of workers actively participate in their affairs. And with the multiplicity of organizations which pervades our society there are adequate outlets for these drives even in the absence of trade union organizations.

In any event I am allergic to forecasters, particularly forecasters of the inevitable, and most particularly to forecasters of the inevitable demise of competition who start with the premise that "competition is not even potentially the best of all possible worlds."

AARON DIRECTOR*


In these days when "police state" has become one of our ugliest epithets, even so modest a pamphlet as this seems a remarkable and heartwarming phenomenon. For it is an instance of the state instructing its officers on the limits of the state's powers.

The good sense of excluding illegally obtained evidence as the sanction for illegal search and seizure has, of course, long been debated, and the debate perhaps climaxed in the varied and intense opinions in Wolf v. Colorado. In his dissent in that case, Justice Murphy dwelt in some detail on the differences in training of police officials depending on whether their jurisdiction followed the federal rule of exclusion. "If proof of the efficacy of the federal rule were needed," he said, "there is testimony in abundance in the recruit training programs and in-service courses provided the police in states which follow the federal rule." The present pamphlet, designed we are told, for peace officers of Illinois, adds some small measure of support for his view, for Mr. Cogan makes clear throughout that crucial evidence may be suppressed and the case lost if the etiquette of search and seizure is not followed.

Mr. Cogan has presented in a flat simple concise form a summary of the law in this area, but despite his efforts to outline and simplify, one cannot but wonder what the normal police officer would make of the complexity that remains. The reader-policeman might be somewhat puzzled by the author's oft repeated caution that cases are to be limited to their facts. Mr. Cogan is not overstating the difficulties of fitting together the precedents of this field into a coherent pattern. But it is difficult to believe that a set of simple and expedient rules for the police to follow could not be carved out from the welter of precedents, if only the prosecution were not insistent on exhausting to the fullest degree its constitutional power of search and seizure. In this sense, the rule of law in this area remains simple and clear.

HARRY KALVEN, JR.†
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