

THE MAIN-SPRINGS  
OF  
HUMAN NATURE

BY J. HUMPHREY

IS MAN GOOD AND EVIL ?

IS MAN AN AUTOMATON ?

MIND, ENERGY AND GOD

ENVIRONMENT - V - HEREDITY

\* \* \*

PRICE ONE PENNY

# THE MAIN-SPRINGS OF HUMAN NATURE

BY J. HUMPHREY

We all know what we mean when we speak of human nature, but few could give a clear and logical explanation of what is human nature. Dictionaries are very vague in their definitions. One says: "Anything that is natural to man is human nature", but what is natural to man they leave us to guess. In this direction psychologists seem just as confused as most other students. Freud had not been teaching very long before his pupils began to disagree with him. Surely all the contradictions and widely differing theories should suggest to the psychologists that there is something wrong with their methods of investigation.

It is easy to see why psychologists have gone astray. Psychology is the science of the mind. Psychologists look upon the mind as something distinct from the brain, as do the phrenologists whose first principle is, "That the brain is the organ of the mind". This is akin to the theory of the Vitalists who state that: "The mind enters our brain and directs its activities." But they give us no explanation as to when it enters the brain, how it gains admission, or how it controls the brain. If the mind controls the brain, how does man make up his mind? If the immaterial mind controls the physical, that is, the material brain, what happens when a person loses consciousness? Why does the mind cease to direct the brain's activity under such circumstances? Every person has the same physical organs and mental faculties, then why does the mind cause people to act so differently from each other? I hope to be able to show that it is the variation in the physical proportions of the body and brain that gives an inherited disposition and tendencies to particular traits of character. The scientists of 2,000 years ago classified these physical variations under the title of "Temperaments" meaning a proportionate mixture; and they are the standard temperaments of today. With very few exceptions writers on the temperaments have been physicians. In the study and practice of their profession they are accustomed to have their attention directed to the various diseases and abnormal mental conditions that accompany particular physical constitutions.

In the study of human nature we cannot ignore the power of the body over the brain, but I am not writing of diseased conditions, but of inherited subnormal, normal and abnormal development of individual physical organs and their mental control centres. However much one dislikes the idea that

man is an automaton one cannot understand human nature unless the study is approached from that angle. We all know that the physical structures and mental faculties react upon each other without the individual being aware of the fact. Physicians and scientists are just discovering the glands which are associated with the temperaments, and play such an important part in stimulating or retarding the activity of the brain.

There are two schools of thought on this subject. One says that human nature never changes, the other, that human nature is always changing. I wish to show that these two opponents are both correct. How can we expect the general public—who are subservient to authority—to have a clear conception of any subject while authorities differ so much that their conclusions appear to negative each other?

Lord Baldwin, when Prime Minister, said that "While the tiger is in man we must prepare for war". The late Prof. Sir Elliot Smith, said in his book "Human Nature" "Cruelty and quarrelsomeness are not due to innate qualities, but are awakened by artificial beliefs and violent practices devised by their fellows". The reference to the tiger in man is not a correct analogy. Tigers, nor any other animal, do not make war on their own species; it has been left to man to fall to such unnatural practices, which have been organised by their rulers throughout the ages.

The reference to the tiger in man is on a par with another well-worn phrase "Human nature being what it is" with which the ordinary person prefaces every objection he raises to any suggested change in the social system. Writing on the subject of "Good and Evil" Mr. H. J. Massingham asks: "Is civilisation responsible for the tiger in man?" He goes on to say:—"The cardinal error of attributing our wars and conflicts to inherent human nature is derived from confusing the savage with the primitive. In reality they are utterly distinct, for early civilisations come between them. The customs of savage peoples can and have been traced back to the cultured contacts of the early pioneers upon them."

"Such people, on the other hand, as the Punans of Borneo, the Greenland Eskimo, the Californian Indians, the Negritos of the Congo, and the Malay Peninsula and others, are unacquainted with the elementary crafts of civilisation. They do not build houses, nor cultivate the soil, nor value metals. They remain at the bottom of the cultural ladder, and represent the once universal condition of mankind. These people and other primates with them, are the gentlest of human beings on this earth. There is complete harmony and absence of violence or cruelty. Authority does not exist, and decisions are taken by mutual consent."

"They represent "the ape, the tiger and the cave man" whom statesmen assure us are so ready to burst snarling from their civilised bonds. It is civilisation itself which is responsible for savagery, for wars, for strife, for violence, and we have nothing to fear from our natural inheritance and inherent human nature"

Dr. Albert Churchward in his book "The Origin of Primitive Man" tells us that these peoples are not the degenerates that some investigators wish us to believe. On the contrary he gives detailed descriptions of their physical structures and their similarity to those of the apes. Like the apes they have all the physical and mental structures that are found in man. The apes have the physical organs of speech, but have few intelligible sounds by which to express their feelings and desires. The Pigmies, the Doctor tells us, are much more developed in this direction, they have a language of their own, but the words are of one syllable only and are used in association with signs.

In the description of their social life we find they make signs to the Great Spirit of the storms, but they have no idea of a God.

The Doctor describes four tribes that are to be found among these peoples. Some scientists class them as different races; that is a mistake for there is no functional change, but there is in each group a progressive improvement in size and physical proportions, also an increase in intelligence.

Nearly all the authorities who claim that there is a mind directing man's mental activities, deny that animals have a mind; in so doing they negative their own position. Dr. Kellogg, and many other scientists, have proved conclusively that the brain of the higher apes can do just the same things that man does, the difference being in capacity not in function.

Dr. Kellogg reared together a baby and a chimpanzee of the same age. Up to six months the chimpanzee learned to do most things more quickly than the baby. As soon as the baby began to understand words it forged ahead. Here we see the difference between function and capacity; both could remember words and signs, but the baby's capacity was greater.

The following extract is from an article written by one who thinks that human nature is always changing: "Oh, indeed! then how comes it we are here, living and talking in civilised communities, instead of hanging downwards from the trees of the jungle by our tails?"

Here we have an example of observing and thinking, but not reasoning, the writer asks the question, but leaves it for someone else to complete the investigation. The question also suggests that the writer is not aware of the difference between

the evolution of function and the hereditary transmission of form, size, colour and quality of the organisation, and the capacity of the mental faculties.

Another controversy is that of Heredity-v-Environment, which is the more important? Without question it is the latter. There had to be a suitable environment before life was possible, and life can continue only while it remains suitable. It is environment that decides heredity, because it brings people together before marriage. It is the social conditions that put the barrier between rich and poor.

At birth all normal children have the same mental faculties but varying in capacity. The son of a well-to-do man may become a physician, but the son of a farm labourer will be fortunate if he becomes a mechanic. The importance of the first seven years of a child's life is seldom realised, but, says the Roman Catholic priest give me the child till seven and I care not who has it after; do not the ruling class keep control of all the channels through which the people obtain knowledge?

The founders of Astrology were aware of the cosmic influences on human nature, and how people's capabilities are stimulated or retarded by the rays. In a pamphlet published recently by the Rationalist Press, the author says:—"The Astrologers talk about rays and vibrations without being able to specify their nature, or demonstrate how emanations from distant planets can so influence children at birth as to determine their characters and predetermine their careers."

Let us see what members of the Rationalist Association have to say on this aspect of human nature. Prof. J. B. S. Haldane, in an article published in a daily paper, wrote as follows:—"That as the sun increased in power from February onwards, the ability to absorb the phosphates from our food increased in a relative degree, and from July the ability decreased in a similar proportion." This he named the "blood tide" because of the "ebb and flow". Blood tests were made on himself and other scientists, but artificial light stimulation failed to counteract the ebb and flow.

Lord Cowdray, who discovered the life-giving yellow ray, carried this investigation a little further. He found that the power of absorption was not changed equally each month in all people, that there was something in the individual that modified the degree of change. He also found that it was the angle of the rays at which they struck the earth, which caused the variation in their influence on mankind.

The Rationalist Association seems to have forgotten, that in one of their own publications, two doctors tell us that our life is dependent on external influences, namely, "light and electricity". These they say: "Are continually absorbed

and again given off as heat and energy." Let us go more deeply into these external influences on people's capabilities and disposition. Prof. Haldane has told us that it is the absorption of the phosphates that comes under the stimulation of the rays from the sun. Next to oxygen the phosphates are the most needed elements for feeding the brain, they are the fundamental elements of intelligence, they have a stimulating influence on the recuperative power of the body, there can be no generation of life without the phosphates. Does not wild life commence breeding in February? A lack of potassium is a contributing cause of cancer. A lack of calcium phosphate is the cause of rickets which the sun's rays will help to cure.

This dependence of life on the cosmic rays should suggest to the Rationalist Association, that there is a field for research, not condemnation.

The foregoing descriptions of primitive man and the external cosmic powers, proves, I think, that the environment is more powerful than heredity; that these cosmic rays influence man without his conscious co-operation; that they do, as the founders of Astrology observed, predispose people to react in certain definite ways to particular cosmic ray influences; and as scientists are discovering, these rays have an effect on the hereditary transmission of physical and mental variations.

Bio-chemists have made a deep study of the effects by each of the twelve principle chemical elements of our body on a person's character and capabilities. They have formulated a system of Temperaments based on the excessive absorption of a particular element. This is not a classification of diseased conditions, but of the inherited physical constitution. This is a most important contribution to the study of human nature.

They have found that excess or deficiency not only predisposes one to particular diseases, but they have a profound influence in modifying the activity of the mental faculties, showing that the material brain is the instrument through which our nature manifests, and is not dependent on an immaterial mind.

Everyone knows that the growth of the body is dependent on the correct functioning of certain glands, but few realise that minute quantities of chemical elements in excess or deficiency will cause direct opposites in character. This will not be surprising when we remember that the brain is fed and nourished by the blood; that the cells are so small that they have to be magnified 200 times before they can be seen; they are not all composed of the same chemicals, yet each cell selects only those elements it needs; there are many groups of cells each group differing in size, shape and colour; if a group of cells is insufficiently fed it cannot be so efficient as when

properly fed. The dependence of the brain on the body is shown when a person faints, for then the brain ceases to function immediately the oxygen supply falls below a certain level; if the whole supply ceases then life ceases at once. The excessive intake of alcohol operates on the brain of different people in different ways; at first it stimulates the most active centres, but as it absorbs the oxygen from the blood it prevents the brain getting sufficient energy (or mind) and brings on a state of coma; the depth of the coma is modified by the individuals recuperative power and ability to reabsorb oxygen.

The Bio-chemists have named their Temperaments after the chemical that is in excess, such as the Oxygen Man, the Hydrogen Man, the Silicon Man, and so on for each chemical. Here we see the difference between the medical system of temperaments which are the result of disease, and those that are inherited, and act as a cause of character and disposition. For an example let us take the oxygen man in whose blood there will be an excess of oxygen, and see how it works in his system. To do this we first observe the characteristics of oxygen, and we find that it is never still, its work of dissolution is continually going on; digestion is dissolution, therefore the oxygen man will have an active digestion, this will enable him to extract plenty of nutriment from his food. As he gets plenty of oxygen he will have large lung capacity, this means that all the bodily processes will be working efficiently and the brain will always have a full supply of oxygen, which is the driving power of the brain. The desire for oxygen will drive him to the open air. His restlessness makes him seek those pursuits which give change and variety, thus he may be a scientist, but not a philosopher, nor will he be found at the chess table. He will be impulsive, quick to anger but never vindictive, he soon forgets. He enjoys good health; if ill it will be through excesses.

The above brief description of the oxygen man will suggest the way all the other elements influence man's physical and mental activities.

It would not be correct to say we inherit a particular blood combination, yet that in the end is what we do, for we inherit glands which have a particular degree of the power to absorb the needed chemical elements. The cells of the body also differ in their powers of attraction and absorption from person to person; this variation is the basis of all the differing types of human beings, mis-named races. For instance, the skin of all peoples is white; it is the variation in the colouring matter under the skin which gives the gradations of colour found in people inhabiting different localities. This colouring is in the blood; there is very little under the skin of the

blonde, but with the brunette we are nearly mid-way between the blonde and the black peoples.

The blonde and the brunette are opposites in both colour and character. Love of praise is the blonde's chief failing. In this direction the early training will make or mar the whole life. Unfortunately, most parents cultivate this sentiment. It being inherited in a dominant degree, the training tends to inflame the desire into an obsession; the intellect is then used to gratify the craving, in this way they become a nuisance to themselves and their friends. If in early life this sentiment is retarded and the intellect cultivated they become ambitious to achieve something, mostly in an artistic direction, they may take to a scientific pursuit, but not philosophy. They lack concentration, are fond of gaiety; many of them are frivolous and fickle. They feel criticism very keenly and often take offence at an ordinary remark, though easily offended they are seldom vindictive, but they often become deceitful if praise is not lavished on them.

Seldom do we find a really vain brunette, but when this does occur they become either vindictive or develop a neurosis when the environment is unfavourable to them. When the venous blood is much in ascendancy over the arterial blood there is sure to be pessimism, they always think everything is against them, and they feel that no one can help them. On the intellectual plane we find the brown and dark-haired people interested in philosophy and kindred subjects which call for persistent thought and reflection.

As there are two distinct mental processes, thinking and reasoning, the brain must have two sections. The first consists of all the brain centres which are linked up with the five senses; these are termed the intelligence centres because it is in them that all our knowledge is recorded. The other section consists of those centres with which we compare, analyse and form conclusions; these are termed the intellectual lobe of the brain, it is seldom used by the average person for he prefers to think rather than reason.

All the five senses were evolved by the interaction between the primitive forms of life and external objects, the medium being attraction and repulsion, which is still the foundation of all human activities; are not all people attracted by those things which they think are beneficial to them and avoid those things which they think are harmful?

Genius means one, therefore a genius is a person who is great in one subject, such as music, poetry, mechanics or some such special ability. Many people look forward to a time when everyone will be a genius. This is a mistaken idea, in nearly all cases a genius is an unbalanced person, mentally

and physically. Leonardo da Vinci was not a genius, but a great man. He was endowed with a brain above the average in capacity in all the intelligent and intellectual centres supported by quick-acting recuperative powers; therefore a supply of energy was always available. But with the genius this is seldom the case, consequently most of them have been undesirable people on the social plane.

Another misconception is, that man's constructive ability is associated with the reproductive functions. It is frequently referred to as "Man's creative spirit". The reproductive function is purely physical, it stimulates the brain into activity for its own expression, and there it ends. Reproduction had its origin in the protozoan cells millions of years before the mental centres, giving us our constructive ability, came into being. Sex evolved out of the recuperative function of primitive cellular life.

The first sign of constructive ability is seen in the birds; among them can be observed many gradations of the ability; from a nest made with sticks and mud to what may be called works of arts so cleverly and beautifully are they constructed. The same variation in constructive skill can be observed in the animals; the Beaver and some of the Apes exhibiting degrees of ingenuity.

The location of the centre of Constructiveness indicates its origin; it is above, and joined to, the centre of Taste. Its physical function is to control the wings of birds, the forelegs of animals, the arms and hands of man. Vision and the sense of touch are both essential in all human activities needing manipulative skill. The colour nerves are most important for painter artist, and the quality of the physical structure determines to a very large extent the degree of the so-called "creative spirit" expressed in all art, music, religions and human sentiments or emotions. Mechanics of all kinds depend on the visual cells and nerves which reflect the size, density or quality of the materials they may be using; not only in art, but in many industries, keen colour perception is a necessity. Whichever branch of the constructive arts or sciences we may observe there will be found more physical influence than purely mental expression. Mental expression is determined by three factors, the inherited physical constitution, the innate mental capacity and the environment. In the mechanical world, as in all other branches of human activity, the mental capacity a person has inherited cannot be expressed in any way before knowledge has been acquired. Knowledge does not give the desire to follow any particular trade or profession, that is determined by the inherited physical and mental structure. The versatility of a person is determined in the same

way; no matter how large the brain, if it is not supported by a good supply of energy there cannot be a continuous output of work which otherwise such a brain would be capable.

Is man a moral being? Has man an innate sense of right and wrong? He cannot have either for moral concepts have to be acquired after birth. If man had an innate moral faculty it would be permanent, it would be the same in every individual. We know that moral ideas have changed continuously throughout the ages, that they differ from tribe to tribe, from nation to nation. If man had an innate conception of moral behaviour, should we not expect to find all religious and ethical principles to be the same? Can we say that the conduct of the leaders of the many religions have been what we could term moral? Man has an innate desire to do what is right and just, but what he thinks is right is decided by his past and present environment. Military propaganda demonstrates the truth of this. In a few months this propaganda transforms a normal human being into a destroyer of men, women and children. Because it suits Authority it is honourable to kill all one can the day before the Armistice, but one becomes a murderer should he kill one person the day after. Why? Because the killing is done to settle the ruler's quarrels, not to gratify an innate human desire to kill.

Enmity between the sexes did not exist before the development of superstition and private property. The criminal is also the product of our unnatural social system, therefore it is society that should be punished, not the victim. Writing in "The Daily Telegraph" the Rev. L. B. Ashby said: "We find forgiveness difficult. There is something in our human nature which rebels against the demand that we should have kindly feelings towards those who have wronged us." Punishment had its origin at the time that superstition began to introduce taboos, etc.. Punishment was one of the first causes of war between tribes and clans. If the Rev. gentleman will investigate the evolution of religion he will find that punishment and religious suppression laid the foundation of warfare between nations, and that it is the leaders of religion who have always preached and practised punishment. There is no innate urge in human nature to punish, the feeling is cultivated; mothers are the first teachers, they start the practice as soon as the baby begins to take notice; following this, parents and friends commence the cultivation of the war-mind by giving the child all types of military toys, then foolishly talk of war being a part of human nature.

There are seven lobes to our brain; these lobes consist of groups of cells, each group has its own particular function. The self-preserving lobe was the first to be evolved. Like

all other organs the self-preserving lobe varies in capacity, the greater the capacity the more inclined one will be to consider self. Those who are familiar with the laws of heredity know that the continued selection of a particular characteristic tends to make it a "dominant factor" in the species. This has happened with the Jewish People. The persecution inflicted on the Jews in the past repeatedly selected those with the self-preserving lobe above average capacity, resulting in the lobe becoming a dominant characteristic in Jewish heredity. This lobe does not determine the methods of self-preservation, environment does that. In capitalist countries money is the only medium, but in Palestine there are thousands living a true Communal Life having ceased to use money among themselves, proving that it is the environment which decided the methods that were adopted for self-preservation.

Many people think that if man were an automaton there could have been no progress. But one may ask, what is progress? 2,500 years ago Greece had a "Democratic State" yet they had slavery, as we have in all democratic countries today; but there are signs of progress. In those days slavery was forced, today it is voluntary. Under forced slavery one had as many slaves as one could afford and keep, to-day they cost the capitalist nothing but their keep.

Had there been no sound vibrations we would not have evolved a sense of hearing. We cannot hear or sense wireless vibrations; they are sent out by a machine and can be picked up only by a machine having the same speed. Man's musical abilities are similar. It is the different physical vibrations of our body that gives man different musical abilities and vocal variations. The physical make-up gives one an inclination for a particular musical instrument. The pitch of the voice is determined by the muscles of the throat, as everyone must be aware.

Wanderlust is a problem that has puzzled many students. I mention this because so many psychologists think it is due to a different mental centre to those possessed by other people. Wanderlust is an expression of a particular physical combination. The direction in which it finds expression is mainly determined by environmental urges and opportunities. It is the same mental and physical combination that makes the pioneer, the explorer and those who perform feats of physical endurance.

An easily seen example of man's automatic nature is the persecution of people with advanced ideas. This action dates back to the earliest records. In historical times we have the cases of Socrates, Christ, Galileo and the millions of victims of religious and political rulers; can anyone say that they

are free from this failing? It is seen in the sparrow that kills the escaped canary; the hen that kills a chick from another brood, and it can be observed in many animals.

SYNOPSIS—Environment created man good. Man, by delegating his responsibility to rulers created evil.

Evolution gave instinct, but not knowledge; it gave function but not capacity. Heredity gives capacity, but not knowledge, function or instinct. It has given the Chinese a large capacity for the memory of outline, hence the immense number of symbols in their alphabet. It may give idiocy and genius in the same person. It gives greatness and personality. Neither evolution nor heredity gives nationality, that is the work of environment. Man's environment includes the sun, moon and other cosmic influences. There is no life, mind or energy without the sun; therefore, environment is both nature and God.

Phrenology, Astrology, Palmistry and kindred studies of man are based on the automatic nature of man. Practitioners in these studies could not give a delineation if man did not act according to his abilities and the opportunities provided by the environment.

A writer in the "Rationalist Annual" for 1941, said;—

"We shall see how, under the "law of the jungle" man's nature became crowded with the opposing qualities of good and evil, of virtue and of vice."

A careful study of the evolution of our mental faculties will convince any unbiased person, that there could be no place for evil in our nature. There is no record of any person having a faculty that is not possessed by all other human beings. There is a logical explanation as to why men commit crimes, but there is no explanation as to how evolution produced in man an innate desire to injure his fellows, nor how this desire could be in some and not in others.

Every living thing loves freedom because all life was evolved in a social state free from the domination of any member of the same species, and man is no exception. So strong is this desire for freedom—which is Anarchism—that governments have no difficulty in getting men to give their lives in its defence.

As all our physical organs and mental faculties were evolved in a social state of Anarchy, then, obviously, Anarchism, a no money system, is the natural social system for man, based on the law that "Each may do as he pleases providing he does not interfere with the liberty of others."

---

Printed and published by J. Humphrey, 2, Malden Crescent,  
Chalk Farm, London, N. W. 1.