

of chaos. Coordination of efforts is a prime requirement for effective government action in metropolitan areas; yet the problems of coordination are compounded by the addition of higher levels of government to the fragmented local scene.

There is an implicit danger that greater reliance on Federal and State action in metropolitan areas may be a form of political abdication in which local governments wash their hands of difficult responsibilities and pass the buck to higher levels. This approach would lead to waning local influence over policies and programs that have significant local impact. Thus it is important to find ways of administering State and Federal programs within a system of democratic control in which metropolitan citizens can shape the programs that operate in their own areas.

Local communities in search of financial aid have turned mainly to the Federal Government rather than the States. The rural orientation of State legislatures has been well documented, and is only now changing to reflect recent reapportionments. For a number of reasons, the cities have found a more sympathetic hearing in Washington than in the State capital. In seeking Federal aid for urban problems, cities have tended to bypass the State and deal directly with Washington. A pattern of intergovernmental relations has developed in which cities and towns in metropolitan areas pursue largely independent policies, with a minimum of interlocal cooperation, but many engage in numerous direct dealings with the Federal Government. The State role has been lagging far behind both local and Federal activity. Yet the States occupy critical positions within the American federal system and possess the power and resources to strengthen local capacities and stimulate greater cooperation within metropolitan areas.

The new intergovernmental relationships also pose more fundamental issues for the future of the American federal system. Minimizing State participation in urban affairs is tantamount to removing State influence from a critical range of domestic issues. The federal system of the United States involves a division of powers between the States and the Federal Government. The States have created a further division by delegating powers to the local governments they have established. If the State role in this partnership is weakened, the ramifications may be far reaching. Without active State participation, it is doubtful whether local government can be reorganized to perform more effectively in metropolitan areas; the localities derive their powers from the States and need State authorization for structural reforms. More broadly, the State role in metropolitan affairs must be considered in terms of the philosophy of the federal system. The division of authority between the States and the Federal Government has served the country well in the past and has helped to safeguard the values of representative and responsible government. Basic changes in the system of intergovernmental relations should not be undertaken lightly or permitted to occur by default.

A major concern of this compendium is the proper use of the federal system in dealing with metropolitan area problems. It is necessary to consider not only the tangible problems that require solution, but also an equitable allocation of responsibilities within the federal