

*Quoted**

§

...I have tried too long to follow Watson in saying that psychology is the science of behavior. I am now convinced that is wrong. Psychology has always been concerned with internal explanations. To show how futile that is, let us imagine that it has been successful. Let us suppose that all those who examine mental processes introspectively now agree on what they see. Let us suppose that what they see confirms a set of theories upon which all cognitive psychologists now agree. And let us suppose that brain science, looking inside the behaving organism in a different way, has found what convincingly can be called the same thing. Shall they then have discovered the causes of human behavior or simply more about what is behaving? (p. 3)

...We have been accused of building our own ghetto... Rather than break out of the ghetto, I think we should strengthen its walls. No field of science has ever been more clearly defined than this world of ours. In no other world are there more fascinating things to be explored. No world has a greater potential for solving the problems that face the world today, above all saving the planet Earth. (p. 5)

§

*From: Skinner, B.F. (1993). A world of our own. *Behaviorology*, 1 (1), 3–5.

[This quote is actually from page 296:]

Quoted*

§

...Skinner and his followers never had a chance of making over psychology by demonstrating that practices informed by their natural science were more effective... Should accumulating evidence force a traditional psychologist to the brink of either abandoning mysticism or discounting valid and reliable evidence, the typical traditional psychologist treats the dilemma as a Hobson's choice—there is no real option. Any science that contradicts the fundamental mystical assumptions is abandoned. People who got into science in the first place in order to shed some scholarly light on the details of their deepest philosophical assumptions (including, especially, those of a religious nature) are not going to abandon those foundations if that science starts causing trouble. Instead, they abandon the science, which at that point is merely an intellectual tool that initially looked helpful, but has proven to cause more difficulties than it is worth. (pp. 128–129)

§

*From a longer quote of L.E. Fraley in chapter 5 of Fraley, L.E. & Ledoux, S.F. (1997). *Origins, status, and mission of behaviorology*. In S.F. Ledoux. *Origins and Components of Behaviorology*. Canton, NY: ABCs.

[These quotes are actually page 318:]

Quoted*

§

...Cultural survival appeared to be at stake during the emergence of modern biological science and on other occasions in human history. And so again today. However, the technologies capable of destruction that characterize the present era (whether actively, as with nuclear weapons, or passively, as with unchecked population or pollution) are qualitatively greater than those of previous times. This puts not just cultural survival but the survival of life in general on this planet at risk (e.g., from a nuclear winter). The early behaviorologists believed... that that was what was at stake, and so they incurred the costs of organizing the behaviorology movement and discipline. (p. 313)

§

*From Appendix 2 (Ch. 7 section) of Ledoux, S.F. (1997). *Appendices*. In S.F. Ledoux. *Origins and Components of Behaviorology*. Canton, NY: ABCs.

Quoted*

§

...Future readers, should their lives have unfolded within the context of a culture pervaded by behaviorology, might have difficulty appreciating a past era of antithesis to behaviorological science. That people would not have readily invested in a repertoire that effective—one that obvious and well demonstrated in its validity and implications, one that elegant in its parsimonious reduction of false complexities—could tax the comprehension of those who live in such a future.... (p. 158)

§

*From Ch. 7 of Fraley, L.E. & Ledoux, S.F. (1997). *Origins, status, and mission of behaviorology*. In S.F. Ledoux. *Origins and Components of Behaviorology*. Canton, NY: ABCs.