EDITOR’S NOTE

As the reader will undoubtedly notice, this issue of the Review places special emphasis on Maryland statutory and constitutional problems. M. Peter Moser’s article, County Home Rule — Sharing The State’s Legislative Power With Maryland Counties, focuses on one of the foremost of these problems, the impotence of local government in Maryland. Mr. Moser, who was the chairman of the Local Government Committee of the recent Constitutional Convention, advocates the adoption of a system of constitutional home rule similar to that embodied in the aborted proposed new Maryland Constitution. His article presents a penetrating analysis of the specific problems facing local governments in this age of rapid urbanization and explains how these problems could be more effectively dealt with under a shared powers system of local home rule. Coming, as it does, in the wake of Maryland’s most unsuccessful attempt at constitutional reform, Mr. Moser’s article hopefully will provoke a renewed interest in constitutional solutions to the acute problems facing units of local government in Maryland.
Professor Lewis D. Asper's highly perceptive review of Lon L. Fuller's noted work, *Legal Fictions*, provides a fascinating introduction to what is perhaps the most singular phenomenon of legal thought, the legal fiction. Professor Asper points out the major contribution of the book — the recognition of the fiction as a legitimate tool for legal reasoning.

One of the most perplexing of all Maryland statutory schemes is that which governs the judicial dissolution of corporations on the ground of misconduct by controlling corporate interests. The Review's current student presentation, *Corporate Dissolution For Illegal, Oppressive or Fraudulent Acts: The Maryland Solution*, analyzes the difficulties presented by the vague standard for involuntary dissolution for corporate misconduct provided in the new Maryland Corporation Law and attempts to assist Maryland courts in interpreting that standard by examining the interpretations adopted in states with similar statutory arrangements.

Two other student Notes isolate specific constitutional limitations on the form and content of funding legislation passed by the Maryland General Assembly, the "single work, object or purpose" clause and the "credit clause." The current issue is not, however, totally restricted to the Maryland scene; it offers a student Note exploring one of the truly hazy areas of federal jurisdiction, the availability of federal courts in cases involving domestic relations. Another student Note highlights the recent decision of the Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in *Larsen v. General Motors Corp.*, describing its effect on the anachronistic legal formulations previously employed in cases involving the liability of automobile manufacturers for negligent design.

The Review is currently planning to publish, in the Spring, 1969 edition, a symposium dealing with the legal problems presented by the severe urban crisis facing our nation today. The symposium will include articles by prominent lawyers and professors, as well as timely student material, and will place special emphasis on the specific urban problems confronting the City of Baltimore. The Review feels that the symposium will contribute significantly to the clarification of some of these pressing problems.