

speeding or delaying outlays for deferrable projects. It has a large variety of programs and roles, and it reaches into every significant industry and every geographic area. It could more deliberately, even more "responsibly," affect the supply of, and demand for, the scarcer services (for example, in the health field) and the prices at which they are provided. Serious and sustained advertisement of the price-wage-productivity macro-truisms could meanwhile be contributing to a favorable public climate for labor-management discussions and pricing decisions.

In retrospect, historians of the current guideline venture may, of course, decide that what the preceding paragraph proposes was essentially the strategy that had been pursued. They will see more clearly that the public collisions of government with industry and labor were actually very few. They may record that these collisions had far less decisive effect than the unexciting and hardly publicized day-to-day actions of government and private officials. Can we learn this lesson in advance and use it to slow the transition to a monitored economy or to render that economy more benign?

*On Private Vigilance.* Our third point refers mainly to the private posture regarding guidelines. (We say "mainly" even though state and local governments do not necessarily have to relax into roles as Federal satellites and can still compete meaningfully and appropriately with Federal power in service of the public. This possibility should be understood although the word "government" is often used, in this paper as elsewhere, as if the different political jurisdictions really make up a monolithic system, or as if only the Federal power is pertinent.) The actions and positions of individuals and organizations can surely influence the shape of a guideline system, affect its administration, and condition its evolution and viability.

The definition of social "responsibility," it is worth remembering, is not yet an exclusive Federal prerogative. Private groups so minded can continue to uphold and propagate a concept that tolerates unequal achievement with equal opportunity, that contemplates wide diversity of economic behavior in pursuit of private advantage within a framework of evolving law and with due regard to the common weal. Furthermore, government behavior itself still is, and ought to remain, subject to review, criticism, and rebuke by the citizenry; and the standard of "responsibility" applied by "the people" need not be the same as the one fostered by whatever public officials happen to be in charge.

The monitor, in short, can still be monitored, but private economic and political muscles have to be exercised diligently and regularly if atrophy is to be avoided. In particular, private groups may wish to insist on flexibility in wage and price determinations, with bargaining assigned its familiar role though tempered by macropreachment. This flexibility, of course, can prove algebraically compatible with the establishment of, and more uniform adherence to, national norms. Private groups, furthermore, ought to find reassuring the apparent effect of their earlier adverse reactions to jawbone weapon-play in the administration of the current guideline program. Official