

rent of land can be regarded as a continuation in part at least of the injustice of the private appropriation of land value.

Politically a 100 per cent collection of the rent of land immediately, may justifiably be claimed as impracticable whatever may be the objective for the future. Therefore, if a compromise has to be made, it could well be argued that a graduated rate of tax achieves more than would a uniformly low rate.

Regarding the derating of agricultural land and hotel land, it would appear again that political forces have been at work, but these exemptions represent quite a different principle of compromise. Relief for agricultural land cannot be justified either economically or ethically. The value of land in no way enters into the cost of production, so that if the government had in mind that the rating relief for agricultural land might in some way keep agricultural prices down or prevent them from going up, then they are clearly misguided.

The derating of hotel land, while the concession is only 25 per cent, is equally unjustifiable. Here again, it would appear that it is intended that tourism is to be encouraged, and that a 25 per cent derating relief will encourage more hotel land to be used than otherwise. But the profits from hotels are, or should be, made simply on the capital employed, not upon the land in use. In short, this derating relief is simply a gift to the owners of hotel land.

Another flaw in this land-value legislation is the apparent concession to "existing use." It would appear that, for just so long as a plot of land is being used for agricultural purposes, for a private dwelling house, or for an approved purpose by an approved organisation, whatever its potential, it will not be valued as for any higher use. This is intended to avoid penalising farmers, homeowners and approved organizations where the development potential of their land *is not* realized — not the same as where it *cannot* be realised or is not permitted. This reduces the incentive for, say a home owner to make his land available for development and buy a more suitable house plot somewhere else. As an extreme example, one could imagine a private dwelling house continuing to exist in a very valuable shopping area indefinitely.

In due course, the economic and social effects of these departures from the principle of site-value taxation will make themselves felt, making it necessary to take a further look at these concessions.

However, whatever the shortcomings of Jamaica's land-value taxes, if the valuations are kept up-to-date there should be an increasing flow of land-value revenue into the public purse.

Behaviourism—A Third Dimension

ROBERT CLANCY

IN THESE DAYS of berserk human behaviour on all levels of society, it may be pertinent to inquire into what makes people act as they do. Of course many have joined in the quest and it is a multi-dimensional project. Psychology has focussed on the subject and theories have abounded.

Freudianism, almost synonymous with psychology, has dominated the scene for many years. Probing into hidden springs of behaviour, with emphasis on sex, Freud has long fascinated professional and layman alike. A more recent development is Behaviourism whose current leading light is Prof. B. F. Skinner. This school (harking back to Pavlov's dog-bell-salivation) teaches that behaviour is conditioned and that people, through training, manipulation and control, can be made to behave in any way that is planned.

There are, to be sure, those who are dissatisfied with both these approaches. Among them is Dr. Abraham Maslow whose views are outlined by Frank Goble in *The Third Force**. Maslow rejects the Freudian approach because it concentrates on individual pathological behaviour. He rejects Behaviourism because it reduces man to mechanical — or at best animal — reactions.

Emphasis should be placed, says Maslow, on the normal individual and the study of what makes him so. And note must be taken that man is more than an animal or a machine; what is specifically human needs attention.

Thus Maslow re-introduces a conception of values and standards into the study of man *via* psychology. He speaks of morality, responsibility — and a concept he calls "self-actualization", which involves the progress of the individual from the satisfaction of his basic needs to the development of his higher potential, the reach for beauty and truth and goodness. Mr. Goble notes that a society which makes the satisfaction of basic wants too difficult stultifies this progression.

These ideas are backed up by research and application. Several other psychologists, either at about the same time as Maslow or influenced by him, became disaffected with Freudianism and tried new approaches. Among them is Dr. William Glasser who deals with "reality therapy" which introduces a measure of responsibility into behaviour rather than

* Pocket Books Ltd., New York, 4th printing 1973. 208 pp., paperbound, \$1.25.

treating deviants as "sick" people to be "treated". Results have been impressive. "Mentally ill" patients for whom orthodox psychology has been able to do nothing have responded remarkably to reality therapy.

Important to the concept of self-actualization is the concept of minimum effort ("man seeks to satisfy his desires with the least possible exertion"). This concept is explored in a book recommended by Frank Goble, *Human Behaviour and the Principle of Least Effort* by George K. Zipf. Using scientific methods and with much investigation, Dr. Zipf establishes "the principle of least effort as the primary principle that governs our entire individual and collective behaviour."

Frank Goble, who conducts the Thomas Jefferson Research Centre (Pasadena, California), finds "the third force" valuable in the development of management and leadership, and his Centre performs much work in this field.

A special study in the July 1 issue of *Time* magazine pointed to the problem of contemporary leadership — or the lack of it. Noting that there is today a dearth of outstanding leadership in virtually all fields throughout the world, *Time* asks why. Confusion, disillusionment, divisiveness, have all taken their toll. A sense of futility and distrust is pervasive. The mass of people feel they have little control over the gigantic forces pressing upon them. We have been through the various types of "leadership" that have arisen up to now to cope with these problems and they are found wanting.

Some of the insights of the Third Force are relevant

here. In discussing industry, Goble cites studies that show that where workers are given participation in the decisions and rewards commensurate with the effort, productivity increases impressively. Where workers are simply given work to do under an authoritarian regime, work slows down and dissatisfaction increases. This could help explain some of the larger problems of society in that many feel it does not pay to be hard-working and virtuous and that power and decision-making are removed from the ordinary man.

There are many elements in the Third Force philosophy and in the concerns of the Thomas Jefferson Research Centre which harmonize with the philosophy of Henry George. To suggest an analogue between psychology and economics: the Freudian approach may be compared with the old "conservative" notion that everything depended on the individual. The Behaviourist school may be compared with collectivist philosophies that see the individual merely as a cog in a great social machine. The Third Force is like the Georgeist philosophy in that it restores individual responsibility and also recognizes that the individual needs a good social environment in order to flourish.

The principle of least effort is certainly Georgeist philosophy, also the concept of broad participation in social and economic as well as political affairs. The idea that man is more than a machine or an animal was preached by George, also man's ability to control his destiny rather than succumb to blind forces. It is interesting to note that these insights of George, counter to much prevailing philosophy, are receiving attention, systematic exploration and scientific support.

Lesson from Java

Excerpt from article *Miracle Seeds and Shattered Dreams in Java* subtitled "On an island of natural abundance, the Green Revolution has fattened the rich," by Richard W. Franke. From January 1974 issue of *Natural History*.

BY the end of the dry season in September 1971, the new technology was being utilized on only about 40 per cent of the available paddy land, representing only 20 per cent of the 151 households in the coastal plain village. Poor families were totally absent from the list of participants. For them the promise of economic development meant only an increase in the wealth and lending potential of

their patrons, and an opportunity for more of their class compatriots to fall into permanent debt and servitude.

In other parts of Java, the relationship between the social classes has deteriorated beyond the increased debt-labour bondage. In south-central Java, wealthy households are actually using the increased productivity of their fields to buy up paddy land from poorer families, driving the latter into the already jobless urban areas. In west Java, a region where landholding differences are even more extreme, some wealthy farmers have even begun buying Japanese-made rice field tractors and home milling facilities, thus pushing an even greater number of landless and small-holding households out of the rural labour market. The very

possibility of technological success is creating a human disaster. For the poor, the Green Revolution in Java offers only the choice between servitude and homelessness.

What will the development theorists say about all this? Their answer lies in their actions: the programmes continue as before with no substantial changes. The technology advocates, the rate-of-profit theorists, the military dictators, and the large landowners are attempting to produce enough food for the people of Java. They are failing. Their optimistic plans and programmes have created only increased human suffering and promise more of the same. Perhaps solutions will come not from the development experts but from the small farmers and landless labourers of Java.