JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

VOL. LXII.

LONDON:

Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W.1.

1930

735TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL, WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 28TH, 1930, AT 4.30 P.M.

THE REV. CHARLES GARDNER, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed, and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then introduced the Rev. H. C. Morton, Ph.D., to read his paper on "The Concept of Evolution in the New Psychology."

THE CONCEPT OF EVOLUTION IN THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY.

By THE REV. HAROLD C. MORTON, B.A., PH.D.

TECHNICALLY the "New Psychology" should be the Psychology of the Unconscious. The Old Psychology confined itself to Consciousness. It had a comfortable doctrine of "unconscious cerebration"; but in reality it dealt with nothing save the conscious processes of the mind. Both these words require emphasis. The Psychology of forty years ago dealt with the mind; it would not have regarded behaviour as coming within its scope; and it dealt with the conscious processes of the mind. "Unconscious mind" it would have regarded as a contradiction in terms. Not so the New Psychology. The New is not by any means careful to confine its scope to the mind. It is often not certain that there is an entity called "the mind" at all. But it is quite certain that the processes we call "mental" are quite as often unconscious as conscious—and

indeed is persuaded that the unconscious mental processes are at the very lowest quite as important and influential as the conscious ones. Consequently the New Psychology has been declared technically to be the Psychology of the Unconscious.

Nevertheless, I am not going to confine myself to this definition of the New Psychology. Such a definition *omits* far too much. It omits Comparative Psychology, which has satisfied its exponents of the immense area of common ground between Man and the animal creation. It omits Social Psychology, which has assigned a great part of our concepts of morals to the herd instinct and the necessities of the life of the herd. It omits that ripe fruit of the whole modern psychological movement—Behaviourism, which has in some ways far more right to assume to itself the title "New Psychology." It is the summit of the movement which might be called the physiologizing of Psychology —that process of observation which has detected, or tried to detect, the physical counterpart of every mental movement, and has steadily resolved all mental processes into nerve processes, accompanied by the mysterious thing we call "consciousness." It has almost made Psychology into a branch of Biology. This certainly is very new Psychology! The Psychologists of forty years ago would certainly not have recognized it as Psychology at all.

The Old Psychology has not any very clear bearing upon practical affairs. We studied it laboriously—sensations, precepts, concepts; cognition, emotion, volition. It was a fine mental exercise; it demanded close concentration upon mental processes and keen discriminating observation of our own states of consciousness. But apart from the Laws of Association—upon the one hand Similarity and Contrast, upon the other Contiguity—it did not aid us in the problems of life. The Laws of Association, which the Old Psychology taught such professors of the art of Memorizing as Loisette and Pelman, have certainly been of practical importance. But much of the rest of the old Psychology was as a dream when one awaketh to the student emerging from the classroom to the business and the world of affairs. The New Psychology has less and less love of the practice of introspection, cares more for the outward than the inward, believes behaviour to be of more importance than supposed mental processes, declares remembering to be simple but the secret of forgetting to be more difficult and important, and aims at practical results. One writer has declared it to be

" as practically useful as a telephone or motor in conducting the affairs of life " (*Psycho-Analysis for Normal People*, Coster, p. 14).

It is important to pause and realize in what senses the New *really* has more bearing upon life than the Old Psychology. It is in ways that Miss Coster does not envisage at all that it bids fair (or foul) to influence human affairs. In the general view the practical importance of the New Psychology lies in two special directions. The first is indicated by the word we hear so often, " Complexes," and the second by Psycho-Analysis. By a complex the New Psychology means a bundle of ideas which my personal experience has deeply associated with some subject in my mind. The association must be so deep that it arises inevitably and without effort on my part; and the ideas called up must be deeply suffused with emotion. A bundle of ideas, suffused with emotion, and tightly wrapped around a special topic in my mind—that is a Complex. On all sides people are talking, and sometimes correctly, about complexes. The " mind " is really a mass of complexes. Practically everything which has a place in our life becomes wrapped up with a bundle of ideas suffused with emotion, inevitably called up without effort on our part. Freud's discovery, upon which has been built up the " Psychology of the Unconscious," was that some of these complexes are suffused with painful emotion. The painful character of these ideas consists mainly in their incompatibility with the moral or social standards which dominate our Consciousness, *e.g.* War-neuroses are often caused by the conflict between the instinct of self-protection in danger and the fear which accompanies that instinct, and our social view of such self-protection and fear as shameful. Freud held that such " pain-complexes " tend to be " repressed " or driven under into the Unconscious; and not recognized by their victim, but in a disguised or symbolic form, they ascend into Consciousness and there set up distressing conflicts of feeling. Between the Unconscious and Consciousness a barrier is set up, which acts as a censor and refuses to let the ideas of the pain-complex ascend into Consciousness unless thoroughly disguised. Sometimes in sleep the censor is off his guard and the pain-complex expresses itself in the symbolic forms of dreams. Freud by the processes of Psycho-Analysis brings up into full Consciousness the repressed complexes, and by so doing ends the distressing conflict of emotion which has disorganized life. For the Unconscious is not just a " limbo " of discarded ideas, but a dynamic region, all

whose constituents war with mighty power to make themselves felt in life. Psycho-Therapy, of which Freud and his pupils, Jung and Adler, have been the great exponents, deals with these repressed complexes whose violent but unconscious emotions derange the soul.

But those who would confine the New Psychology to the Unconscious in Freud's sense, much as the Old was the Psychology of Consciousness, quite unduly limit it. By the New Psychology it is wiser to understand "the new trend" in Psychology. The practical and very evil issues of the New Psychology are best observed when its logical goal appears in sight. The new trend results from the introduction of the concept of Evolution into the realm of Psychology. The Freudian psychology of the Unconscious is frankly evolutionary. It led Freud himself to a deterministic philosophy of life. The New Nancy School regard the Unconscious, which hampers and injures us so often, as being largely composed of inherited animal and other instincts, which our auto-suggestion counteracts. Dr. Rivers in his *Instinct and the Unconscious* advances the theory that the Unconscious is formed mainly "from instinctive reactions and experiences associated with them, which are inherited from earlier stages of evolution and are harmful to the organism in its more highly evolved form." In another place he contends that injuries to the brain result in throwing back the mind into earlier ancestral phases of mental development.

But whatever influence evolutionary speculation has upon the theory of the Unconscious and Psycho-Analysis it is in other realms that it specially works out to a logical conclusion. Psychology turns into metaphysics and finally is resolved into Biology; that is to say, it enters upon the discussion of the source and reality of Consciousness and Innate Ideas; and having negatived the reality of everything in the realm of the Spirit finally contents itself with a mainly biological statement of the processes of human life. In other words, Psychology has steadily become materialistic and anti-theist. Under the urge of evolutionary excitement it has allowed itself to be turned from an examination of the processes of the mind into an extreme anti-spiritual philosophy.

Herbert Spencer in this sense of the "new trend" was the father of the New Psychology. It is the fashion to say that "Spencer is obsolete": but those who say it merely reveal that they have not traced the development of the new trend. Spencer

set himself to trace origins, and to analyse Consciousness. How do our innate ideas arise? *e.g.* the idea of Right, the "thou shalt" of morals? Grappling with this problem on utilitarian lines the concept of Evolution came to Spencer as the solution. The question of innate ideas was, of course, psychological; and the conflict between the empiricists ("All our knowledge is derived from experience") and the transcendentalists ("We possess ideas which transcend experience and are innate") was decidedly turning into a victory for innate ideas. It was so difficult as to be impossible to account for innate ideas on the ground of individual experiences of utility and harmfulness, or pleasure and pain. Then Evolution offered the empiricists a way out. We certainly have innate ideas, they agreed, but these innate ideas are the outcome of ancestral experience. "Innate ideas are the petrified deposits of race experience" says Baldwin (*Hist. of Philosophy*, ch. ii, p. 82). Spencer was the great protagonist of this evolutionary solution: and although his early training caused him to protest vigorously against the charge of Materialism—his mother was a class leader of the Wesleyan Church, at King Street, Derby, whilst his father became a Quaker, and Spencer went to the Friends' Meeting on the Sunday morning and the Wesleyan Church at night—there is not the least doubt that Spencer held essentially the same views which, followed to their logical conclusions, have given us the nightmare "psychology" of Behaviourism as the fine fruit of evolutionary thinking. The position of Spencer was this:—

> Evolution offered the student an entirely new standpoint. Its great principle of the continuity of phenomena, applied to the problems of intelligence showed that all absolute distinctions, here as elsewhere, were mere subjective illusions. Between mind in its highest development and mind in its first dim awakenings no boundary could anywhere be set; and the complex intellect of the modern adult, so far from being treated as a thing unique and apart, had thus henceforth to be regarded as the production of the compounding and recompounding of simpler and still simpler elements . . . the principle of continuity further warns us against any attempt to fix a barrier between physiological and psychological phenomena. The manifestations of physical and mental activity have also their unity of composition.*—(W. H. Hudson, *The Philosophy of Herbert Spencer*, p. 105.)

* Spencer says: "Between the automatic actions of the lowest creatures and the highest conscious actions of the human race a series of actions displayed by the various tribes of the animal kingdom may be so placed as to render it impossible to say of any one step in the series, Here Intelligence begins."—(*Principles of Psychology.*)

Essentially this position of Spencer goes the whole way of the materialistic interpretation of life. He fought shy of the logical conclusions of his position; he even, in later life, wrote with capital letters about "that Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed"—Capital I, Capital E's—whilst the New Psychology has no acquaintance with the Quaker Meeting House or the Wesleyan Class Meeting, and feels no such scruples as Spencer had. But Spencer, in this attitude of his, is the forerunner of all the tribe of "theistic evolutionists" and Christian New Psychologists, who try to blend absolute incompatibles into one discordant system of thought. The main differences between Spencer and the New Psychology, as so far developed, are these—that the New Psychology is not prepared to recognize innate ideas in the mind but prefers inherited nerve correlations, predisposing consciousness, or making the way smooth for it, to run along certain predetermined lines of thought; that the logical New Psychologists really regard thought as a form of organic physical movement (nonsensical as that sounds); and that the New Psychology is not prepared to recognize the existence of that intangible and invisible entity we call Soul, or Consciousness in the sense of Personality. But Spencer is the forerunner of those who follow the "new trend," the pathfinder of the evolutionary army, and the father of the New Psychology.

Upon three resultants which proceed from the concept of Evolution in the New Psychology I propose to dwell, namely these:—That the New Psychology is inevitably Determinist in character; that Consciousness is not a Controller but a mere Spectator; and that Personality is an illusion. I shall not be deterred because many exponents of New Psychology would not go to these lengths and would even protest against my argument. It would be a thing of little value to the Philosophical Society that we should merely record universal agreements; it is more important to understand principles and forecast the inevitable goal.

I.—The New Psychology is determinist in character. Determinism is a psychological theory of the nature of Will.

To the New Psychologist Evolution is an axiom. All that is in Man is but a development from a complicated chemically unstable molecule called protoplasm. We have not yet mastered the secret of its manufacture. That is a triumph for the future.

But apart from this beginning all forms of life and all functions of life from the amœba up to Man proceed. We have to regard mentality as inhering in all forms of life from the beginning. Indeed the New Psychology wants mentality to be the psychic side of matter; and few quotations are more popular with him than "Consciousness is latent in the mineral, sleeps in the plant, dreams in the animal, and wakens up in Man." In the higher animals and Man mentality reaches consciousness. Man's consciousness is a development (to give Darwin's famous "line") by means of resident forces from the consciousness of the amœba, the sea-squirt, the amphibian, the marsupial, the hairy tailed quadruped, and the tangle of apes which preceded Man. Indeed, we must go further back than the animal and find consciousness beginning in the plant and even in the mineral. The New Psychologist is fond of pointing out that so far as observation can avail us the same processes of choice, of acceptance or rejection, can be observed in plant as in animal life, in animal life as in Man. The roots of the tree, for instance, turn away from the poor soil and deeply luxuriate in the plentiful supply of food of the old manure bed, and in similar circumstances what else or what more do we observe in animal or Man? Vitalism, seeking to present to us a new concept of freedom, finds its concept of freedom as "creative action" exemplified in the plant world; for instance, a deciduous tree in our temperate zone adapts itself to conditions by preparing in advance for the seasonal changes. It does not wait for winter frosts but sheds its leaves in autumn; nor does it wait for spring to form its buds, but gets them ready in advance. What more does animal or Man achieve by freedom? The amœba is equally sensitive all through: but when a creature appears with some cells more sensitive than others, that is the first appearance of the critical faculty and of "control." Mentality runs up from the lowliest plant forms and the lowliest animal forms into Man, and those lowly forms of life came from the lifeless. There is no break anywhere. "The principle of continuity forbids us to attempt to fix a barrier between the physiological and the psychological"; or between the inorganic and the organic. Is the mineral free? Is there a controlling Soul in the sea-squirt? Does the deciduous tree exhibit what common sense means by "foresight"? Granted that tree roots "prefer" rich soil to builder's rubble, is that "preference" the expression of an intelligent weighing of the alternatives? Manifestly in this unbroken advance from the

mineral to Man there is no possible point at which Choice, Purpose, that intelligent weighing of alternatives which is at the heart of what we mean by Freedom, can be found. In other words, Evolution shuts the New Psychology up to Determinism: to the ceaseless action of necessity.

The Evolutionist takes care to leave us in no doubt about this. The basis of the evolutionary Concept is Continuity. No new forces ever appear or have appeared. Resident forces have controlled the whole process of development. No new element can ever enter. All the forces and all the elements which ever have been on the earth are here now; all that are here now always have been on the earth. Continuity is King. Evolution absolutely bars out God. From the days of Empedocles, who showed how adaptation arises by chance and not design, to Prof. H. F. Osborn who says: "We may first exclude the possibility that Evolution acts either through supernatural or teleological interposition through an external Creative power" (*Origin and Evolution of Life*, p. 10), Evolution has been anti-theistic, has displayed the needlessness of God, and has thrown all its weight on the side of resident forces.* Continuity shuts us up to the alternatives—Man is free if protoplasm is free; but if protoplasm is bound by necessity so also is Man. To affirm that protoplasm is free is not to think but merely to trifle with words. The inevitable alternative is that Man, like protoplasm, is bound by necessity. There is no possible point where Freedom can enter in.

Hence with contemptuous emphasis men to-day deny human freedom. "Free will is a mere lingering chimera. No writer who respects himself can be called on any longer to treat it seriously" (Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*, p. 435). A daily paper trumpets out Herr Einstein's assertion: "Everything is determined—the beginning as well as the end. It is determined for the insect as well as the star." Prof. Wildon Carr in his little book, *The Free Will Problem*, concludes that the Determinist wins the battle of argument, and that Freedom can only be maintained to-day in the sense that Creative Evolution gives it, viz. by submerging the individual in the mysterious reality which is behind and underneath all things, which has not yet

* Compare Prof. Leuba's statement: "In religious lives, accessible to psychological investigation, nothing requiring the admission of superhuman influences has been found."—(*A Psychological Study of Religion*, p. 272.)

fully expressed itself but is in process of expression, and by identifying Freedom with the Universal Life Principle itself.

This vitalistic conception of Freedom does not really help us. It is not the Freedom of which all men are conscious. The only thing free is the universal Life Principle itself, and we are swept along in the effort of its self-expression. Moreover, the concept of Creative Evolution makes no difference to the essential "necessity" of Evolution. Every process remains just what Emergent Evolution conceives it. Spencer took for granted Matter and Motion; Prof. J. B. Watson asks instead for Physics and Chemistry. The difference is a trifle; out of those non-personal beginnings the evolutionary process at last produces Man—"How noble in reason! In apprehension how like a God!" That is still the claim. It makes no manner of difference to the position that Bergson asks us to believe that the universal Life Principle is thus realizing itself. Evolutionary beginnings and endings remain the same; its processes are not altered; they still depend on resident forces, and forbid any barrier or boundary between the mineral and Man.

From Necessity Freedom cannot come. Prof. William James says, "By their fruits, not by their roots, shall ye know them," apparently on this occasion wishing his readers to believe that with a necessitarian ancestry Man has somehow attained to Freedom and that we need not trouble about the ancestry. We are asked to believe that at a certain stage in the combination of non-personal elements, Personality emerges, and in spite of its roots is not an illusion but is real. But Jesus of Nazareth went on to say that fig fruits do not grow on thorn roots. You cannot get the vine's fruits from the thistle's roots. Fruits *come from* roots, and different kinds of roots bear different kinds of fruits. Take, for example, what Mr. H. C. Miller says about prayer (*The New Psychology and the Preacher*, p. 67). It is useless, he says, to pray for fine weather; but if a child prays for fine weather on its birthday and the day turns out fine the child's idea that the weather has been determined by its prayer is "a purely ego-centric impulse, expressing itself in a phantasy mechanism, whereby it attributed the fine weather to its own prayers." Is it not clear that if prayer *derives* from "ego-centric impulses expressing themselves in phantasy," that derivation proves its worthlessness; but if prayer *derives* from "God-centric impulses, expressing themselves in realities of the divine promise and power," that derivation proves its worth? Roots

determine fruits. It is not possible to reach Personal Freedom by infinite combinations of necessitarian elements, whether those combinations are directed by "the universal Life Principle," or by the old "resident forces."

The Theistic Evolutionists (including many of the religious New Psychologists) who combine free theistic religious concepts with necessitarian anti-theistic evolutionary concepts, are the most illogical and impossible of all thinkers. They accept the concept of Evolution, and are baffled by the contradiction between the findings of religion and consciousness and the "necessity" of Evolution. But, instead of rejecting Evolution and preserving the consistency of their thinking, they thrust into Evolution the idea of an intervening God who breathes into some humanoid animal a free spirit. Evolution utterly rejects the idea; and nowhere, either in the Bible, or in the rocks, or in the laboratory, has God hinted at such a combination. Gen. ii, 7, cannot possibly be translated other than "God made man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, so that man became a living creature." There is no hint here of the implantation into a humanoid animal of a Free Self-Conscious Personality, turning the animal into Man. The same Hebrew phrase, *nephesh chayyah,* is found ten times in the Old Testament and only here is it proposed to give it a peculiar meaning which allows the Theistic Evolutionist to combine contradictories, viz. Evolution and Theism. Gen. i, 30, attributes *nephesh chayyah* to "creeping things"; Gen. ix, 10, to "fowl, cattle, and every beast of the earth"; Lev. ii, 46, speaks of "every *nephesh chayyah* that moveth in the waters." That ardent New Psychologist, Dean Bennett, in *A Soul in the Making,* pens wild statements such as "Every human embryo, prior to birth, goes rapidly through the stages of beast, bird, fish and perhaps vegetable too, and after birth retains vestiges and remnants of them all"—and all this to support a Christian appeal! The muddle-headedness of it all is so astounding that anyone with a logical sense feels himself bludgeoned into silence. The best apology for the Theist who insists upon perversely thrusting the concept of Evolution into his Theism would be good Bishop Blougram's view—

> Some think Creation's meant to show God forth:
> I say it's meant to hide Him all it can.

At all events, Evolution's brilliant success in hiding Him

seems to me quite beyond dispute. It gives God no chance of intervention.

II.—The New Psychology belittles Consciousness. "Unconscious Mind" is one of its fundamental concepts; "the great discovery of New Psychology is unconscious motive" (Miller); and psychical processes go on at least as well without Consciousness as with it. Consciousness, in fact, is just a spectator, not a controller, of our life.

It is only possible to touch upon this belittling of Consciousness. That the mind sometimes functions subconsciously is, of course, a teaching of the Old Psychology. There it was called the Subconscious, and such a phrase as "unconscious mind" would not have been tolerated. To the New Psychology, with its dream of consciousness latent in the mineral, sleeping in the plant, etc., unconscious mind presents no difficulty. The Freudian exponents say that the Unconscious mind is the factory of which the public sees and knows nothing. It only sees the products in the shop window, and the shop window is consciousness. We are conscious only of the results of unconscious mind processes, viz. the thoughts, emotions, motives, purposes thrust up into consciousness. These were made without our knowledge; and there is also a great deal in the Unconscious which never rises into consciousness, but yet influences our life. Psychical processes go on just as well without consciousness, and work more powerfully than with it. This view is indeed a very thorough belittling of consciousness.

And it accords with the inevitable and growing view that consciousness is a mere Spectator, a mere awareness. Even those New Psychologists who still illogically hold that each one of us is a spiritual entity called a Soul can only regard consciousness as a mirror in which some part of our life is mirrored. It is not a controller; the New Psychology is determinist and has no place for free personality. Our Personality at best is a spectator, who watches what happens without any power to influence it, and receives from the Unconscious—the dynamic underworld—what the Unconscious is pleased to send. Man is the creature of Necessity and consciousness not the controller of things as they should be but the mirror of things as they are. If there is such a thing as Intelligence without Will, we may still be intelligent beings;

but it is intelligence robbed of its glory. The concept of Evolution makes it inevitable that at best we are intelligent spectators of a life which it is not within our power to control.

III. The Concept of Evolution reaches its fine flower in the "psychology" of Behaviourism. It is there reaching its full logical expression. Behaviourism has its exponents everywhere, and is very popular in America: but its special claim upon attention is that it is the logical development of Evolution.

"Unconscious Mind" seems to most of us a contradiction in terms, inasmuch as mind in our experience is always conscious. The real concept of the New Psychology in this matter presumably is that nerve processes and correlations which have no reflection in consciousness none the less influence mightily nerve correlations which have such reflection. Put into physiological rather than psychological terms unconscious mind is comparatively intelligible.

Such an explanation opens the door for that delightfully logical "psychology" called Behaviourism—which is in reality the denial of Psychology and a development of Biology. Prof. McDougall expresses surprise at the rapid spread of Behaviourism; but when Evolution has been with us for millenniums why be surprised that some people have seen its logical outcome? Prof. J. B. Watson, its famous American exponent, calls it "the modern note in Psychology, now rapidly forging to the front." He regards it as a return to early common sense:—

> Early Psychology was behavioristic—grew up around the notion that if you place a certain thing before an individual or group of individuals, the individual or group will *act*, will *do* something . . . The keynote is, Given a certain object or situation, what will the individual do when confronted by it? (*The Battle of Behaviorism*, pp. 8 and 9.)

For what we call "Soul"—the very subject of Psychology—Behaviourism has no use. Soul is a religious concept, about as important as the nurse's bogey who grabs naughty little children in the dark. "No one has ever touched a soul, or has seen one in a test-tube, or has in any way come into relationship with it as he has with the other objects of his daily experience." Wundt's students boasted that in the first psychical laboratory Psychology had become a science without a soul. But Watson

is not satisfied with that, because they substituted "consciousness" for "soul." But what is "consciousness"? "It has never been seen, touched, smelled, tasted, or moved. To say that Psychology is the description and explanation of states of consciousness is absurd, because consciousness is only an assumption as a basis for "sensations" and their ghosts the "images," and "emotions," and "volitions," and "all the rest." Behaviourists refuse to work with intangibles.

> The Behaviorist puts the human organism in front of him and says, What can it *do*? When does it start to do these things? If it does not do these things by reason of its original nature, what can it be taught to do? What methods shall Society use in teaching it to do these things? . . . With this as subject, Psychology connects up immediately with life.—(*Ibid.*)

The Behaviourist, as a true logical evolutionist, finds nothing required to explain behaviour except the laws of physics and chemistry. He sweeps on one side all such ideas as Cause, Purpose, Will, Deliberation, Choice, Desire, Incentive, Motive, Responsibility, Sin, Guilt, and Consciousness in the sense of controlling Intelligence. He will not even admit Thought. How the unanchored human mind swings! Hegel declared, "Thought is the only Being." Prof. Watson says, "Thought is behaviour: it is motor organization; just like playing tennis or golf or any other form of muscular activity." It is just the reflection in consciousness of muscular action—either of talking, or it may be of movements of the hands, or sometimes of the viscera. "Thinking is merely talking, but talking with concealed musculature." And along with all the concepts which involve choice and assume Personality (which has never appeared in a test-tube!) it seems clear that all moral concepts must go—such as Justice, Honour, Purity, Love—though Truth in the pragmatic sense perhaps may survive.*

It is, of course, easy to see how Behaviourism gets rid of Deliberation, Choise, Responsibility, Sin, Guilt, and so forth;

* Presumably this accounts for the vile movement in some American Universities, where questionnaires have been issued by professors to students of both sexes, asking the most intimate questions concerning their views and practices as to the relationships of the sexes. When the Board of Curators of the University of Missouri disciplined the offending professors, the Association of University Professors, a national organization, strongly protested, affirming "the offense" to be "trivial, if any." This seems to indicate what we may look for when Evolution works out yet more widely into Behaviourism.

not so easy to see how it dissolves Cause away into nothingness; or finds itself able to deny the existence of Thought. Take Deliberation and Choice. All mental processes are really physical processes, mirrored in consciousness (for even Behaviourism cannot get rid of the mystery of "awareness")—"electrotonic, atomic, or molecular movements," someone says. Memory, always present in Deliberation, is to be accounted for by traces left by previous movements in the brain. Many stimuli are all acting upon the deliberator's organism; no one stimulus has the field to itself, or such force as to result in immediate action; and Deliberation is the period during which the various stimuli, uncoordinated, remain balanced against one another; whilst Choice is the resultant when the response, inevitable however long hindered, actually begins its effective movement. Of all this we have awareness; but we need nothing to explain behaviour save the ordinary laws of physics and chemistry, and there is neither scientific evidence nor need for any "vitalistic" ideas.

This is plain enough to those who realize that to Behaviourism Psychology is Biology. But the idea of Cause is more ingeniously explained away. Prof. Watson shows the illusory character of the idea of Cause thus: Stimulus A calls out Response R, and we say A is the cause of R. But if B goes along with A, very soon B calls out R as easily as A does. So, too, if C, D, E are with A. It is thus clear that there is no inherent or sacred connection between one thing and another. Suppose A is a loud noise, and R the fear manifested by a child that hears it. But if we frown when the loud noise occurs very soon our frown awakens R; or if we produce a red balloon, or a dog appears along with the noise, very soon the balloon or the dog will "cause" the fear in the child. The original response "fear" to stimulus "loud noise" is an inherited nerve co-ordination. All the rest is a matter of "conditioning," *i.e.* training, and the idea of Cause vanishes. Similarly the idea of Thought as a process directed by Intelligence is resolved into a complex series of movements, of lips, etc., shaping words, of hands whose movements often replace words, and even movements of internal organs of the body. The only possible answer to our indignant and incredulous question, How then is it that we have the idea that "we" are "thinking"? is that all these movements, all recalling objects of experience, are mirrored in consciousness so that there is the appearance of "thought."

What clever trifling! It gives the willing dupe a glass through which he will "see men as trees walking"—with just as much purposiveness and personal intelligence as a tree or any other organism, and no more. What ingenious and arrant nonsense! The clear deliverances of the universal consciousness of Man are set aside: Soul, Consciousness as directing Intelligence, Personality, is denied: to the Behaviourist Soul is a mere illusion, a faint shadow which haunts the background of mentality, a mist which for some people clouds the mirror of consciousness.* So he denies its existence and elaborates a Psychology without a Psyche—a Psychology which reminds us of G. H. Lewes' words about metaphysicians, viz., "a race mad with logic and feeding on chimeras." The soul has never been seen or smelt, touched or tasted; therefore there *is* no soul! It is simply a shadow. Yet it makes all the difference between reason and unreason, between a spiritual and a mechanistic interpretation of life!

A little more, and how much it is!
A little less, and how far away!

In conclusion, there are three points which I desire briefly to stress. First, the Freudian concept of the Unconscious and Psycho-Analysis might have been devised without any hypothesis of Evolution. That hypothesis colours it in various ways, as the writings, *e.g.*, of Dr. Rivers reveal. But for the rest the New Psychology—as necessitarian in character, sadly belittling Consciousness, and finding in Behaviourism its destined fruit—is the inevitable outcome of the concept of Evolution. That is a fact which many advocates of a Christian interpretation of life have not really faced. From failure of logic, or from too great plasticity of mind, they have failed to deal with the situation. Theistic Evolutionists are spiritual believers, trifling with an implacably hostile theory. Religious New Psychologists in the name of religion lead their devotees a long way towards irreligion. In both cases the defenders of Mansoul have invited Diabolus to come inside, and the New Psychology shows that the only possible result is that Diabolus will set about destroying the city.

* Prof. Russell quotes William James, who calls Consciousness "the faint rumour left behind by the disappearing Soul upon the air of philosophy"; says "the stream of thinking" is really "the stream of breathing"; and substitutes "I breathe" for "I think."

It would be wise for religious people to face the issue. Dr. Rivers says somewhere that in after years we pay a very heavy price for "suppressing" unpleasant "complexes" into the Unconscious. From that deep dynamic region they mightily derange our life afterwards, and our only hope is that the Psycho-Analyst may correct our mistake. Evolution to great numbers of people is the centre of a great number of painful ideas, a "pain-complex." To grasp its meaning and realize its effects means time, effort, and then much bitter conflict. So they shirk the issue and repress it into the Unconscious, thereby storing up even worse things against the time to come. Evolution inevitably spells Determinism, the denial of Personality, and the mechanistic interpretation of all life alike. From the lowest life up to Man himself it is one ordered progression, resulting from resident forces, with no external power which ever intervenes. There is no escape here from the coils of Necessity; no gap through which Personality can enter; no need of anything save physics and chemistry; no logical psychological outcome except Behaviourism. Prof. McDougall scoffs at Behaviourism—yet he holds to Evolution! He admits that *the* problem of philosophy is "Mechanism or Purpose—Which?"—and Behaviourism is simply a school which answers "Mechanism," and then proceeds to account for all illusions of Thought, Personality, and Freedom on the mechanistic basis to which Evolution shuts it up.

Secondly, those who trifle with Evolution need to realize that all arguments against Behaviourism are really arguments against Evolution. Evolution has no scientific standing-ground. Last year, *e.g.*, at the British Association in Cape Town, Prof. D. M. S. Watson, President of the Zoological Section, said that while it is extremely difficult even to test the theory of Natural Selection he thought it was likely to be accepted *because there is no alternative explanation of Evolution;* and went on to say:—

> The theory of Evolution itself is a theory universally accepted not because it could be proved to be true but *because the only alternative, Special Creation, is clearly incredible.*

No more need be said to show that it has no scientific standing. It is a philosophy—and a philosophy leading to impossible conclusions which demonstrate its falsity. It leads to Behaviourism, and the arguments against Behaviourism include the following:—

(*a*) That to deny Personality, directing Consciousness, Freedom, Choice, Desire, Responsibility, is flatly to con-

tradict the universal consciousness of Mankind. The one sure ground of belief is that consciousness. Of the immediate deliverances of consciousness we are certain. Those who adduce reasons for doubting consciousness, themselves depend upon the very consciousness they doubt. Moreover, the doubts are the culmination of long sophisticated processes of thinking. After much effort Man's mind is able to conceive the idea of Determinism. But at once, when the strain of thought is over, like a relaxed bow the mind returns to the unforced consciousness of its natural freedom.

(*b*) That language itself—words such as Motive, Incentive, Purpose, Desire, Responsibility—have no meaning on this basis. Then, how did the very ideas come into existence? If it be answered, "Illusion," then whence the illusion?

(*c*) That Behaviourism flies in the face of Life. We *know* what a difference desires make to action; what a Law Court thinks of motive; what a difference there is between accident and purpose.

(*d*) That physical and chemical processes cannot explain the abysmal differences between the engine which men have made and the extraordinary capacities of the men who made it.

(*e*) Prof. McDougall advances the pragmatic argument that to adopt a philosophy which robs "incentive" of its meaning would be ruin in practical affairs.

(*f*) Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, in his *Dædalus* says that modern physics admits that Matter taken by itself is unintelligible. Physics is so beaten by its problems that it is calling in mind to help it and to supply it with concepts of Matter, Time, Space, to enable it to understand the world. Mighty arguments! Fatal to Behaviourism! And therefore fatal also to Evolution.

Thirdly, it may well make us tremble to contemplate that this grossly materialistic Psychology will probably be given to hundreds of thousands of University students in the years immediately before us; that it will fit in all too harmoniously with the lower impulses of human nature; and that all the mighty urge of Logic will predispose everyone who accepts Evolution to accept Behaviourism also. If it is the task of Philosophy—and it is—to guard the springs from poison, the Philosophical Society has a great task before it.

Discussion.

The Chairman (the Rev. C. Gardner) said: I wish to express my hearty thanks to Dr. Morton, and warm appreciation of his paper, in which he has manfully grappled with a very difficult subject. When I say that there are fifty points in his paper with which I do not agree, I want it to be understood that fundamentally I believe that he and I are agreed. He has covered a long space of years, and reviewing those same years and the facts, I find that I read them differently from Dr. Morton.

First of all, the lecturer refers to the psychology of the Unconscious as wholly modern, and says that forty years ago "Unconscious mind" would have been regarded as a contradiction in terms. But already Hartmann had published, in 1869, his *Philosophie des Unbewussten*, and earlier in the same year had appeared Browning's *Ring and the Book*, in which all turns on the unconscious influence of Pompilia. Still earlier, in 1861, George Eliot had published *Silas Marner* in which the unconscious influence of a little child gently draws Silas into fellowship with his neighbours again. It is here, I think, that we should look for the roots of the modern movement.

Dr. Morton rightly criticizes the doctrine of evolution as expounded by Herbert Spencer, but he is the father only of one party of the modern evolutionists. If evolution is a mechanical process, which negates will and choice, then of course we cannot accept it as an hypothesis. Charles Darwin's theory was mechanical, and for a decade or two it paralyzed all thinking Europe. The early plays of Ibsen show, not only the Doll in the House, but the men, too, to be merely puppets. But deliverance came largely through a pregnant phrase of Schopenhauer—"the denial of the will to live." Nietzsche, a pupil of Schopenhauer, repudiated his master, and after passing through a phase of Positivism, dropped the first part of Schopenhauer's phrase, and affirmed the will to live as a coercive power higher even than logic. Very soon the new evolutionists dropped the mechanical part of evolution, and, instead, saw in it a mysterious life-process dependent on will and choice.

Evolution was thus presented in the pages of Samuel Butler and later in Bergson, and it is the accepted view of those who call themselves Christian. George Eliot, though at one time much associated

with Herbert Spencer, yet drew no mechanical conclusion. In *Daniel Deronda*, published in 1876, her chief character, Mordecai, says that the denial of choice is the blasphemy of the time. "Shall man, whose soul is set in the royalty of discernment and resolve, deny his rank and say, I am an onlooker, ask no choice and purpose of me? . . . Let us contradict the blasphemy, and help to will our better future and the better future of the world."

For my own part, I do not see how logic vindicates the freedom of will and choice. Nevertheless I am entirely convinced that we have the God-given powers, and I constantly remind myself that life is greater than logic. There are many things resolvable in life that remain at a deadlock in logic; and if I am aware that in Christ Jesus I have eternal life, I shall not be deterred by logic, but shall look elsewhere for a solution of perplexities.

I understand that Dr. Morton repudiates evolution altogether. But if evolution is synonymous with development and growth, I see no need to reject it, since in this modified form it leaves us with the freedom of will and choice.

Mr. AVARY H. FORBES said: In his very able and learned paper Dr. Morton calls the New Psychology "clever trifling"; I agree that it is "trifling" without the "clever." It abounds with a stock of brand-new words for which there is no occasion whatever; for they all have their equivalents in last century's dictionaries. Let us look at some of them: *Behaviourism, Complexes, Psycho-therapy, Determinist, Egocentric, Concept, Humanoid, Awareness, Musculature*, etc. What is there in any of these words that expresses a new idea? They introduce real confusion when they are used (as they often are) to do duty, sometimes for one older word and sometimes for another. The word "Concept," for instance, is used sometimes for idea, sometimes for notion, sometimes for belief, or theory, or doctrine; and the reader has to pick out for himself the meaning intended; for now, as formerly, "New Presbyter is but old Priest, writ large."

All this shows merely the bankruptcy of originality. After reading a course of metaphysics, one realizes the aphorism—"If you hear two men arguing and one doesn't know what he is talking about, and the other knows still less, that's metaphysics." The different "schools" differ from each other *toto cælo*; and even members of the

same school contradict each other largely. Sir William Hamilton—one of the most acute and original of our philosophers—differs from Reid, Stewart, and other members of his own school, *in eighteen points*, over *one* faculty of the mind—Perception!

I cannot find that the New Psychology has thrown a single new ray of light on any of the problems of the mind. The phenomena of the unconscious mind and of subconsciousness are as old as the Garden of Eden. The ancient Persians played with the subject; so did the very early Greeks, as we see in Æsop's fable of the cat turned into a damsel. The whole case of the New Psychologist is that of an Evolutionist turned into a fanatic of materialism. With him all life is physical—consciousness, thought, sensation, emotion—are all physical, merely. "I think means I breathe"; "no need of anything save physics and chemistry." "Ingenious and arrant nonsense," Dr. Morton calls it. I would say—"arrant nonsense, but far from ingenious." It is materialism run mad. There is quite as much sense in Mrs. Eddy's dictum that there is no such thing as pain; it is only imagination.

When I meet a fanatic of that kind, I fling Berkeley at him, and then he has not a leg to stand on. Yet I suspect that, though the new psychologists may have read Berkeley, very few, if any of them, have really assimilated Idealism. For Berkeley proved by inexorable logic that the only thing of which we have *direct* knowledge is conscious feeling. Of no *physical* things have we any but indirect, inferential knowledge—which, indeed, has no right to be called knowledge. Descartes had expressed this fact in his well-known formula, *cogito, ergo sum*: but it ought to have been, *sentio, ergo sum*: for feeling comes before thought. The net result of Idealism is that we have no immediate knowledge of "matter" or of anything material—not even of our own bodies. Hence, the existence of chemicals, and retorts, the whole paraphernalia of the laboratory, the fossils of the museum—skulls, bones, teeth, etc.—an inference only.

"Berkeley," said J. S. Mill, "has proved conclusively what no man in his senses can believe." And Bain remarks that "all the ingenuity of a century and a-half has failed to see a way out of the contradiction exposed by Berkeley." Therefore, until the New Psychologist can demonstrate the existence of matter, he is living in the clouds and building castles in the air.

All this deification of the material is the vice of philosophy as applied to Evolution : for the *moral* differences between man and the ape are a thousand-fold *more important* than any physical similarities ; and they disprove heredity far more conclusively than the physical resemblances may seem to assert it. And yet this line of argument is almost entirely ignored by both scientists and philosophers.

In January, 1928, a discussion appeared in *The Times* between men of science, on the subject of cruelty ; and it was admitted that pure cruelty—" taking pleasure in inflicting pain "—was peculiar to the human race, and was not to be found amongst the lower animals : the cat with a mouse being no exception. Take the fiendish cruelties of Soviet Russia, the ghastly tortures of the Inquisition in Spain, the Netherlands, Piedmont, etc., and the perennial ferocities of the cannibal savages ; how can these be inherited from any of the harmless, frugivorous ape tribes ? By parity of reasoning, we see that the worst carnal vices can likewise not have been inherited from the lower animals ; for there is no trace of such vices amongst them.

This argument holds good also of the highest virtues. Is there any trace in the lower animals of the religious instinct, of awe, of worship, of reverence, or of any spiritual feeling—to say nothing of the " joy unspeakable, and full of Glory," which among men is confined to the devoted followers of the Lord Jesus Christ ?

Until these chasms are bridged, it is idle to talk of physical parallels.

Mr. Percy O. Ruoff said : The paper is of unusual interest. There is without doubt a great deal of nonsense talked by some modern psychologists. This is demonstrable by comparison of their contradictory theories. Some speak with ignorance and arrogance as though their fathers were unreflective and unobservant of mental processes. From my study of psychology I conclude that a man is far too complex in the whole range of his personality to be compassed by the methods and rules of psychologists. There are mysterious depths of our being which psychologists vaguely call " the unconscious." The only safety for a man who professes to be a Christian is to place his whole being under the government of the Spirit of God.

I do not apprehend that the best minds in psychology go anything

like the lengths in Determinism which Dr. Morton avers. In an interesting book recently issued entitled *Psychology's Defence of the Faith,* Dr. D. Yellowlees says : " When big things are at stake, when spiritual issues are concerned, when it is not a matter of choosing a number in a game, but choosing this day whom ye will serve, it is quite another story. You cannot even then discount the effect of previous choices, the relative values which a man's past history will inevitably place on the consideration for or against his present choice, but there is more in it than that and well we know it." And again, " There is a sense in which Psychological Determinism is true and important, and we do well to remember it, for our simplest habits and ways of thinking depend upon it, but there is no Determinism which can finally fetter the creative mind and will of man."

This last sentence is important. Every man knows that he can choose any one of a hundred or more courses, and can prove that he is capable of following any or all of these courses by doing them successively, by his own conscious choice of order, or at the bidding of someone else in any order.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : In common with most of the special sciences, Psychology has made rapid progress in our own day ; in fact, the stream of fresh data is now so great that even the professional psychologist can hardly keep abreast of it. Historically the science has remained the same, but the new methods and new knowledge acquired have suggested the popular phrase " The New Psychology."

These advances have inevitably made more acute such persistent problems as the relation between mind and matter and the freedom of the will. But Dr. Morton's title calls attention rather to the use which psychologists have made of the hypothesis of Evolution. Every scientist must employ hypothesis in seeking to arrange and explain the facts which he discovers. The evolutionary hypothesis has been found to furnish a fruitful system of classification. If it can be shown to involve mechanistic conclusions, contradictory alike of Christianity and of the most immediate avouchments of consciousness, it becomes the task of the Christian philosopher to produce an alternative explanation of the progressive orderliness which is such a marked characteristic of the phenomena.

Dr. Morton is to be congratulated upon placing this particular issue before the Institute for the first time. To ignore the issues which have been created by the new facts is worse than futile. Let us face them in quietness and confidence, for "*all* His works shall yet praise Him."

Lieut.-Col. F. A. MOLONY said: I fear that what our learned lecturer has said at the end about University students being taught a grossly materialistic Psychology is only too true, because I have seen at Cambridge a Psychology syllabus, from which it was clear that they profess to be able to give a psychological explanation of Conversion, that most wonderful of all the wonderful acts of God.

Psychology may be useful, but some psychologists are not pleasant people to live with. For one thing, they are always pushing psychological answers at one when one wants straight answers. And these psychological answers are often grossly inaccurate. How can it be otherwise, when the attention of the answerer is being directed as to how best to produce the psychological effect desired? But as regards the root question, are we automata or free agents? I think it is best to consider a concrete case. Take David Livingstone. As a boy he turned from boyish delights, and set himself to learn Latin. Later, he started to explore Africa, though it meant parting from his beloved family, working with natives in a way which was very unpopular in South Africa, learning to take astronomical observations, though he had had but little training in mathematics, and also braving many sufferings and quite appalling risks. Later, he persevered, though his work had brought about the death of his wife, and of the missionaries who had answered his call. Further, Government withdrew support, and the explorer had many other grave disappointments.

Now did that man drift from the source of Heredity down the stream of Environment and the river of Determinism? No! he worked against the stream all the time; and surely the motive force was either his own good Will, or the Guidance and Grace of God—or both.

But if either explanation be correct, then Deterministic Philosophy and Necessitarianism must be rejected.

Mr. G. WILSON HEATH: As I listened to Dr. Morton's eloquence

I conjured up imaginary danger pits all around me, and I longed to find some way of escape, not only for myself, but for the young life of this and other lands. I judge Dr. Morton's case is proved up to the hilt, and I am helped to this judgment by the Chairman's remarks.

May I ask the lecturer two questions? (1) What are we to do individually or collectively to escape from this inferno ourselves? (2) How can we sound the tocsin that others may be warned ere it is too late? The warning, I judge, should be in such clear and definite language that "wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."

Lieut.-Col. L. M. DAVIES: I heartily agree with all that Dr. Morton says. His paper is the more welcome to me because it emphasizes a point which I have tried to bring out in papers read before the Institute, namely, that the modern dogma of *Continuity* lies behind every form of Bible-denying thought to-day. Last year I declared that our latest Psychology, styled *Behaviourism*, is ultimately founded upon belief in Continuity (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. lxi, p. 219); and, in his able paper, Dr. Morton proves the fact in detail, tracing Behaviourism logically back to its origin in that same principle of *Continuity* which was the basis of Herbert Spencer's philosophy.

Evolution is a philosophy, not a science; and it is a philosophy founded, as Huxley showed, upon belief in Continuity. Now Continuity implies Determinism—Determinism by resident forces—which is the most degrading of all beliefs, for it removes both the idea of credit for resisting our lower impulses, and the idea of guilt for yielding to them. Even the most degraded races of mankind have, in times past, been to some degree controlled by a sense of responsibility due to their instinctive recognition of the *fact of choice*; but, as Dr. Morton shows, all such sense of responsibility is now being rapidly removed by the New Psychology, deduced from the idea of "Continuity." Thus the ancient Bible prophecy is being fulfilled in every detail. We are, in this twentieth century, in a fair way to find ourselves surrounded by "scoffers, *walking after their own lusts*," who appeal to the long-foretold dogma that "all things CONTINUE as from the beginning of the creation" (2 Pet. iii, 3, 4).

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

Dr. MORTON, replying on the discussion, said: I am much obliged to all who have taken part for speaking so kindly of the paper. It is quite true, as the Chairman has said, that the Psychology of the Unconscious held a large place considerably more than forty years ago; but forty years ago Psychology was dealing mainly with the Conscious Mind and its processes. I am very glad to note that the Chairman only spoke of accepting Evolution as an hypothesis. I put in the earnest plea that we must not allow a mere hypothesis to colour our thinking and interfere with the certainties of life. I could not admit that Bergson's vitalistic concept makes any difference to the inevitable Determinism of Evolution, inasmuch as it alters nothing in the evolutionary processes but merely assumes that the Universal Life Principle is expressing itself in these processes; but *we* are swept along in the effort of its self-expression. My argument is that Evolution is inevitably necessitarian, and therefore cannot possibly be accepted by those who are conscious of freedom.

I am sure it will never do to define Evolution as "development and growth." Everybody, of course, believes in these; but Evolution is a *very particular kind* of development—namely it is *transformism*; the transmutation of species. It is essential to keep this fact absolutely clear.

I quite agree with Mr. Avary Forbes that the New Psychologist in rejecting Personality and admitting only the existence of matter is faced with a problem that he cannot solve. He rejects the immediate "findings" of consciousness and therefore ought to reject the existence of matter unless he can prove that existence, which he cannot do. I agree with him also that it is quite impossible to find any step by which either the worst vices or the highest virtues have passed from the lower creation to Man.

I think Mr. Ruoff has got, in his volume *A Psychologist's Defence of the Faith*, an illustration of theistic evolution if his quotation is typical. I feel bound to urge again that to attempt to combine Evolution, which is essentially anti-theistic, with the Theism taught in the Bible is to combine absolute incompatibles. Mr. Leslie desires me to say how I should explain the progress made by modern

Psychology if Evolution, which has guided that progress, is false. But my reply would be that much modern Psychology is independent of Evolution. I said, for example, that I thought Psycho-Analysis might have been devised without any evolutionary hypothesis at all; that I think is also true of Comparative Psychology, and, I think, even also of much Social Psychology. Where Evolution has mainly influenced thought is in the Psychology of Behaviourism, and I should not admit that Behaviourism represents any progress at all.

I am very glad that Colonel Molony emphasizes that Man is consciously a free agent and often works against the stream of heredity, and environment, and all the forces of Determinism. There is nothing that we are *certain* of except the things which are matter of immediate consciousness. These things we *know*. I am glad he and Mr. Wilson Heath both sound the note of alarm. I agree with Mr. Heath that it is difficult for any of us to free our minds to-day from this obsession of the modern mind—Evolution. Yet I am quite sure that for our own protection we must steadily refuse to think in evolutionary terms; and in answer to his second question I am more and more deeply impressed with the need for educational enterprise. We have not in Great Britain one single Fundamentalist University. We need to follow the example of the non-Conformists of 250 years ago, who, when they were turned out of the Universities, started their own Colleges all over the country. Sound thinkers ought to claim " a local habitation and a name " in University life.

I am encouraged by Colonel Davies' agreement that the dogma of *Continuity* logically must result in the nightmare Psychology of Behaviourism. What a tragedy it is that the modern mind is in the grip of this false dogma, which is forcing it on over the precipice and into the abyss.