

aggravate both concerns while also providing means for assuaging them. The Declaration of Policy of the Employment Act of 1946 provides a convenient framework for the design and implementation of Federal programs pertaining to jobs.

While progress toward the monitored economy is not widely endorsed as such,³ it is abetted by common attitudes and by innumerable governmental decisions having specific objectives that may seem to be unrelated or even to have an opposite import. When steps are discussed and taken to promote the national safety or the general availability of jobs, it may be natural to assign too little weight to conjectural negative long-run implications and to contemplate the particular intended benefits with too much optimism. Ideological erosion of the two-party system by "me-tooism" in domestic affairs and by bipartisanship in the international sphere is both a cause and effect of the general underappreciation of the adverse concomitants of remedial action. It is both a cause and effect of complacency, consensus, and conformity, and of their identification with the "public interest."

If the trend toward a monitored economy is indeed inexorable, the parameters of such an economy are, surely, also plastic. In looking ahead to, say, the 1980s, one need not be resigned to an unhappy rendezvous with destiny in 1984. The future can be invented—or prevented—in some degree, even in the social realm. Those who prefer what is nowadays disparaged as "Puritan ethic" to an inchoate but ominous "American gothic" need not yet despair. As citizens and by legal means, they can act, with some hope of success, to slow the trend toward guideline monitoring (by seeking occasional reversals and detours) and to channel the trend into more benign, and away from less liberal, paths.⁴

The primary focus in this paper on the longer run hardly precludes acknowledgment of the current venture into guideline monitoring and the problems besetting it. Indeed, the present monitoring program is not assumed here to be dying or dead, even though any daily newspaper or weekly magazine so assures us. Accordingly, this paper is intended in part to be responsive to the challenge issued in the spring of 1966 by the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers:

If we do not like the current voluntary controls, we need alternatives which are constructive and superior. All of us in government will appreciate your participation in helping us to find them.⁵

³ In the first of his recent Reith lectures, J. K. Galbraith has observed, particularly with reference to the United States, "where faith in free enterprise is one of the minor branches of theology, . . . evolution may well be a better source of socialism than ideological passion." He includes wage and price restraint among the examples of our government's expanding economic role. He emphasizes the "strongly convergent tendencies as between industrial societies . . . despite their very different billing as capitalist or socialist or communist." See *The Listener*, November 17, 1966, pp. 711–714.

⁴ Economists who missed or do not recall the brief preface to the second edition (1946) of Schumpeter's *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* may find it still worth reading.

⁵ Gardner Ackley, "The Contribution of Guidelines," in *Guidelines*, p. 78.