

difficult for officials in Washington to defend the ICC and to a lesser extent the CAB and similar regulatory bodies.

Early in 1970 the Council of Economic Advisors took the lead in raising the deregulation trial balloon. In its Annual Economic Report, the CEA stated flatly:

The original justification for regulation - that railroads were monopolistic - has lost much of its validity since there is now considerable competition from other modes of transportation . . . A policy of permitting and encouraging competition of all kinds would, if general economic experience is any guide, make the industry more efficient as well as benefit the public.

Following CEA's lead, and spurred on by the Office of Management and Budget, the Transportation Department began "cranking CEA reports into [their] thinking." The ultimate goal is to end regulation of all air, land, and water

transportation, but the first major step will be limited to land and water - the domain of the ICC. The odds appear good that the ICC will be abolished within the next several years.

Deregulating *part* of a thoroughly regulated mixed-economy is not particularly easy, although it *can* be done, as the Canadian example demonstrated (*REA-SION*, "Trends," March 1971). U.S. railroads are expected to favor abolition of the ICC because, despite the protection they receive from it, they are harmed more by the protection it gives to trucking and waterway companies. The latter industries are among the most thoroughly protected of all U.S. industries: trucks operating on federally-built super-highways, with strong ICC-imposed barriers to free entry; and barges operating on waterways maintained at taxpayer expense by the Army Corps of Engineers. Both are determined to see the ICC's current rules restricting rail operations continue in force and will fight any moves toward deregulation.

Because of the political realities associated with such interdependencies, deregulation will probably have to be gradual. Rate deregulation would probably come last in a series of steps starting with removal of legally-imposed entry barriers, especially in trucking. A good bet is that such phased deregulation could involve tradeoffs among different modes, removing a restriction on one, while compensating a competing mode by removing a restriction on it. (Given the number of restrictions, the number of such possibilities will be limited only by bureaucratic imagination.) One example, already proposed, would let railroads lower prices to compete with waterway competition, while simultaneously allowing barge operators to mix regulated and non-regulated cargoes in the same shipment.

SOURCES:

"White House Eyes Deregulation Route," *BUSINESS WEEK*, 21 November 1970.

"Washington Report," *PRODUCT ENGINEERING*, 7 December 1970. ●

on securing liberty

Those who have spent some time defending a free society against opponents and skeptics must not underestimate the difficulty of their task. Liberty is not a self-evident value to everyone. While we might want people to grasp the worth of political freedom, the absence of coercion, and the numerous implications of these *without* difficulty, in fact the understanding of political and economic theory takes effort.

Yet, as a number of libertarian theorists have observed, it is not always profitable and advisable to concentrate on gaining converts. Opponents of freedom are rarely if ever simply ignorant. To fail to realize this would be to believe that evil in the world is accidental. Very often those who oppose liberty are doing so because they *evade* their responsibility of thinking through the implications of what they know about human beings. It is no secret that free men work harder than slaves. It is not hidden from us that a climate of relative freedom in the United States produces, through the activities of relatively free people, a life for most citizens which, all things considered, is both qualitatively and quanti-

tatively superior to the lives of most people outside our borders. Neither is it difficult to see that increasing intervention in the private economic, moral, and intellectual lives of the citizens of the U.S. by their government is leading toward overall worsening conditions throughout the culture. Thus, the failure to draw the implications in favor of freedom and in opposition to slavery cannot be due entirely to innocent ignorance.

Yet opposition to freedom will frequently be presented in the form of eloquent and sophisticated objections and questions. The minds of those who fear self-responsibility are not impaired; they are not naturally inferior creatures. Those who embark upon the control of their fellows' lives have every bit the intellectual capacity of those who recognize that human freedom is of the utmost worth. Underestimating the capacities of one's intellectual and political adversaries is, therefore, no less consequential than expecting to succeed in baseball or golf by believing that one's opponent is (physically) inferior.

tibor machan

I have always preferred treating opponents to liberty as if their objections and questions were motivated by ignorance alone. This is often time consuming, admittedly; on those occasions one must be judicious and decide thoughtfully when the evidence shows that the opposition is not *really* for lack of full understanding, agreement, or knowledge. Having decided this, it is often advisable to depart. (Needless to say, as someone who who is both intellectually and, consequently, morally committed to political liberty, I can understand that the urge to "score points" against stubborn adversaries is powerful. To forego leaving the impression on an opponent of liberty that one has *won* is difficult but often necessary.)

For example, in defense of military conscription, zoning, or other coercive activities of government, some socialists have claimed that, since we are economically interdependent, we have obligations to "society" which we have not assumed voluntarily. Not long ago, the British government drew the logical conclusion from this and instituted measures against scientists who wanted to

POEMS BY WENDY MC ELROY

RUNNING

*I must run through life,
Midnight to dawn,
For I've worlds to seize and conquer.
I've someplace to go
and someone to love,
With tears and touches and laughter.
I'm Young!
I don't want tastes of life,
I want to eat it raw.
I want to swim through flowing fields
down slopes and then to fall
breathless to grass,
breathless to laugh
Yet laughing 'til it pains.
And then to smile
to see your face and the laughter start again.
For I'm free and dizzy -
In love with myself,
A lifetime's love affair
Of meadows and music
And wind running wild,
Wild and lost through my hair.*

UGLY WHEN SEEN

*What does it matter
Truth or lies!
The world demands illusion,
demands a God with Xmas bells
So little people
In little hells
Can smile and pretend to live.

Dear sweet liar,
Dear innocent fraud,
Committing suicide with every word . . .
Do you still watch the eagle soar,
Or do you turn your eyes away?
You
Whose life is twisting by
Like a snake through tall grass,
usually unnoticed,
ugly when seen.*

participate in the "brain drain." The government and its defenders argued that these scientists had no right to leave the country since their skills and existence hinged on what their "society" had done for them. Apparently, few of these people considered that Communist Hungary and the other countries of the Soviet bloc use the same argument to justify the shooting down of people who attempt to leave without the explicit permission of the government.

When defenders of liberty object to increasing demands of government upon the lives, incomes, and properties of American citizens, the response based on social indebtedness seems, at first, innocent. Since not many people understand the difference between *economic* interdependence, based on the fact of a well developed division of labor, and *social* dependence, based on certain confused theories concerning what each man owes to "society," the presumption of innocence is justified. Yet, often it becomes evident that this argument, as many others, serves a desperate effort to concoct yet another rationalization

for many people's tolerance of the absence of political and economic freedom. Clearly, interdependence means that each economically active member of society contributes a great deal to the well being and derives much benefit from the productive activities of others. The process may be summed up as the widespread trading of values. It is not accurately characterized when viewed as an instance of dependence analogous to the dependence of a child on its parent or a patient upon his nurse. The picture is captured better by employing the model of the choir where, in order to produce the desired result, a beautiful sound, each member adds his or her effort. But, if one decides not to contribute, he is also willing to forego the benefits. No onesided dependence or duty enters the picture.

Yet, after theoretical discussions, many historical examples of the use of such arguments to excuse atrocities, and numerous helpful analogies, many defenders of coercion still insist on the claim that the individual owes his life to the collective under the direction of the mighty state. Under such circumstances the patience

that we, as advocates, owe to people who desire honest communication is *not* warranted.

Each human being has, I believe, the responsibility to take certain steps to secure for himself optimal political and legal conditions and to the best of his capacity, therefore, to understand such matters. Thus learning about and discussing politics is not a mere parlorgame but a genuine human need. Hard times - when liberty is in danger - warrant, I think, extra attention to man's political needs. The considered and courteous advocacy of liberty is, under such circumstances, our moral responsibility (to the best of our ability and judgment).

But as with everything else, the free market should give us the guideline to how we can best profit in communication. The dogmatism of those who refuse to recognize the moral worth of political freedom may at times be so entrenched that one can fulfill his self-responsibility of promoting the free society by leaving certain people alone; even at the risk of being considered less than charitable by them.

FED UP WITH ROCK

jim wilson

Fifteen years ago rock was not taken very seriously. It was considered preadolescent music and when people talked about "serious music" it was understood that they were not talking about rock. Today all that has changed. Rock is omnipresent and is taken very, very seriously. Adults approach you shouting, "Have you heard the latest by the 'Mentally Retarded?'" whose latest generally is their first and last. Books are written on the history of rock and on its great significance for Our Time (always capitalized). Rock artists like Dylan and The Beatles are considered the great artists of our era. It is the purpose of this essay to put rock into a proper musical perspective.

First off I must emphasize that I am considering rock from a *musical* perspective. It is necessary to state this because I am often confused by rock aficionados who tell me they absolutely adore such and such a group and yet when pressed they admit they cannot remember any of the group's music. This split also shows up in many reviews of rock music I have read, where the reviewer will quote a passage from a song in order to show the reader how good or bad the song is. The reviewer has, however, said nothing about the song but has shown the reader the quality of the poetry that has been set to music.

This split between words and music in rock is not a trivial point. It does not, to my knowledge, occur in other musical genres. (For example, when Samuel Barber's opera "Cleopatra" was premiered a few years ago, I don't recall a single review pro or con divorcing the words from the music.) I think this split points to an important deficiency in rock, that deficiency being the frequent inability of the rock artist to integrate the subject matter of the words with the emotional projections of the music.

An example will clarify what I mean. I once listened to the Tom Jones show. At the end of the program there is an approximately ten-minute segment when Jones does nothing but sing. On this night he sang one of his top hits called

"Delilah." The song is about a man whose woman betrays him for another man. The first man ends the story of the song by stabbing and killing Delilah. Pretty sordid stuff; and, yet, the music has one of the gayest tunes I've heard from rock. Tom Jones while singing the song was dancing around the stage, just having a jolly old time. At the point in the song where the man stabs Delilah, Jones was smiling and dancing as if he was tip-toeing through the tulips. The effect was ludicrous.

Another reason it is important to point out this split between words and music in rock is that it shows us the basic amateurishness of rock music. For instance, continental European rock stars have made no headway on the U.S. market as long as they sing only a foreign language. Why? Because if the listener cannot understand the words, he must then focus on the music and *in rock the music just isn't worth all that effort*. Yes, I know that English speaking rock groups make frequent tours of continental Europe, but one must remember that an awful lot of continental Europeans speak English. Also, ask yourself how many continental European rock groups you can name, groups who only sing non-English, have ever had tours in the U.S., and of those how many lasted any length of time? To emphasize my point I would ask rock fans if they would listen to Dylan if he sang only in Italian.

Now, in the serious music genre, the fact that an opera is in a foreign language is no hindrance to its distribution. The only exception to this is if the opera is written in an obscure language which the singers don't know how to pronounce. In that case a translation is usually effected (but not necessarily in the singer's native tongue). In fact, most opera lovers I've talked to prefer to listen to opera in a language they don't understand so that they can concentrate on the music.

There is another reason why some people like rock and once again it has nothing to do with rock as music. This reason can best be put under the term sentimental-

ity or the "they're playing our song" syndrome. Adolescence is a turbulent age and it is during adolescence that most people start listening to popular music. Hopefully many pleasant memories are formed during adolescence. Frequently popular music is involved at important points in the young man or woman's social development (for example, at a dance or in a parked car with the radio turned on). Thus the popular music of one's adolescence tends to take on a special significance but the significance is *extra-musical*. This explains the curious phenomenon of most adults fixating on the music of their adolescence and never listening to contemporary pop music. It also explains the utter inability of adults to explain why they dislike present pop music. It isn't really the music they detest; it's the realization that their adolescence is past, that they are now considered old, and what they cherish is now considered *passé*.

It is pertinent at this point to note that serious music is not afflicted with this problem. People are still listening to Bach with avid interest; and father and son can and frequently do attend a concert of classical music with both generations enjoying it.

As far as the music of rock is concerned, it is totally unoriginal and secondhand. The bass lines and progressions show almost no variation between artists and consist almost entirely of I-II-IV-V-I. The form of rock music is deadeningly repetitious. I have heard songs by Dylan that last 12 minutes where the same passage is repeated from beginning to end, without the slightest variation, almost 15 times! There are songs by the Doors in which the bass line stays exactly the same for a full ten minutes.

The repetitiousness of rock's form demonstrates, once again, rock's inability to coordinate words and music. (This coordination is unnecessary in the case of artists like Dylan since the words of most of his songs are meaningless.) Because rock's form consists of repeating the same music with different words as the