

Recs C/5/3 (6)

URSP 5/3/6

JAMES DREVER (1873-1950).

EMERITUS PROFESSOR JAMES DREVER died on August 11th last year. He had made a good recovery from the heart attack which prevented his taking part in the Twelfth International Congress of Psychology in 1948, but a second attack, in March, 1950, proved much more serious, and his death, when it came, was not unexpected.

He was born in the Orkney Islands and educated at Stromness. Those who know the Orkneys merely from the map probably think of them as rather wild and remote, belonging with the Hebrides and other struggling depopulated outposts. In point of fact, they are relatively prosperous and fertile. The climate is windy, but the rainfall is not excessive, and the Gulf Stream maintains a winter temperature about the same as that of the Isle of Wight. The natives are hard-headed, practical people, of Norwegian ancestry, and the schools at Kirkwall and Stromness have a very fine record. I remember a photograph taken at some conference which showed my father and several other Orcadians of round about the same age. All were scientists, and, except for Sir John Flett of the Geological Survey, all were in charge of university departments. Thus, the step from the school at Stromness to Edinburgh University was neither an unusual nor a difficult one.

My father graduated M.A. in 1893, with the intention of going on to qualify in medicine. He completed two astonishingly strenuous years' teaching during the vacations and during term combining the first two stages of a medical degree with the honours classes in philosophy. His eyesight began to trouble him, however, and he gave up medicine to become a full-time teacher. For the next decade teaching was a background to very active studies in science, until, in 1905, Professor Darroch invited him to act as Assistant in Education at Moray House.

At Edinburgh, as perhaps elsewhere, it is probably fair to say that while philosophy and physiology may have been the parents of psychology, education acted as a wet nurse without whom the child would have failed to develop its present robust constitution. From as early as 1906 Scottish teachers under training had to take a course in psychology. In 1914 a step forward was taken by the establishment of a post-graduate Diploma in Education of which the university class in psychology became an integral part. Finally, in 1917, the course for the degree of Bachelor of Education provided, for the first time in Scotland, training in psychology at an honours level. Until quite recently this degree has been by far the most important means by which psychological qualifications could be obtained north of the Border.

During this important early period for psychology, my father played an active part. He was still at Moray House then, but the University department of psychology was being built up on a sound experimental foundation by W. G. Smith, whose early death, like that of H. J. Watt at Glasgow, was a grave loss. In 1919 my father succeeded Smith in charge of the University department. He was made Professor in 1934.

I have sometimes heard it said that psychology at Edinburgh has had an easy time compared with some other universities. Certainly the Department passed early beyond the "man and a boy" stage and was well housed and equipped by contemporary standards. This was due in large measure to my father's energy and enthusiasm, perhaps also to a certain pugnacity which he never failed to show on what he held to be matter of principle. The going was not particularly easy. In the University itself psychology had to grow up alongside the philosophical disciplines, and, in Kemp Smith and A. E. Taylor, my father

James Drever (1873-1950)

had two notable colleagues who viewed the new science with a certain reserve. It was a major achievement to place psychology beside philosophy and moral philosophy as a subject for the honours M.A. degree. In Science it was easier, and the honours B.Sc. came quite early.

Much of my father's time and thought after 1919 was devoted to building up the Department. His most important published work dates from his Moray House days. The *Instinct in Man* was published in 1917. It has worn well. The historical sections are scholarly, and contain material not easily accessible elsewhere. Many of the theoretical points are acute and still relevant. Only the controversy with McDougall has dated. The whole work is very much in the older Scottish tradition of empirical psychology, an *Essay on the Passions* rewritten in the light of contemporary biological knowledge. Other published works, written sometimes in collaboration with Dr. Collins, are mainly at a fairly elementary level. They are sober sensible treatises and must have done something in their time to counteract the more extravagant variants of psychology that have such a ready, popular appeal. Of the journal articles on a wide variety of psychological and educational topics the earlier were on the whole more important than the later.

One might say of my father that he was a pioneer rather than a discoverer ; one whose task was to break in and cultivate a new tract of land rather than set out into the unknown. Like most pioneers he was intensely conservative. Freud and Spearman, for instance, seemed to him speculative and unsound.

His pioneering was not, however, confined to the academic field. He was convinced that psychology, even at an early stage in its development, had much to offer the community at large. He founded an early child guidance clinic, and did a great deal of practical work in selection and vocational guidance. In this direction he did much for Psychology. His combination of enthusiasm and obvious integrity attracted many people who might otherwise have rejected psychology as new-fangled and " queer."

It is difficult for someone in my position to sum up in any adequate fashion. I have been too close to see my father in perspective, and my sense of loss is still too great to find ready expression. As a person he was shy. Though confident enough in the lecture theatre he was apt to be lost in the drawing-room. Someone who could talk shop was always welcome, not necessarily psychological shop, for his intellectual interests were very wide. He was very much attached to some of his professional colleagues both here and abroad. But his closest friends remained those of his Oracadian boyhood.

Perhaps a psychologist brought up by a psychologist ought to have something interesting to say about his own childhood. Looking back, however, I cannot detect anything that one could readily label " psychological." Affection, humour and understanding were there in abundance, but so also was a certain, old-fashioned strictness. I can still remember the traditional formula, delivered in all seriousness " This hurts me more than it hurts you."

But it is as a student of my father's that I should be writing this, and on behalf of other students. From Kenneth Craik downwards, if they will forgive me for putting it like that, they are a goodly company. Looking back they will be able to fill in all the really important things that I have failed to say. And they themselves are his best memorial.¹

JAMES DREVER (Junior).

¹ EDITOR'S NOTE.—To this modest report of Drever's life and work should be added the following. He was President of the Twelfth International Congress of Psychology, a former President of the British Psychological Society and of the Psychology Section of the British Association. He was editor of the *British Journal of Psychology Monograph Supplements*, and a member of the Editorial Board of the *British Journal of Educational Psychology* from its foundation.