legal treatise today is faced with a dilemma for which there is often no solution. The practicing attorney requires that a text be exhaustive; that it treat every point in the field which it purports to cover and consider; that, at least, it cite substantially every relevant case. Yet the increase of printed judicial opinions in the last half century has been such that principle tends to become lost in detailed treatment of any save the most minute point. As a result the recent output of legal scholarship has tended toward one or the other of two forms: the law review article intended to explore some single point of doctrine, and the multi-volume treatise which by its very size must serve as a reference work to be consulted like an encyclopedia but seldom read or studied as a whole. In this text on opinion evidence the authors have taken a middle road. By selecting for consideration a single, broad but manageable topic, and then limiting themselves to the precedents in a single state, they have been able to combine thorough and complete coverage with a clear and understandable outline. Like the late Albert Kales, they have demonstrated that, granted the necessary scholarship and understanding, an entire subject in the law can be analyzed, developed, and demonstrated from the cases of a single state.

It cannot well be doubted that the rule excluding opinion evidence deserves such careful treatment. Even those who most strongly question the justification of the rule admit its practical importance. Thus Judge Learned Hand is quoted by the authors for the proposition that the rule against opinion evidence "is the most annoying rule in its application that I know." If the most annoying of all the rules of evi-

† Professor of Political Science, Stanford University.

* Members of the Illinois Bar.