

also seems to be necessary for exhortation. Government, especially democratic government, depends vitally on the verbalization of truths for all, even though these truths may lack obvious handles for all who should care. It is not always appreciated that *every* President who has served since adoption of the Employment Act has had to face the dilemmas of wage-price stabilization and to acknowledge in *Economic Reports* the familiar macro-constraints of non-inflationary development.¹⁰ Intellectuals who are glandularly disposed toward activism may be intolerant of "macro-yak" by a non-favorite President or on certain topics, or in manifestos or books other than their own. What is vaguely called "freedom," however, will certainly last longer, or be displaced less traumatically by a Hegelian variety, if use of the jawbone as an instrument of public instruction keeps a much higher priority than its use as a weapon of force.

This is far from claiming that Executive macropreachment can comprise a total policy. Rather, in helping to slow the decay of contemporary-style "freedom" or to make the impending order more tolerable, exhortation can play an important political and economic role. Monitoring, as we have already seen since 1962, tends to require some hectoring; what begins as ear-stroking can end as browbeating and even worse. It would be foolish, therefore, to overlook the contribution that macropreachment can make toward establishment of a basis of public understanding of the common necessity, toward creation of the conditions of voluntarism and consent. The internalization of external constraints is certainly a preferable alternative to the open application of government sanctions against a sullen majority or a sizable stiff-necked minority. Internalization is related to puritanism and to creeds held in even lower esteem, such as communism, but it is also the essence of education and enculturation. Men still should raise a standard to which the wise and honest, and the confused, can conceivably repair even if the event is no longer believed to be in the hands of God.

The probability that methodical macropreachment would reduce the need for stern or ill-tempered administration of guidelines should not be ignored either during the remaining lifetime of the present venture or before any other monitoring effort is formulated. Indeed, it is fair to conjecture: *Whatever the informal controls may have accomplished since 1962 could probably have been accomplished, with the aid of more intensive macropreachment and with fewer dramatic "confrontations," by a system even less formal than the informal guidelines.* Instead of proclaiming and enforcing general price-wage standards, the Federal government might do just as well by (1) acting as a self-interested monopsonist and (2) more purposefully using in the broader interest the legal powers it already possesses as a creditor, guarantor, debtor, underwriter, co-financier, or policeman of antitrust. It could quietly face the steel, aluminum, and copper industries and other suppliers as a hard customer. It could influence construction prices by

¹⁰ Appendix A of *Guidelines* omits reference to guideline talk in the Truman *Economic Reports* (both annual and midyear).