

1981

Biblical Principle, Behavior Theory, and the Social System (Chapter 3 from The Human Reflex)

Rodger K. Bufford

George Fox University, rbufford@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp_fac



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

ISBN 9789991767680 Published by Harper & Row, New York, NY. Pages 67-82.

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School of Clinical Psychology at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - Grad School of Clinical Psychology by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolf@georgefox.edu.

3. Biblical Principle, Behavior Theory, and the Social System

IN THE past few years, behavioral approaches have increasingly been extended to societal applications. Some of these extensions have been largely theoretical, while others have been experimental and applied.

This chapter will concentrate on a few selected areas: (1) ethical and moral behavior; (2) issues in the control of human behavior; (3) implications of behavioral principles for the welfare system, socialized medicine, public education, and the penal system; and (4) social influence and other social applications of behavior theory. In each case, related biblical teachings will be presented.

ETHICAL AND MORAL BEHAVIOR

Skinner proposes that we make ethical and moral issues a matter of scientific study. He clearly implies that empirical study of values and morality will enable us to arrive at clear value statements.¹ Skinner's argument is elusive, but there is a subtle begging of the question in his approach. In order to understand this, we must examine the role that empirical study can play in the area of values.

Scientific study of ethical and value issues may produce several outcomes. First, it can help with a description of what actually exists in the way of ethical and moral behavior in two forms: (1) what people say is moral, including their attitudes and values regarding moral behavior; and (2) the way people actually behave, including indications about the degree of consistency or discrepancy

between expressed values and actual behavior. Research may also contribute to a knowledge of the reinforcing or punishing consequences for specific behaviors.

The types of conclusions that emerge from empirical study of moral behavior include statements of what kind of behavior is typical for a given person or group, what behavior is valued by the person or group, and what consequences follow valued and devalued behavior. For example, we may study cheating as a moral issue. We can collect data on the frequency of cheating, the proportion of the population that engages in cheating, and the probability or frequency of cheating for a given individual. We may collect data on attitudes toward cheating in individuals and groups, and we may relate attitudes to actual behavior. Finally, we may collect data on the social consequences, positive and negative, that follow cheating for an individual or a group.

The limitation of the empirical approach is that it cannot resolve the question of whether any given behavior is good or bad. We can conclude that 70 percent of the individuals in a given social group disapprove of cheating, and that 82 percent actually engage in cheating. We can conclude that there is a discrepancy between attitude and behavior. But, based on our data, we cannot say cheating is either right or wrong. That is, *on the basis of science, we cannot make conclusions about right or wrong unless we are willing to define right and wrong in terms of what the majority approves/disapproves. This is social-cultural moral relativism.*

Moral relativism leads to a number of problems. As attitudes and opinions change, values change; thus what is moral today may become immoral tomorrow. Further, what is moral will depend on where you are, and with what group; moving to a new area, becoming part of a new group of friends or coworkers, or having others enter your present group all may result in changes in what is considered moral. For example, cheating may be considered moral among classmates, but immoral to the teachers. In such a world, moral confusion must surely prevail.

The alternative to moral relativism is moral absolutism. A number of bases may be given for arriving at moral absolutes. For persons within a Christian tradition, the Bible is pointed to as a source for moral absolutes. Briefly summarized, the biblical absolutes are: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all

your mind; and your neighbor as yourself.”² The Ten Commandments elaborate on what it means to love your neighbor, including not stealing, not killing, not bearing false witness, not coveting, and so on.³ In a sense, the whole Bible is a detailed explanation of what it means to love one’s neighbor.

Behavioral psychologists who have addressed the issue of values fall into two groups. The majority advocate using the standards of the community as the basis for values. Psychologists Leonard Ullmann and Leonard Krasner take this approach.⁴ A few, like B. F. Skinner and Perry London, argue for some absolute standard. Skinner views preservation of the species as the highest value, though he does not offer any justification for this view.⁵ Skinner then argues that value decisions can be made on whether the behavior in question contributes toward meeting the goal of species preservation.⁶ London’s value “. . . is one of maximizing choice, i.e., in the sense of personal freedom and of self-control in people’s lives.”⁷ Like Skinner, London gives no justification for such values.

The implications of biblical absolutes for application of behavioral approaches to the control of human behavior have been presented in some detail elsewhere.⁸ Briefly, the basic issues involve the *means* and the *goals* of behavior change. *Both means and goals must be scrutinized in terms of their value implications.* For example, eliminating George’s stealing may be a worthy goal, but if we do so by amputating both arms at the shoulder, questions may legitimately be raised about the morality of the means. Similarly, we may agree that use of positive reinforcement techniques to teach a new behavior are a legitimate means; but when the new behavior is safecracking, we may have objections to the goal toward which the means have been applied. Both means and goals for the application of behavioral technology, then, must be evaluated against some system of values. We have proposed absolute values based on biblical teachings. The alternatives are another system of absolute values or relativism of either social-cultural or individual-subjective varieties.

ISSUES IN THE CONTROL OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR

One of the basic issues raised by behavioral psychology is that of the control of behavior. With the promise of increasingly effective techniques of behavior control, concern about the ethics of behavior

control has become more prominent. In this section we will examine the universality of control, the biblical teachings regarding control, the role of education in control, and the relationship of control to personal freedom and choice.

THE UNIVERSALITY OF CONTROL

With the development of behavioral techniques, critics began to raise objections to behavioral approaches on the grounds that control of human behavior was not desirable, and was by implication immoral. The first line of response by behaviorists was to point out that control already exists, that it is universal, and that it is accepted and even valued.⁹

That it exists is exemplified by the fact that I wear a coat when it is ten degrees out, but not when it is ninety; by the promptness with which I withdraw my hand when it contacts a hot object; and by the blinking of my eyes when a blast of air contacts them—all are examples of control over my behavior. While behavioral control is an important part of the social environment, it is also an aspect of the physical world that we cannot escape. Control already exists, and it is ubiquitous. Even when I am asleep, a sharp jab in the side will result in my rolling over, a response that is negatively reinforced by termination of the painful stimulus.

Our social approval of control is embodied in a legal system that tells us which behaviors will not be tolerated and specifies aversive consequences for engaging in those behaviors. Approval of social control is exemplified by an educational system that is created by law, and in which all children are required by law to participate. Not only attendance is controlled; the goal of education is to foster the development of other behaviors: reading, computational skills, recreation, diet and health practices, and so on. This, too, necessarily implies control. Behaviorists are quick to point out that the fact that control is not perfect does not mean that control is lacking; they go on to suggest that if these goals are really desired, then it seems consistent to seek the most effective means by which they may be accomplished. If behavioral techniques are indeed effective, they should be embraced rather than feared.

CONTROL AND THE BIBLE

Broadly speaking, the Bible seems to support the conscious use of human control at all social levels, as well as to acknowledge its

presence. At the individual level, the Bible teaches us to encourage, admonish, exhort, and reprove each other.¹⁰ At the family level, parents (especially fathers) are taught to raise their children in the discipline and instruction of the Lord.¹¹ At the societal level, we see the Law given to the nation of Israel, along with a penal system that included judicial procedures and a set of prescribed sentences for various types of offenses, and we see individuals taught to obey civil authority.¹² Finally, control within the social system of the church is also a biblical teaching.¹³

CONTROL AND MANIPULATION

Manipulation is defined as "treating, operating, or managing with skill or intellect."¹⁴ In a psychological context manipulation, which may serve either good or bad purposes, involves controlling the action or behavior of others. The concern frequently expressed with respect to manipulation as a behavioral technique, however, is directed toward exploitive uses of control to serve the ends of the manipulator.

Earlier it was suggested that the basic concerns surrounding the ethics of behavior control focus on *means* and *ends*. Abusive manipulation involves the use of undesirable means of control (e.g., cutting off the arms to discourage stealing), controlling behavior toward undesirable goals (e.g., teaching an exconvict to be a more effective safecracker), and combinations of illegitimate means and goals (e.g., blackmailing a person to sell defense secrets to an enemy agent).

To the extent that behavioral technology provides greater ability to control behavior, it also increases the potential for abusive manipulation. Precautions against such abuses take several forms: (1) individual countercontrol measures, such as escape, and behavioral countercontrol to alter the behavior of the would-be controller; (2) legal prohibitions of certain forms of control, such as laws and regulations prohibiting "excessive use of force" by police officers; (3) the more widespread and fundamental countercontrol provided by social, ethical, and moral constraints of the society in which the person lives, such as the widely accepted prohibition of sexual relationships between psychologists and clients in a therapy relationship.

Adopting biblical standards for determining the means and ends toward which behavior control may be directed seems to provide

the best safeguard against manipulative exploitation. Individual-subjective or cultural relativism places an individual or group of individuals in the position of deciding when behavior control becomes exploitive. In such circumstances, there is always the risk that the individual or group may make decisions that are self-serving and exploitive; this could happen even with the best intentions.¹⁵ By contrast, biblical standards provide independent criteria by which we can assess whether control is beneficial or exploitive, a standard that all can use as a safeguard against exploiting or being exploited.

IMPLICATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL CONTROL FOR SOCIAL SYSTEMS

Social control of behavior at all levels seems to be endorsed by biblical teachings. Thus adoption of a biblical basis for determining absolutes in the area of values implies acceptance of social control as a legitimate phenomenon. The following sections examine some of our present social control institutions in behavioral and biblical perspectives.

THE WELFARE SYSTEM

Our contemporary American welfare system is based on an "enlightened" humanistic philosophy that advocates the view that each person, by virtue of human existence, has certain rights. Among these are the rights to food, shelter, and medical care. Society has the obligation to provide these things to those who do not have them.

It's generally recognized that the present welfare system does not work very well. Abuses are numerous. Some draw multiple welfare checks through fraudulent means; some draw checks even though they do not qualify; some find ways to qualify primarily to avoid the necessity of working. Once having begun on welfare, it is unlikely that these persons will return to the work force.

Social Security is a relatively unique aspect of the welfare system, because some participate in benefits from the system by virtue of having "earned" them through contributions from their own salary. In a sense, however, these individuals are the victims of a second-class membership in the system. Others receive benefits without participation: those who were of retirement age when the

system was initiated, those who were dependent children of a deceased participant, and those who never entered into the work force by virtue of being "disabled," all qualify for social security benefits.

Several aspects of the welfare system make it particularly problematic. First, it punishes going back to work; if the individual takes a job, welfare benefits and related benefits such as medicare are lost, taxes and social security contributions are required, and the person may actually suffer reduced financial status in addition to having to work. Malingering and laziness may be rewarded with benefits, particularly if the individual is able to present them in the guise of some form of disability. Nagging back pain and a variety of mental disorders are common complaints. Bureaucratization of the system results in economic inefficiency; great sums are consumed in administration and in a tyranny of regulation, in which human need is treated as less important than the rules for administering aid. Often the regulations both limit flexibility and increase costs.

Behavioral Principles and Welfare

A behavioral critique of the welfare system focuses on the tendency to reinforce undesirable behaviors. Money is a very important reinforcer for most individuals in our society. If money is made contingently available for enacting a sick role, people will become sick. If money is contingently available for being "unable" to hold a job, people become unable. Essentially, the welfare system reinforces "helpless" and dependent behaviors rather than initiative and personal responsibility.

Welfare and the Bible

The Mosaic Law given in the Old Testament includes a set of principles and mechanisms that were designed to provide for those in the nation of Israel who had needs. We will call this the Ancient Jewish Welfare System. Before discussing this system, it is important to emphasize a basic biblical principle on which it was predicated; the "work to eat" principle. According to the Genesis account, meaningful activity was carried out even in the Garden of Eden; Adam was responsible for naming the animals, for example, though apparently this was not an onerous task. When put out of

the Garden, a part of Adam's condemnation was the necessity of earning food by means of effortful work for the rest of his life: "By the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground. . . ."¹⁶ Adam's condemnation to work in order to earn his food was in turn passed on to all of his descendants. The principle of working to eat is repeated throughout Scripture,¹⁷ and is both presumed and implied by the Ancient Jewish Welfare System (described primarily in the Old Testament book of Leviticus).

Seven basic elements are included in this system: (1) the incomplete harvest; (2) lending without interest and selling without profit; (3) land remained in the family; (4) Jews could become hired servants but went free on the seventh year; (5) servants who wished could become servants for life by choice; (6) the tithe of the harvest; and (7) the giving of portions. We shall examine each of these briefly.

At harvest time, the Jewish law indicated that the farmer was to leave the "gleanings" of his fruit trees and his fields. Whatever unripe produce which was not gathered from the trees or vines on the first picking was to be left; the corners of the fields were not to be harvested. If bits of food or grain fell off the wagon on the way to the barn, these were to be left. The poor and needy of the land, those who were without property or unable to farm on their own, were free to come and help themselves to this remnant from the harvest.¹⁸ A touching example of this practice is recounted in the story of Boaz and Ruth.¹⁹

The principles of lending without interest and selling without profit implied that none of the Jewish people were to become wealthy as a result of the misfortune of their neighbors (although profiting from foreigners was permitted). If a man experienced misfortune due to drought, insect damage, disaster, or poor management, his neighbors were to help him without personal gain.²⁰ It is important to remember that at this time Israel was an agricultural state in which virtually all but the priests worked the soil.

The principle of land remaining in the family involved the notion that the land of Israel actually belonged to God, who had apportioned it to the various families of the tribes of Israel as a perpetual inheritance. Land could neither be bought nor sold; rather, the use of the land and the crops it would bear was bought and sold. The land was to revert to its original owners on the sabbath

(seventh) year. The price for its use was to depend on the number of years until that occasion.²¹ In our day, we were very much aware that land is wealth; by forbidding the sale of land, two outcomes were insured. First, no one was able to become fabulously wealthy. Second, no family was permanently disenfranchised. The possibility of meaningful work and productivity was thus insured to all.

A Jewish person was free to become a servant to another in the event that he was unable to provide for himself. In this way, those who experienced misfortune or failure could continue to earn a living for themselves. However, the master was obliged to let the servant go free at the end of a period of seven years (the Sabbath year).²² Moreover, the master was to send the freed servant out with provisions to see him through to the next crop.²³ If, for some reason, a person found himself unable to cope successfully on his own, or if he found it more appealing to work for another, he could volunteer to become a servant for life.²⁴

The tithe of the harvest provided for the needs of those who were unable to meet their needs in any of the ways we have described so far. Each person was to bring a certain portion of his harvest to the temple, where it was set aside to meet the needs of "the Levite [who owned no property], the alien, the orphan and the widow."²⁵ Remember that, in a culture like that of Israel, it was extremely difficult for women to find work. The priests spent their time in worship and also had no property of their own, thus were not able to raise their own food. By means of the tithe of the harvest, provision was made for these individuals.

Giving of portions was a part of the social festivities associated with the periodic religious feasts and celebrations. These occasions combined worship of God with rest from work, socialization, feasting, and celebration. On such occasions, those who were relatively wealthy shared from their abundance with those who were impoverished, by preparing an abundance of food, which was then shared. In this fashion, all entered into the joy and enjoyment of the occasion.²⁶

There is some question regarding whether this system ever functioned fully in the way in which it has been described here. We did see in the story of Ruth and Boaz one instance of its effective functioning. Other biblical passages, however, reveal the breakdown in

the system as advantage was taken of widows and orphans or servants were not permitted to go free at the appointed time.²⁷ But the principles of the system are relatively simple and straightforward, involving reward for effort while at the same time minimizing the risk of exploitation.

The basic principle of the Ancient Jewish Welfare System was that of positive reinforcement. If a man worked, he obtained food. No one did it for him. An exception was made for persons who, through no fault of their own, were unable to work. The similarity between approaches suggested by behavioral principles and the Ancient Jewish Welfare System suggest that a common truth about human nature underlies both.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

One of the issues that regularly comes up before the legislative branch of our federal government is that of socialized medicine. Initial steps toward implementation of socialized medicine have already been taken in the enactment of Medicare/Medicaid, and in the provision of dialysis for persons suffering from kidney disease.

One of the issues inherent in socialized medicine is the question of whether society should bear the cost of medical treatment for individual members. This issue is especially cogent amidst the growing realization that personal lifestyle is a major factor in heavy use of medical care by a small portion of the population. In part, the issue involved here is the same one involved in welfare: a choice between a rights and obligations model of providing for those who have needs, as opposed to a sharing of personal resources with others out of a sense of loving service to God and fellow humans.

While behavioral psychology has thus far dealt with this area only to a limited degree, certain tentative conclusions regarding socialized medicine can be drawn. First, when medical service is made available noncontingently, there is no incentive to avoid unnecessary use of medical resources. Second, there is little incentive for taking positive steps toward health. A social context in which medical services are more costly to the individual than are preventive measures is more likely to foster constructive use of lifestyle approaches to preventive medicine than one in which medical treatments are provided freely to all comers.²⁸ Interestingly, the

common practice of private health insurers to provide co-insurance, in which the individual bears some proportion of the cost of medical treatment, is designed to discourage wasteful and wanton use of medical resources while making treatment available to those who genuinely need it.

While the Bible has little to say directly about medical care, the general thrust of many biblical teachings is in the direction of individuals providing for their own needs, insofar as they are able. When the individual has needs he or she is unable to meet, family and neighbors are called upon to meet those needs out of loving concern.

At a basic level, then, behavioral and biblical approaches agree insofar as they require the individual to take responsibility for his or her own needs. The major difference is that biblical teachings include a provision for those needs for which the individual's capacity is inadequate. In short, both behavioral and biblical principles point toward individual responsibility and away from socialized medicine (which grows out of a humanistic philosophical tradition).

PUBLIC EDUCATION

One of the major struggles in our present educational system centers around the values inherent in various educational approaches. While specific issues such as creation/evolution and instruction about sexual physiology and functioning are focal, the underlying issues in each case seem to involve disagreements about what is good, right, true, or moral.

Behavioral psychologists have accurately pointed out that education is one of the areas in which our society is most clearly involved in deliberate, self-conscious behavior control. Implicitly, then, our values in terms of the means and goals of behavior control become issues in education.

Historically, religious orders were leaders in the development of education, in the founding of educational institutions, and in the fostering of widespread learning. In the last few generations, we have seen the state and federal governments take over primary responsibility for education. Initially, this posed little problem, as there was consistent agreement on the basic values inherent in approaches to education. In our present pluralistic society, however,

disagreement over basic values has become an increasingly focal issue in education.

Conceptually, behavioral psychologists view values as essentially identical with reinforcers. When we say that members of our culture value education, we also imply that they will work to obtain or provide education. Further, when we disagree about educational goals, it implies that different educational accomplishments are reinforcing for different individuals. Some parents are reinforced when they hear their children offer creationist explanations for human origins, while others are likewise reinforced on hearing evolutionist explanations.

One of the central points emphasized by behavioral psychologists is the significance of individual differences. In the area of education we have developed a social system that tends to minimize such differences. While critics of behavioral approaches have suggested that systematic application of behavioral technology to education will produce carbon-copy people, Skinner and others have clearly pointed out the potential of behavioral approaches to foster diversity and develop unique skill.²⁹

While education is not a central theme of biblical teaching, the Bible does suggest that educating the child is primarily the parents' responsibility, with special emphasis on the father.³⁰ Since the focus of the biblical teachings is on religious education, religious education specifically becomes a parental responsibility. This necessarily implies a diversity in approaches and a recognition of differences in values. It also implies a high degree of individualized instruction.

THE PENAL SYSTEM

Critics of behaviorism often suggest that behavioral approaches to punishment as applied in the penal system are ineffective, and imply that the failure of the penal system means that the behavioral conceptualization is faulty. For those who understand the basic principles of punishment as revealed by behavioral research, it should be clear that the penal system currently in use in the United States is doomed to failure because it fails to incorporate good behavioral techniques.

The issues involved in the effectiveness of punishment are discussed in more detail in Chapter 4. Briefly, punishment is most effective if it is immediate, certain to follow the target response,

and severe enough to outweigh any reinforcement that may also follow the response. In our penal system, as it presently operates, punishment is neither swift nor sure. Trials may be delayed weeks or even months; cases are dismissed on procedural grounds; charges are reduced through plea bargaining, and so on. Even when conviction is finally accomplished, execution of the sentence does not necessarily follow quickly, and the appeal process may begin the whole cycle over again. The primary rationale for these processes is the protection of the innocent accused. Further, the equity of the sentencing process is seriously breached when one person gets probation for fraud involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, while another gets a long jail term for simple robbery of an inexpensive item.

From a behavioral perspective, the ideal would be for the criminal to be apprehended, found guilty, and punished immediately. The immediacy and certainty of punishment maximize its effectiveness. In addition, imposing consequences that are aversive enough to reduce future probability of the same response would be a further application of behavioral principles.

From a biblical perspective, the primary teachings regarding government, and especially regarding penal systems, come from the Old Testament Jewish law as it is presented in the Pentateuch. In our discussion of the Jewish law, it is important to remember that it is given in the context of the relationship between God and Israel. Thus the *New Bible Dictionary* notes, with regard to the Ten Commandments, that "the common designation of the contents of the two tablets as 'the Decalogue,' though it enjoys biblical precedent, has tended to restrict unduly the Church's conception of that revelation . . . it is not adequately classified as law; it belongs to the broader category of covenant. The terminology 'covenant' and 'the words of the covenant' is applied to it. It is also identified as the 'testimony.'"³¹

The *Dictionary* goes on to suggest that, "covenant" not only implies an agreement between God and his people, but in its structure the Jewish law parallels the widespread Semitic practice of covenants to formalize relationships between lord and vassal. Thus the whole notion of law here is somewhat different from that with which we are familiar in our current practice, which tends to view law more as a social contract among peers.

Briefly, then, the Jewish law or covenant specified a number of

offenses, and a number of specific punishments that were to follow certain types of offenses. The principal method of capital punishment was by means of stoning; the specific method of execution by the "avenger of blood" in murder cases is not specified, but probably was often also stoning. Other punishments included beating, with a maximum limit of forty stripes; fines and restoration fourfold of stolen or damaged property; payment in kind for personal injury—"eye for eye, tooth for tooth"; confinement to a city of refuge in cases of involuntary manslaughter; and total destruction of people and property in cases of corporate wrongdoing, such as false worship.³²

Specific offenses that were to be punished with execution by means of stoning included idolatry, and enticing or encouraging idolatry in others; blasphemy; apostasy; Sabbath-breaking; divination; sacrificing of children; adultery; and rebellion toward parents.³³ Murder and kidnapping and disregarding judicial decisions of judge or priest were also punished by death, probably most often by stoning, though the method is not specifically mentioned. In stoning, the procedure was for the prosecution witnesses to cast the first stones. If the convicted person was not yet dead, the other bystanders joined in stoning the person to death.³⁴

A variety of specific punishments are provided for various types of specific offenses. For example, theft of sheep or cattle is to be paid back four or fivefold, or the person may be sold to pay for the theft if he has nothing; if the person leaves an open pit and another's animal strays into it, the one who dug the pit must pay for damages; in personal injuries that do not result in death, a fine is to be paid, or "if there is serious injury, you are to take life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot. . . ." ³⁵

These punishments seem, by our standards, quite harsh. This is recognized in the biblical teachings with the warnings: "Show her no pity,"³⁶ and "Show him no pity. Do not spare him or shield him. Then all Israel will hear and be afraid . . . and no one among you will do such an evil thing again."³⁷

Although difficult cases were to be passed on to authorities at a higher level, who were presumed to have greater wisdom in judging, no appeals process *per se* existed. The principal safeguard against being wrongly condemned seems to be the requirement that no one could be convicted on the testimony of a single witness.

False witness or perjury was strongly discouraged by providing the same penalty for the false witness as that specified for the offense of which he had falsely accused another.

Several features of these judicial practices stand out. First, they are relatively simple compared to our elaborate legal system. Second, the penalties seem, to our sensibilities, remarkably harsh in most instances; yet they avoid the "cruelty" of incarceration, which is so common in our culture, and the related social cost of prisons, guards, and provision of food, clothing, and so on for the offender. One is also struck by the rapidity this system employed in completing the judicial process and resuming daily routines.

SOCIAL INFLUENCE AND OTHER SOCIAL APPLICATIONS

Behavioral approaches have recently been applied to a wide range of other social issues. A number of studies have shown that behavioral approaches may be successfully employed in business and industry to improve industrial safety, and to increase the usage of containerized packing of goods for shipping, thus increasing efficiency and reducing costs. Another area of application is in reducing litter; preliminary studies suggest that behavioral techniques can reduce littering and increase the proportion of waste materials deposited in trash receptacles at minimal cost. A few studies suggest that behavioral approaches may make a favorable contribution to conservation practices in the use of our dwindling energy resources.

Another area of recent interest among behavioral psychologists is that of behavioral coaching. Recent studies suggest that a behavioral coaching approach can enhance skill acquisition in such diverse areas as football blocking, tennis strokes, and ballet performance.

Taken together, these recent developments in behavioral applications to social situations suggest that there is a potential for promising development of behavioral approaches toward dealing with a number of social system problems.

NOTES

1. B. F. Skinner, "Freedom and the Control of Men," in *Control of Human Behavior*, ed. R. Ulrich, T. Stachnik, and J. Mabry (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1966), pp. 11-20.

2. Luke 10:27.
3. Exod. 20:1-17; Deut. 5:6-22.
4. Leonard Krasner, "Behavior Control and Social Responsibility," in Ulrich, Stachnik, and Mabry, *Control of Human Behavior*, pp. 317-321; Leonard P. Ullmann and Leonard Krasner, *A Psychological Approach to Abnormal Behavior*, 2d ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975).
5. Carl Rogers and B. F. Skinner, "Some Issues Concerning the Control of Human Behavior: A Symposium," in Ulrich, Stachnik, and Mabry, *Control of Human Behavior*, pp. 300-316.
6. Ibid.; B. F. Skinner, "Freedom and the Control of Men."
7. Perry London, "Behavior Control, Values and Future," in *Modifying Man: Implications and Ethics*, ed. Craig W. Ellison (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1977), pp. 189-208.
8. Rodger K. Bufford, "Ethics for the Mass Application of Behavior Control"; Allen Verhey, "Some Concerns of Justice"; and Paul Clement, "Behavioral Engineering and Spiritual Development"; all in Ellison, *Modifying Man*.
9. B. F. Skinner, *Science and Human Behavior* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1953); Skinner, "Freedom and the Control of Men."
10. 2 Tim. 4:1-2.
11. Eph. 6:1-4.
12. Rom. 13:1-7.
13. E.g., Heb. 13:17.
14. Webster's *New Collegiate Dictionary*, 7th ed., s. v. "manipulate."
15. Prov. 14:12; see also Bufford in Ellison, *Modifying Man*, pp. 209-214.
16. Gen. 3:19.
17. For example, see 2 Thess. 3:6-15.
18. Lev. 19:9-10; Deut. 24:19-22.
19. Ruth 2:1-23.
20. Exod. 22:25-27; Lev. 25:35-38; Deut. 23:19-20.
21. Lev. 25:13-17, 23-34; 27:16-25.
22. Exod. 21:1-6; Lev. 25:39-55.
23. Deut. 15:12-15.
24. Exod. 21:1-7; Deut. 15:12-18.
25. Deut. 14:29.
26. Deut. 16:9-17; 26:12-13; Neh. 8:10-12.
27. For example, see Jer. 34:8-22.
28. Preliminary work in dealing with these issues is found in P. O. Davidson and S. M. Davidson, eds., *Behavioral Medicine: Changing Health Lifestyles* (New York: Bruner/Mazel, 1980).
29. For example, see in B. F. Skinner, *The Technology of Teaching* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968), pp. 169-184.
30. E.g., Deut. 6:4-8 ff.; Eph. 6:1-4.
31. J. D. Douglas, ed., *The New Bible Dictionary* (Grand Rapids, Mich.; Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1962), p. 1251.
32. See Exod., chapters 20-23.
33. Merrill C. Tenney, ed., *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, vol. 5 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1975, 1976), p. 524.
34. Douglas, *The New Bible Dictionary*, p. 1218.
35. Exod., chapters 20-23; quotation from Exod. 21:23-24 (NIV).
36. Deut. 25:12 (NIV).
37. Deut. 13:8-11 (NIV).