
good attorneys (the majority cannot afford top legal talent and are ineligible for legal aid). Frankel would require trial lawyers to expose false evidence, even if this implicates a client. This duty has already been imposed on federal government lawyers. Frankel would also ease the severity of sentences for those who persist in seeking a trial—thereby lessening the incentive to plea bargain. Finally, he favors a federally funded legal service available not just to the poor but to all, in both criminal and civil suits. The public might balk at such substantial government investment in lawyers. But it would be the average taxpayer who would gain greater access to the courts, now constricted by the steep costs of litigation.

—John T. Noonan ('80)

**SOCIAL JUSTICE AND
THE LIBERAL STATE**

by Bruce A. Ackerman
Yale, 1980
393 pp. \$17.50

No one is entitled to say that he is better than anyone else. Nor is one person's view of the "good life" superior to another's. Through a series of imaginary dialogues based on these premises, Ackerman, a Yale law professor, attempts to show that liberal ideals—e.g., equal distribution of economic resources and equality of educational opportunity—can be rationally defended against all rival theories. Ackerman's conversations take place among the planners of a hypothetical society; they touch on such topics as population policy, abortion, education, and the limits of parental authority. Some readers (especially meritocrats) may find their views inadequately represented in the refined abstractions of Ackerman's egalitarian "planners." But this work surely joins social philosophy's Big Books list—so recently augmented by John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* (1971) and Robert Nozick's *Anarchy, State and Utopia* (1974).

—Peter Singer ('79)