

=====

Skinner posits that benevolence is not the result of 'inner qualities' but the result of explicit external circumstances (an "environment" if you will). The notion of counter-control is advanced in About Behaviorism and in other places. Walden Two, then, if it is to be benevolent (or 'democratic') must have explicit counter-controls in it to be plausible. What then are these counter controls?

Planner counter controls:

Term limits (prevents the indefinite accrual of potential power) of 10 years

Non-aversive methods (prevents violence, and abuse),

Staggered terms (previous 'blocs' of power).

Relative Anonymity (prevents 'cults of personality')

Triads of voting members, no Planner acts without another Planner's vote

The Planners must live under their own plan

Manager counter controls:

Planner selection

Non-aversive methods

The Labor Credit system of accounting

Member counter-control

A 'bill of rights'

Labor Credit system

Personal privacy (room)

No large assemblies

Right to choose (arbitrary) work

Right to learn any form of work (work mobility)

countercontrol.txt

Compliance with code (right to continuing receipt of community wealth)

Right to complain to [Associate Managers?] 'Surveyors' (Planners?)

Self-Control is member designed and driven, allowing for member selection and creation of techniques

Member agreement of rights, responsibilities, limits

Scientist counter-controls

Restriction to non-aversive methods

Peer review/publication

Replications

Methods of science

An IRB or IRB like body to approve all research before execution

Informed consent

There are no explicit means by which a Scientist or Planner may be removed from office or appointment. We might assume, for the sake of additional counter-control, that the Scientists could remove a Planner from office. Scientists might be appointed by the Planners, but for fixed terms - or for life - like a 'Supreme Court'. The Scientists then would act as a check on the Planners. The Scientists, having no real power except to conduct experiments and remove Planners, would need the least counter-control.

Managers, presumably, can be removed by Planners. Members would not be subject to removal from the community except in extreme cases where the member contract has been violated and attempts at correction have failed.

Counter-Control Problems:

1)How is exploitation defined, and how is it measured? Being defined and measured, who measures it? What ensures an accurate measure?

countercontrol.txt

2)What protects members from exploitation and oppression that is not originating from the Planner-Manager system (i.e. other members)?

3)What if the Planners are found to be exploitative and/or oppressive?  
What then? Are they sanctioned? Removed? Retrained?

4)What prevents collusion or special treatment? For example, a Manager who treats a Planner with special care in exchange for better treatment?

5)What level of disparity in resources is acceptable and what is done to minimize or eliminate disparity? Who measures it and how is it measured?