

A plea for the unborn : an argument that children could, and therefore should, be born with a sound mind in a sound body, and that man may become perfect by means of selection and stirpiculture / by Henry Smith.

Contributors

Smith, Henry.

Publication/Creation

London : Watts, 1897.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/x367b5yc>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

A PLEA
FOR THE UNBORN.

BY

Henry Smith



22102135710

Med

K20476

Dxix. a

19

A PLEA FOR THE UNBORN.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/b28112647>

A PLEA

FOR THE

UNBORN.

*AN ARGUMENT THAT CHILDREN COULD,
AND THEREFORE SHOULD, BE BORN
WITH A SOUND MIND IN A SOUND
BODY, AND THAT MAN MAY BECOME
PERFECT BY MEANS OF SELECTION AND
STIRPICULTURE.*

BY

HENRY SMITH

*(Author of "Physical Education," "Religion of the
Brain," "Genius and Art," etc.).*

LONDON : WATTS & CO.,
17, JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEET STREET, E.C.

1897.

2/6

3823

6923 732


WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	welMOmec
Call	
No.	W

PREFACE.

My love for children, my veneration for the good and beautiful in man, my deep-felt sympathy for the deformed and diseased, make me sad, and cause me to write this book. The shocking facts, that human creatures inherit physical and mental disease from their parents, and that no laws exist by which diseased persons can be prevented from marrying, constitute a disgrace to civilization. If this little book be the means of preventing any unfit persons from marrying and entailing upon their children disease or insanity, I shall be well repaid.

HENRY SMITH.

*Torquay,
January 5th, 1897.*



INTRODUCTION.

HUNDREDS of great and good men have devoted their lives to writing against evil, and to-day many are working for this end. Thousands of books are written and published yearly against sin and error, against every form of evil; but not one teaches how to *remove the cause*. Our medical men are far in advance of our clergy, our moralists, our Agnostics, Secularists, scientists, and philosophers. Their aim is now to *prevent disease*—they are *destroying the cause*. They wisely

say : "It is more rational to prevent than to cure." This is common sense.

When did it occur to the mind of the social reformer to remove the cause of evil? When did it enter the mind of the minister of religion to remove the cause of sin? I ask : When will our judges leave the bench, when will our clergy leave the pulpit, and set to work to remove the *cause of evil*? Like Othello, their occupation would be gone. True ; but a better would be found.

In my library of many thousands of volumes I know that I cannot find one book which will tell me how a *perfect man may be created*. I wander round the library of the British Museum, but fail to find one book

which will teach me that, to cure evil, we must cultivate a healthy or well-balanced brain. An abnormally-developed faculty may be the cause of evil. If an organ of the brain is excessively large, it will be the cause of evil. If an organ is deficient in size, it will be the cause of evil. When the faculties of the mind or organs of the brain are normally developed the result will be one harmonious whole—a perfect man. Our duty, then, is to subdue the excessively-developed organs and to encourage the growth of the deficiently-developed ones. I know of no organ or faculty which could be entirely removed from man's mind without destroying the perfection of man's intellect.

I knew two small farmers who had stony ground. At a social gathering these farmers met, and one asked the other how he was doing in the world. He replied : “ Oh ! very well. I find my ground pays me.” The other said : “ Well, friend, I am sorry to say mine does not ; it is too stony.” His friend replied : “ So *was* mine, but I had the stones removed by the poor of the village.” The other answered : “ Well, now, it never occurred to me to have the stones removed.”

Just so ; it never occurred to his mind to have the stones—the cause of his ground not yielding to his satisfaction—removed. And so it is with our clergy, judges, lawmakers, philosophers, philanthropists, and moralists ;

it never occurs to their minds to *remove the cause of evil*. They, like the old doctors who treated the symptoms only, are devoting their energies to punishing crime—or, in other words, treating the effects of *an unhealthy brain*.

If we want a good man, we must *create in that man a good brain by culture ; we must subdue the evil-producing organs, and develop the good-producing organs*. This can be done only by Selection, or Stirpiculture—in other words, by selecting those who are physically and mentally perfect, and *allowing only them to marry*, and by making it criminal for the unfit to marry. By so doing, physical and mental deformity would be stamped out.

If it be true that it costs the nation £10,000,000 a year to protect society against criminals, the sooner we give up our present system of teaching—religious and secular—and try another system, the better. That system is : *to prevent crime by creating in man a better brain.* Let us act like our advanced medical men, who remove the cause of disease ; let us remove the cause of evil.

Like the foolish man in “Pilgrim’s Progress,” who swept up the dust without sprinkling water or opening the windows, which he might have done for ever without ridding the room of the dust, so do our preachers. They continue to pray and preach against sin, without any effect ; the

rational thing to do is to remove the cause of sin. The abnormally-developed brain prompts man to evil, and to disobey the laws of society. To induce men to be good, the Church offers heaven, with everlasting happiness. To deter men from evil, the Church teaches hell and everlasting punishment. The State punishes the evil-doer with imprisonment and death. The motive is to punish the evil-doer, and to deter others from crime.

Now, although the Church teaches men that everlasting torment in hell will be their doom if they commit sin, and although they believe it, this does not deter all men from sin. Men know that crime is punished in this

life by the State; they know that fines, imprisonment, hard labour, and *death* are certain to follow evil-doing. This does not deter all men from evil-doing. Rewards are offered in this life, and in the life to come, for well-doing; but this fails to induce all men to be good. This is a well-known fact. I cut from the *Standard*, December 3rd, 1896, the following statement, which most forcibly points to the shocking condition of society at the present time. I give the extract :—

“The Rev. W. D. Morrison presided, and, remarking on the importance of the subject, said that between 500,000 and 600,000 cases were annually tried in the criminal courts

of England alone; while the total expense of protecting society against criminal offenders of one kind and another in the British islands fell little, if anything, short of £10,000,000 a year."

Does this not prove how ineffectual is the present system to subdue man's evil nature? All this money and labour is devoted to protecting society from the consequences of men's bad conduct, which is *caused by an unhealthy brain*. How simple, how rational, would it be to remove the cause of crime by creating a better brain. I have said before, and I here repeat, this must, and this can, be done by selection—that is, by permitting only the physically and mentally perfect to

marry. There is one class of earnest men who believe they are doing a great work in society by their endeavours to remove what they consider superstition—that is, belief in the existence of a personal God ; immortality of the soul ; man's spiritual nature ; in heaven, a place of everlasting happiness, and hell, a place of punishment. These teachings are held by the Church as useful in inducing men to lead a virtuous life, and deterring them from evil. Some men go so far as to teach that our penal code is wrong—believing that men are not induced by rewards to be virtuous, nor deterred by punishment from vice. This I hold to be a fearful error. That *some* people are induced to be good by hope of reward,

and *some* deterred from evil-doing by fear of punishment, is patent to all who think.

There is a reason why *all* are not caused to be good, and it is this : They are bad by nature ; their mind organs are bad, their brains are bad, and they may act accordingly. These men are *mentally diseased*, and cannot be cured. One half of our convicts are of this class. They are bad by the nature of their brain, and cannot be cured. To punish these men is irrational, because they cannot be cured by punishment. They should be treated as diseased persons—not criminals. The time is fast approaching when this will be acted on. I am fully aware of the difficulty in drawing

the line between crime and disease. Nevertheless, our judges are acting on this as far as they can; they are anxious to distinguish crime from disease.

If a man talks irrationally or believes foolish things persistently, we consider him insane, and treat him accordingly. If a man does certain acts contrary to the law, we consider him a criminal. Why is one considered *insane*, and the other *criminal*? Words and deeds are all caused by the brain, and all is *disease*. Here we are face to face with an important fact or question. I must now go back to my friends who wish to remove all deterrents from evil such as the Church considers deterrents from evil, and such as the State considers deterrents from evil.

I ask them to well consider what they are doing. I advise them to leave the Church and State to their work of curing the symptoms, and to set themselves to

REMOVING THE CAUSE OF CRIME.

Let them devote their lives to causing a perfect brain—to creating within man a brain that will cause only good actions.

Man is what his brain causes him to be.

Science teaches how, by selection, a great brain can be built up which will cause great and good actions only.

The work of science must be the creation of a perfect man. This can be done by building up a better brain,

by subduing those organs which are the cause of evil, and developing those which are the cause of good, actions.

A PLEA FOR THE UNBORN.

AN ARGUMENT THAT CHILDREN
SHOULD BE BORN WITH A SOUND
MIND IN A SOUND BODY.

YES, what I plead for is that a pure mind should be in a pure body. Man *ought* to be perfect in mind and body ; man *can* be perfect. I have said it can be. Then, I ask, why is it not ? Why are we improving the breed of horses, cows, and sheep, and allowing man to degenerate ? Why should the horse be a noble creature, the result of man's care and breeding, while

he who has given beauty to that animal is a pitiful object, degenerated in body and mind? While we are improving animals, we are neglecting man. There is a cause for this sad fact, and it is this : Animals are the property of man, and it is his interest to produce the best he can, for two reasons—to increase his wealth, and to satisfy his pride. The horse is the property of a man ; this man has a personal interest in the horse ; and the *result* is a fine breed of horses. Man has no owner ; no one is interested in him ; he has no owner to watch over his development with anxious care. The horse has a value according to his quality. Man has a direct interest in his horse ; he wishes to see

it increase in value, and not to deteriorate. This is a cause acting on the development of the horse. We now turn to man, the boasted lord of creation. How comes it that man is rapidly declining—that man to-day is not what he was? The reason is, man is under no control; he has no owner; no one is interested in his development; no one can make money of him in the market; he is his own owner; he is free to do what he likes. Man is at liberty to destroy his constitution by vice and disease, and to marry one like himself, and bring into existence diseased and deformed children. This was prevented in the Slave States. Don't be shocked, good reader, when I name the slave question.

In the Slave States the nigger was the *property* of another man, and it was the other man, the master and owner, who was interested in the development and worth of the nigger. When the nigger Sambo asked his master's permission to marry Susan, the master had an eye to business. If he saw Sambo and Susan were fit and proper persons to unite and bring into the world a healthy, and therefore valuable, family, he consented. But, if he considered them unfit to breed good stock, he said No, and wisely kept to his No. I have given this fact to show the result of ownership and interest in the breeding of animals and man.

It is desirable to have a noble race

of men. If this can be accomplished by culture, stirpiculture, or selection, it must be done. The question is, How? If Legree is not to say to Sambo, "You shall not marry Susan, because I know you are not fit to marry; I know you would not have fine, healthy children, and that they would be of little or no value"—I say, if this is not to be done by one man (the owner), then *it must be done by the State*. If Legree is not to own Sambo and say, "You shall not marry Susan," the *State* must own Sambo and say: "You shall not marry Susan. The law will not allow you. You, Sambo, belong to no *one* man, but to *many* men—that is, the State."

Now we have come to the means of

preventing the frightful evil resulting from the union of men and women who are unfitted to produce healthy offspring. Man must be caused to see that healthy children can come only from healthy parents, and that, to prevent unhealthy children from being born, the law must be put into action. The people will then make the laws, and thus man will control himself and others. *One* Legree will not say, "You shall not take that woman to wife;" but many Legrees will.

No one who is physically or mentally diseased should be permitted to marry. It is a *crime* to entail upon children tainted blood, loathsome disease, and insanity. I consider it is worse than murder, as murder puts an end to life,

and may put an end to a life of misery ; whereas bringing diseased children into the world is entailing possibly a long life of misery. What right have we to bring into the world imperfect human creatures ? It is considered a crime to mutilate a person, and the act is punishable. If it be a crime to injure a person physically—say to destroy the sight of one eye—is it not equally a crime to bring into the world a deformed or diseased living creature ? The time is fast approaching when society will not permit those who are unfit to marry. Laws will be enacted which will prevent so great a sin. We are now passing stringent laws to compel builders to construct healthy houses ; engineers to construct

perfect drainage, so that disease may be prevented. There is a great movement in this direction, and the principle is, it is better to prevent disease than to cure it. I say laws are very wisely being enacted to render our cities healthy. Everything is being done to improve the condition of man. All classes of people are cared for now. The house of the labouring man is as carefully built as the house of the rich. The physical condition of man, *after* his birth, is cared for, as well as his moral and religious welfare. If there be one sign of an advanced civilization, it is that we are equally caring for all classes. This is a noble manifestation of the best side of man's nature, and that best side is permitted to come

into play. Not only is this shown to human beings, but the same care is devoted to the well-being of animals under the subjection of man. This is noble ; this raises man to a high degree of perfection. If all this is done for the well-being of man *after* his birth ; if this is being done to cause him to be healthy in body and mind, it shows the importance of a healthy community. Ought we not, then, to take the same means to *prevent* unhealthy children being born ? Common sense teaches us that it must be wiser to prevent evil than to cause it and then endeavour to cure it. If only the fit were allowed to marry, we should soon have a new man.

A mother who smothered her child

because it had inherited deformity and a loathsome disease would to-day be led to the gallows, because society considers that taking the life of a creature unfit to live is a crime. The time will come when such an act will be considered a virtue, and a statue will be erected to the honour of the woman who thus safeguards the purity of her race.

The Church of England forbids a man to marry his grandmother, but does not forbid a man who is suffering from a loathsome disease to marry a woman who is known to be far advanced in consumption. The Church has not the power to step in and say : " We will not permit you to commit so great a sin. We will not allow you to bring into the world diseased chil-

dren." How slow is the dawn, how brilliant the day, when it comes ! How slow is the development of man's higher nature ! How grand will be the manifestation of love and kindness ! Evolution is slow, but sure. How long, O Nature, will it take to evolve the tiny spark of love into a flame, which will give universal love to man !

I have stated that a healthy and perfect race of human beings is desirable, and that it is undesirable to have a race of physically and morally diseased people. I have stated that laws ought to be enacted to prevent diseased people from marrying. This would be one means of improving the race, inasmuch as the law would permit

only the healthy to marry. If only the *diseased* were allowed to marry, common sense tells us that we should soon have a community of *diseased* people. If, on the other hand, only the physically and mentally healthy were allowed to marry, we should ensure a healthy race. This is self-evident, and it only requires a little reflection to see its great importance.

There is another means of causing a healthy race of people to exist—that is, by *selection*, which means selecting the most desirable people to marry. If we aimed at producing a people tall in stature, then men and women who are tall would be selected to marry. If our aim were to create a highly intellectual people, then people pos-

sessing the highest intellects would be selected to marry. This I should not consider desirable. The most rational procedure would be to cultivate the physically perfect man, relying on that man having a sufficiently intellectual mind. On the principle of selection all shades of feeling and phases of character, tastes, passions, and sentiments, vices, virtues, and powers, could be reproduced. By selection, the pigeon-fancier can breed to a peculiar feather ; the florist can cultivate to a particular spot or line of colour on a leaf ; the breeders of horses to any particular form, and almost any given speed. By selection in man we could reproduce not only any physical form, but any vice or virtue. Man would

be, by selection, scientifically formed. By stirpiculture the breeder can breed Durham shorthorns only, Dartmoor ponies, or cats without tails. By stirpiculture we could breed only dwarfs or giants. When these laws are thoroughly understood, and acted upon for the improvement of the race, the present condition of things will be read of with horror. We shall be looked upon by the children of the future with the same disgust as is now felt by the New Zealand child when told that his great-grandfather was a cannibal, and drank the hot blood from the veins of his captive, and feasted on his flesh afterwards. I do not hesitate to say that our present condition of society is infinitely worse

than the condition of the Sandwich Islanders when discovered by Captain Cook. We pride ourselves on our so-called civilization. Is it a high state of civilization to allow those who are well known to be insane to marry, and entail insanity on their offspring? Is it a high state of civilization to allow the scrofulous, the deformed, the blind, the kleptomaniac, the inveterate drunkard, the diseased in body and soul—men who are known to be criminals by nature—indeed, the lowest possible type of humanity mentally, and the grossly immoral—to marry?

My plea for the unborn is that laws be enacted to prevent the possibility of these people bringing into the world a

race of creatures like themselves.

While I write, I shiver at the remembrance of what I have seen, and what every medical man has seen—children come into the world covered from head to foot with marks of the disease their father or mother was suffering from ; children given to their mothers with a deformity—a deformity which may have caused lifelong grief to its father or mother.

I have said that to-day the feeling is, and the law is, that man shall be punished if he mutilates another living man. The sanitary inspector is called in to investigate the drains, and if it can be proved that a death has taken place from the escape of a poisonous gas, thousands of pounds can be

recovered. A community can be caused to pay £5,000 for having allowed a poisonous gas to enter a house and cause the death of one living creature. That same community, that same civilization, allows thousands of human creatures to be brought into life diseased, and who may live to marry and bring into the world epileptic, cancerous, and consumptive children. Thus, if you take the life of *one* man by the escape of a gas into his house, you can be made to pay £5,000 ; but you may bring into existence any mental or physical deformity without reproof.

Oh that we could only see ourselves
as we are seen by the despised savage !
Oh that the nation could be caused to

feel what the savage feels when he looks around him and sees that his once healthy tribe is now demoralized, now partly destroyed by diseases brought over by the civilized people—to see that his people are being annihilated by vices introduced by the civilized. Then I think we should awaken to a sense of shame and arouse to action, which would cause us to cease breeding a degraded race of beings, and prompt us to say: “We will endeavour to at least stamp out disease in our own country.” Perhaps the nobler sentiments of man’s nature may rise to the resolution: “*We will not take our diseases and our vices, and spread them broadcast over the world.*” We may see that the so-called

savage would be justified if he acted on the principle that *we* now act on in regard to the importation of diseased foreign cattle. We do not wish our healthy cattle to be contaminated by diseased imported cattle, and, wisely, we slay them. This is the law of prevention, and this is the law I plead for. For the sake of humanity, for the sake of sweet, inoffensive babes, the little boys and the little girls of the future, *let us stamp out disease by any and every means, and thus prevent its continuation.* I have in my mind a beautiful little girl, one of four—a child perfect in intellect, sweet in disposition, suffering from the earliest dawn of her intellect from the knowledge that she had inherited

a physical deformity from her mother. I know a boy who has inherited a peculiar vice from his father. I well remember a young man of twenty, who was a cripple, telling me as a medical man that he knew he had inherited his disease from his father. He looked on his father and saw the disease. Was not this young man justified when he expressed to me his abhorrence at the sight of his diseased father? What, then, must society feel—or ought it to feel—when it looks around and sees moral pollution, physical deformity, disease, vice, and insanity rapidly on the increase? To whom shall these unfortunates turn, like the young man, to utter their abhorrence? Who is

their father? *The highly-civilized Christian nation of which they are members.*

MAN AS HE NOW IS.

WHY has the Church lost its power over its people? I answer at once, the majority of the people do not believe in the teachings of the Church. They do not believe in theology; they do not believe in a future life, in heaven, or in hell; therefore they do not believe in future punishment. They have no reverence for the clergy. To them the priest is not a sacred person. The clergy have, therefore, lost their power over the people. The cause of this, or the causes, I may say, are many. Among them are science,

individual thought, education, Socialism, wealth, and free thought.

A form of society exists which has been built on certain teachings. This condition, or form of society, is the result of man's belief and acceptance of doctrines, theological and moral. I will give them : A belief in God and the attributes assigned to Him ; in a future life ; in heaven, a place of happiness for the good, and hell, a place of punishment for the wicked ; in certain actions being good which will be rewarded here and hereafter ; in certain actions being bad which will be punished here and hereafter ; in the duty of man to obey the laws of society and the moral law. Men have also been taught that respect is

due to those who are by nature gifted with higher powers, who are richer in money and estate, and superior in social position ; while love and duty to our parents has been inculcated. On these beliefs our present society is built ; and on these beliefs only can the stability of *this form of society* continue. Is this society desirable ? Do we wish it to continue ? If we wish the *effect* to continue, we must see that the *cause* also continues ; for if the cause ceases, the effect will cease. The superstructure will fall if its supports are removed. If in the place of belief we have disbelief ; if man does not believe in God, a future life, in heaven or hell ; if he does not believe his bad actions will be punished,

and his good actions rewarded, in a future life ; if he doubts whether there *are* bad actions ; if he does not respect intellect, or wealth, or social position ; if he denies that one man is better than another, and asserts that he is a law unto himself—that, while father and mother have a duty towards *him*, the only duty he knows of is the duty to self ; then, I say, society as we now know it must dissolve.

The whole thing is built up and sustained on *mental conviction*. So long as we have strong conviction, so long have we power. Let doubt enter into our minds, then we shall be weak. Let disbelief take possession, let our convictions be destroyed, and we are powerless. It will be asked, How

comes it that the Church and society still hold up their heads ? How is it that, now the people have lost faith, the Church nevertheless lives ? Why does society hold together ?

I say the Church, as the Church, does not live. Let me illustrate. It is like a corpse which may be seen through a sheet of glass in the coffin lid ; it has been there for five hundred years ; that which formed it is no more ; only the skeleton remains, and that skeleton is ready to crumble into dust if touched. The outward form exists, and that only, and the outward form will disappear if touched ; the life, the spirit, is no more. And so our social structure is decayed. We have the outward form only, not that which caused it to

be. Its supports are ready to be withdrawn, when a better effect can be produced. What, then, are the convictions which give support to the Church and State? The scientifically-educated man does not believe in the existence of a personal God, in a future life, in rewards and punishments in another life, in heaven or hell; but he does know that the belief of the majority of the people in theological creeds deters them from a line of conduct which would be hurtful, if not destructive, to society. He is convinced that churchgoing is still respectable, and that it will ensure him a good reputation. This is policy. He knows that he does not believe one word of the theological teaching, nor

of the dogmas taught; and he also knows that his neighbour who sits by his side does not believe. He may know that the minister does not believe in all he reads and teaches. The society man, then, is not worshipping before the altar of God, but at the shrine of *respectability*. Here we are face to face with a curious and sad fact. Man does not wish to disbelieve in God, in a future life, in reward and punishment, in virtue and vice; he does not desire this, but is compelled by his scientific education; so that he gives support to that which he does not believe in, but which he considers useful. He argues thus: Although possibly false, a great society has been built on these

teachings, and, until we see that a great society can be kept up by that which we believe is true, let us support what we believe to be untrue. There may be no God who watches our actions, and who will reward or punish accordingly; but the belief in this will—nay, does most assuredly—deter many men from evil-doing, and cause them to do good. There may be no black man up the chimney, who will come down and take us if we cry; but the *belief* in this does prevent children from crying, and therefore it is useful (but not desirable) in the nursery. If the naughty child could be caused to be good by being told its mother did not like it to cry, then we have the child acting on a rational

principle ; but it is not usually so. As in the nursery, so in society. Man is deterred by fear of punishment from evil-doing, and is encouraged by hope of reward to be virtuous. Fear will deter when love, or a better principle, will not. Thus institutions are upheld ; thus the Christian Church is supported by men who, disbelieving the theology and dogmas taught, believe in the good caused and the evil prevented. This is sad, but it is true.

The State is supported on the same principle ; the system of Monarchy is considered to be the most useful. We well know that half those who are convicted and punished as criminals are, in fact, *mentally diseased*, and yet we continue to send them to penal

servitude on account of the good achieved by their removal. That is to deter others from crime.

I now go back to my statement—that science has taught men that the teachings of the Church are false, that there is no personal God, no immortal soul, no future life. I say science teaches this, and has thus destroyed faith. Not only has science taught all this, but more; it teaches that man's actions are the *effects* of *causes*, and that there can be no free-will. Man is not a free agent. Now, if science is true (I do not say all that science teaches is true), theology and the Christian religion are false, and the society formed on their teaching should not be permitted to remain. Let

us stand or fall by the truth. It is unthinkable that we should wish to continue a form of religion and society built up on falsehood. If science is true, then let science give us a form of new morals and social laws, on which we can erect a new and better condition of things.

If the present state of society is false—that is, founded on falsehood—let it be destroyed ; if it is unnatural, let us try and find out what is natural. The so-called lower animals have instinct, which guides them. Nature has given them that which is *sufficient* for their *happiness*—*i.e.*, instinct. Surely nature has not left man without the means of self-government and the power to form a community ! Does

instinct enable the bee and the ant to create a form of self-government, which is fixed and sufficient, and has nature left man without instinct, and given him what we call *reason*? Is the condition of the world to-day the result of man's boasted *reason*? I fear to look back, for I know well I shall find man in the same, if not a worse, condition. The history of man's social life is one of horror. If this is the result of *reason*, it would have been better for man if he had simply possessed a higher instinct.

I now come to the questions, "Does science *know* that there is no God? Does science *know* that there is no future life for man?" I say, without fear of contradiction, that science *does*

not know. She has only done what Christianity did in Rome—taken one God off the altar and put another on. For God she has given us the Atom, and this Atom science cannot prove to be in existence. Next we are given *Force* and *Ether*, neither of which can science *prove to be*. Science knows nothing beyond Phenomena. The theologian knows nothing beyond Phenomena. Science can do nothing more than observe the *modes of action* of what it calls Matter, which is only a name given to that which acts on our senses.

Theologians will not give up their teachings. Scientists cannot give us teachings on which religion or morality can be based. Where, then, are we

to look for help—to find the true principles on which to build up a good form of society, religion, and morality? Some would advise us, in order to build up a good state of society, to fall back on teaching what they believe to be false, that good may come. They say, Let us teach that there is a God who watches our actions and registers them; that when we die we shall be judged by this God and rewarded or punished. If there be no nobler principles within us than doing right for fear of punishment, then let us have the fear of hell before us. If we must be kept down, like the brute creation, by fear, then let it be so; let us support the religion which teaches “*Do this, and you shall have your*

reward ; *do not* that, or you will be punished."

I have asked : Where are we to look for help ; where are we to look for the true principles on which to build a good form of religion, morals, and society ? I now answer : To the perfect man, to the fully-developed brain, to the brain equally balanced, to the man physically and mentally perfect. Here we shall find what man is, and from this man we must take our knowledge of what man is—what nature intended him to be. It must be our aim to cultivate this perfect man, and take care that he does not degenerate. We must not form an ideal man, and then condemn the natural man because he does not come up to

our ideal, but cultivate our man to his utmost possibilities. This I hold to be rational and practical. We must not let man fall from his standard of perfection. It is to man's brain we must look for our guidance in forming our religion, morals, and society.

THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN.

LET us now study the constitution of man's mind. In doing this we cannot do better than turn to the science of Phrenology :—

PHRENOLOGY TEACHES THAT THE BRAIN IS THE ORGAN OF THE MIND.

MIND IS THE ACTION OF THE BRAIN—NOT A THING PER SE.

THE PRACTICAL USE OF PHRENOLOGY IS ITS APPLICATION TO THE CULTURE OF THE BRAIN.

When the organs of the brain are their normal size, man is perfect. To attain this state of perfection each

organ must be fully developed. If one faculty is in excess, or deficient, the balance of the mind is lost. As with the incandescent light there is an exact point at which the light is perfect (if the gas is on too much or too little, the full light is not given ; indeed, the light is not), so with the mind : if the organs are not correctly balanced, we do not get a perfect mind.

George Coombes, in his work, "The Constitution of Man," says :—

"Man, viewed in one aspect, almost resembles a demon ; in another he still bears the impress of the image of God. Seen in his crimes, he might be mistaken for an incarnation of an evil spirit ; contemplated in his discoveries in science, he seems a bright intelligence from heaven."

Evil is the result of an *imperfect* brain ; good, of a *perfect* brain.

Let us suppress the Demon—Evil.

Let us develop the God—Good.

If there is not a “ bump,” or locality, in the brain for each faculty, nevertheless the faculty is within man. No one will dispute this fact.

Here is a list of man’s mental and moral faculties, as given by phrenologists : Amativeness, Philoprogenitiveness, Inhabitiveness, Adhesiveness, Combaticiveness, Destructiveness, Alimentiveness, Secretiveness, Acquisitiveness, Constructiveness, Self-esteem, Love of Approbation, Cautiousness, Benevolence, Veneration, Firmness, Conscientiousness, Hope, Wonder, Ideality, Mirthfulness, Imitation, Individuality,

Form, Size, Height, Colour, Locality, Number, Order, Eventuality, Time, Tune, Language, Comparison, Causality.

These, then, are the faculties of the mind ; or, to express it otherwise, these are man's faculties, and what we call mind is the result.

Life, feeling, hearing, seeing, smell, taste, together with the faculties enumerated, constitute the animal man. It is from his faculties that all his actions arise. When we know this we understand what we have to deal with. When an accountant has the winding up of a bankrupt estate, he asks for *all* the books and papers. He must know of what the estate is composed. When he knows all, he can

set to work and report on what he knows to be the result. He will give a full and accurate statement of the condition of the estate, and will report accordingly. This is positive ; this is the known outcome of the facts given to the accountant. Now, suppose someone called on the accountant and told him that probably a large sum of money would be left to the estate, or that there were many unknown sources of wealth connected with it. Under these circumstances the accountant could *not* know what the estate was, and could not arrive at a precise estimate of the estate.

When I am told that man's actions are *not* solely the result of his constitution, but of supernatural influences ; that

he is prompted to act by *inspiration*, or suggestion ; that he is *tempted* to do evil, and *caused* to do good, by spirits, or agents, of God or the Devil ; when I am told that he is caused to act by an external power, as in the case of the puppet doll, whose movements are caused by an outside mind which pulls the strings—I say, if this be so, then man is a puppet. His actions are not *his* actions ; his words are not *his* words ; the thoughts are not *his* thoughts, but the actions and thoughts of a power, or powers, outside of him. If this be true, then man is a most contemptible thing ; and I prefer to go to the ant and bee, and study them. That this is the teaching of theology and of the

Churches, that this is the teaching of Christianity, that this is the teaching of the Bible, no one can deny.

Now, if this were not fact—if it were only fiction—we could afford to smile at it; but it is not fiction—it is the teaching of the Bible and the Churches. So long as this doctrine is taught there can be no hope for man's improvement. Let us clear away this supernatural teaching, and place man in his true position among animals; let us look on him as we look on any other animal acting according to its nature or instincts. We shall never be able to understand man otherwise, nor fix him in his proper place. We do not say the dog is caused to act partly by his nature, and partly by

spiritual promptings. We do not admit that the lower animals are influenced by a supernatural power in their actions ; this we arrogate to ourselves. The gods talk not to horses, nor cause the antics of monkeys. We do not allow to other animals a soul ; we just take the horse and study him as an animal pure and simple. Now, THIS IS WHAT WE MUST DO IN REGARD TO MAN : just take him and study him as an animal pure and simple, not a compound creature—part animal, part spirit ; not two in one—a mortal man and an immortal spirit—as if the body was nothing more than the house which the spiritual man occupied for a time only. We must examine man, and accept him—with his senses and facul-

ties—as he is, in the same manner as we accept the bee, with its senses and instincts. We must take man as man, and find out what he is, and what nature intended him to be ; and what he *may become* when his brain is healthy and normally developed.

One great error must be got rid of before we can make our first move—that is, the belief in free-will. Tell a constitutional monarch that he has free-will ; tell the soldier he has free-will ; tell the slave he has free-will ; and tell the pauper that he has free-will. Nonsense ! If you talk to the scientist of anything in physics being *free*, he will tell you there is no such thing. All is *cause* and *effect*—from the fall of the acorn to the growth of

the oak tree, from the formation of the dewdrop to the formation of a world, or the creation of a thought in man's mind—all is cause and effect. Every thought, every action, is the result of a cause. When the question arises, Shall I go out or stay at home? the reasons why I should and why I should not present themselves to my mind, and I am caused to act by the *stronger motive*. We know the effect, but the cause we do not always know. If we always knew the cause of our actions, we should talk no more about free-will. Give life and consciousness to the weathercock, it would know that it moved; but, not knowing that it was moved by the wind outside of it—not knowing it was caused to move,

it would think it moved itself, that it did so freely, by free-will. So with man. Every action is caused, but we know not the cause ; hence we think we have free-will. In man I see an animal devoid of instinct sufficient to cause him to act well ; mentally often far below the brute creation ; cruel, selfish, and conceited ; diseased in body and mind ; a curse to himself and to animal life. Other animals act from fixed innate instincts, and these are sufficient to guide them ; but man has not these natural instincts which cause his actions. Man's mind is far different. He has a brain, and within this brain are certain faculties. These faculties are acted on by external circum-

stances (not spiritual), like the pipes of an organ ; any melody, or result, can be produced by an external cause, or player. Man can thus be caused to think, to speak, to believe anything ; there is nothing too foolish, nothing too false. He can be induced to hold strong convictions, it matters not what—how false, how ridiculous, how wicked, how cruel ; *the convictions are the cause of his actions.* He is convinced that he has a soul, and that no other animal has ; so he may ill-treat the brute creation. He is convinced that *his* belief, *his* religion, is the only true one ; and he considers it his duty to make a fire and roast his neighbour alive if he holds another faith. This

is not the fashion now, or we should do it to-day. Tell the Indian devotee that his god will be pleased at the sight of his worshipper swinging with a hook thrust under his spine ; he will submit to this torture to please his god. Tell the Hindoo woman she ought not live after her husband is dead ; she will jump upon her husband's funeral pile, to be burned alive. Tell one sect of religious people that one of the joys of heaven will be to see from Paradise the torments of their friends who think differently to them on some questions of dogma (read Spurgeon's sermons), and they will take pleasure in the horrid prospect. Tell a woman it is immodest to show her ankle, she will

guard it most religiously. Tell the daughter of this woman it is the thing to ride astride a bicycle, and she will do it. Fashion says you must not show your neck in private life, but you may go to the opera half-naked to the waist. *It matters not what the impression is, the brain will act on it.* Man acts from the impressions on his brain. If we can get a set of *good impressions* or convictions on his brain, the person will be good ; if *evil impressions* are made, the person will be bad. This is the nature of man's mind. He has a set of faculties, which act when excited. One or more may be called into action. Sometimes one acts alone, sometimes two or more. For the mind to act rationally many facul-

ties must be brought into action ; one controls the other. But how few persons know this science of rational action.*

Man's actions are the result of his convictions. A conviction is an impression made on the brain. A good man, a bad man, a Mohammedan, or an Agnostic, Deist, or Atheist—the beliefs or disbeliefs of all of these are the result of impressions on the brain. The study of society should be how to make good brains, and how to get a good set of impressions on those brains. This can be done, and this must be done, if we are to have a good people and a good form of society.

* I have gone fully into this subject in my work, "The Religion of the Brain" (Watts & Co.).

The question will be asked, Is a change possible? Are we not too hopelessly fallen? Where is the power to come from? To this I can only say, I believe it will come. I have been speaking of the rule, not the exception. There are great exceptions in this case. In all ages great brains have appeared in the midst of a mass of degraded minds. Great men have been born with great intellectual faculties, who, by the power of their example and teaching, made a great impression on the minds of the people, and thus reformed the age they lived in. These men had wonderfully-formed heads or brains—brains with faculties all well developed, and all in harmonious action; not what we often

call men of genius—men who have one or two faculties large, and the others small, but each faculty large, and in action. My hope is, and my belief is, that a man will come whose teaching will cause a revolution in human thoughts and actions. He will teach that we must, in the first place, prevent the unfit marrying and bringing into the world children like themselves. Laws must be enacted and enforced to prevent those who are mentally and physically diseased from marrying, and laws enacted to consign to the lethal chamber children who are born and who are considered *unfit to live* by a council of medical men. This would be noble and humane. Thus we must stamp out mental and

physical disease, and cultivate a new and perfect man. When we get man physically perfect, we may expect to get man mentally perfect. This will be the first step.

The reformer will teach that man's nature must be studied and man's mind understood. The higher faculties must be cultivated, and those faculties which tend to form a lower type should be subdued. Let man be cultivated on the same principle as animals and flowers—on the principle of selection—bred from the best samples. Let those only who are selected marry. It will be said this can never be. I have shown that it can be done ; if it is not done, then man will not remain what he now is, but will fall lower and lower.

If no restraint is enforced by law of the country, if diseased and deformed men and women are allowed to bring into the world diseased and deformed children, we cannot improve, but shall become worse and worse. Man must be induced to act for the benefit of man. Individual freedom must be restrained ; liberty to do wrong must not be allowed. My argument is that, by stirpiculture, selection, and suppression, we can change man's intellectual nature—that is, we can suppress his evil propensities—and that we can by cultivation develop his higher moral nature—that is, we can destroy evil and create good ; we can convert the present man into a perfect being. The question will here be asked,

“What religion must be taught, what morality?” The religion will be the religion of man’s best nature, the love of man for man. The healthy brain will dictate what true religion is. It cannot be reduced to rules; no code can, nor should, be formulated; it must spring from man’s nature; no rules, no law, no form, no ritual, no set actions, but a constant spring of love and kindness to man. Morality is the obeying of certain laws formed by man for the well-being of society. We know theology has been taught for over six thousand years, and Christianity for over eighteen hundred years, and we also know with what result. If we take a survey of history to the birth of Christ, we shall see a

fearful picture of man and his doings. Since that period Christianity has done more to cultivate and civilize man than any other form of religion ; and this because it is more humanitarian than any other religion.

I am told that man's nature is so bad that he must be subjected to restraint ; he must be kept in fear of the whip, and in fear of hell ; the only way to keep him in order is by fear and punishment ; the different religions are absolutely necessary to society. I admit that man as he now is—man of to-day—must be governed as he now is. To remove the restraints imposed by Christianity or other forms of religion, to remove the restraints of the present moral law, would be like

opening the cage doors of the wild animals at the Zoo, and expecting the freed animals to behave like domestic pets. The lion can be caused to act in a desired manner from fear of the red-hot poker, but that is not acting from his nature; it is a course of action caused by fear of the consequences. So with man. The man we have to deal with, the man of to-day, is forced to act in a given way, so that we may have some settled form of society. If to-day all restraint was withdrawn, we should have one vast slaughter-house. The present character of man must be changed before we can get the man we want and the form of society we desire.

What should we think of a farmer

who wanted a certain form of horse for his use, and yet paid no attention to the breeding of his horses? What should we think of the florist who wanted a certain flower—a certain marked tulip—but who devoted no labour to the culture, by selection, of that particular tulip? The farmer who wanted a powerful plough-horse would breed by selection—that is, he would take care that the horse selected should not mate with any animal which was not suitable. The florist would select seed from such plants as he desired, and cultivate that only. The pigeon-fancier knows that he can produce by selection almost any kind of bird—any plumage to a feather. All this can be done, and is being

done, all over the world. If we want a better animal, we breed it ; if we want to tame it, we do so—that is, if we desire an improved animal, we cause an improved animal to be.

Now we want a perfect man, and, if we desire that perfect man, we must breed him, and use the same means as the horse-breeder, the florist, and the pigeon-fancier. We do not take the gutter-child and put on him a suit of clothes fit for Eton ; but if we wish that boy to go to Eton we train him, and dress him up to the position we hope to place him in.

To remove the old religion and morals, to abolish the police and the unwritten laws of respectability at once, and offer man a new form of

religion and morals, would be folly. The present man is not fit to receive them. Our work must be to create a perfect man—then the new garments will become him. The old religion will be useless to him ; the old moral law he will not require ; he will not want the whip to keep him in order, nor the fear of not being considered respectable. It will be his nature to be good. He will be good without knowing it, without trying to be good. The bee builds the honeycomb perfect without study ; man will do right because it will be natural for him to do so.

Can this be ? I answer, Yes ; not only can it be, but it must be.

MAN AS HE SHOULD BE, AND CAN BE.

NATURE now and then produces a brain so well-balanced that it causes perfect actions. I have in my mind one such—a girl whose actions are perfect, one who has never done wrong. Every act is strictly correct in conversation and manners. I have known her for five years most intimately, have watched for a fault, but have not found one. This child may be called a freak of nature. I care not by what name she is called. To my delight she *is*. Her education has had nothing to do with the fact. She,

from her babyhood, gave evidence of what she would be; she, by her nature, is above education—I am not speaking of letters, but of all that which goes to make a perfect being. Her mind requires no guiding, no training; and no one has had occasion to correct her. This girl is a living fact, and to me a most valuable one. Her nature has shown to me the possibility of human perfection. She stands before me and says: “See what is; let it be your aim to teach how a race of perfect men can be.” With a race of perfect creatures like this child, we should want no formal religion, no churches, no priests, no form of morality, no prisons, no police, no incentive to good deeds, no offer of a reward for doing

that which is right to do, no "honouring of father and mother that one's days may be long in the land." There would be "no looking for a reward," nor abstaining from an action, for fear of the rod ; no, not even a *consciousness* of having done either right or wrong. The good act will be automatic—an act done because it was natural to do it. This is what we want, and what we can have. How can this be done ? How can we form a perfect man ? Who is to do it ? These are questions which will present themselves to the minds of the thoughtful.

I see no difficulty. We have only to prove our case—to convince people by our writings, and rouse a conviction in the minds of men. There are

now thousands of great and good men in the Churches ready to do the work. They are doing what they believe to be best for the people's welfare. They are good and true men, prepared to sacrifice even their lives for the truth, if called on to do so. In all countries, in all religions, men are searching for light to guide them, sorrowing for the conditions of society, and using their best powers and knowledge to bring about a change. But they are sweeping the room with the door and windows shut; they are ever teaching and preaching to men whose brains are unfitted to receive their teachings.

They are sowing seed in stony ground that never can yield fruit.

Look at the man of to-day, then at the teachings of Christ, and ask yourself whether it is at all possible for the popular brain to follow the better teachings. Christian teachers, moralists, philosophers, teachers one and all, cease talking and writing, and set to work to make laws by which people will be *prevented* from marrying and bringing into the world the same class of men we now have. Make it penal to marry a deformed person or a diseased person, mentally or bodily. Let it be *shameful* to have a diseased child—even make it unfashionable. Make it *respectable* to have healthy children. Let us create a new man. Turn your attention to the children. The temperance advocates say : “Give

us the children ; it is useless to talk to the old." True, it is no use talking to the present type of man ; let us work for an improved one. I have said before, exceptions to the rule will occur. Nature occasionally produces extraordinary brains. Great men are sometimes born in a village, the population of which is of a low type. This we call a freak of nature, because we do not understand the reason, we do not understand the causes, which produced this extraordinary brain. In a community of immoral people some virtuous people are born. This fact is, and it is equally a fact that our physiologists do not understand how this comes about.

If we had a community of such men

as I propose—that is, men sound in mind and body, and marked by a highly-virtuous standard, there would be born in this community some whose brains would not be perfect, and whose conduct would be the result of their unhealthy brains. It would be the duty of the community to form such laws as would tend to the suppression of the evil resulting from these unhealthy brains. In other words, these people would have to be controlled by the majority of the healthy-minded citizens.

We are now ignorant of the causes which produce the phenomena of a Burns born in a Scotch village, a Napoleon in Corsica, a Newton in Grantham; so we should be ignorant of the cause

of an immoral man appearing in a community of strictly moral people. Undoubtedly there are causes which have been equal to the effect ; but of these causes we are ignorant. For nearly two thousand years we have been fighting against the *action* of certain organs of man's brain, instead of taking means to subdue those organs and to develop the good, or desirable, ones, like the old system of physic, when the doctors treated the symptoms, but never thought to eradicate the disease. They now kill the microbes, thus stamping out the cause of disease ; and we must no longer be content to *punish crime* only, but we must remove the *cause* of crime. The perfect man will

require no law, no religion, no morality to guide him to goodness. His nature will be his guide. The young mother is not guided by written laws how she should love her new-born child. The child needs not to be taught to love its mother. No law is required to compel a boy to love his sister and to protect her ; no law to teach us to help the blind across the highway ; no law is necessary to teach schoolboys that it is cowardly for a big boy to fight a little one. This springs from man's nature—from the good side of his brain.

When the new man is formed he will be all goodness, because his nature will spontaneously produce goodness. To form this man is the work of the

future. Remove the cause, the effect will cease.

All history tells us that Good has been contending with Evil. Good men in all ages have been fighting against evil—not only physical evil, but moral evil, the evil that comes direct from man's imperfectly developed brain. I am now taking it for granted that we do not regard man as a mere puppet who is caused to act by the strings being pulled by a supernatural power, but that man's actions are the result of his own nature, of his own mental faculties. The old teaching must be for ever given up ; for, if it be true that man's actions are in fact not *his* actions, but the actions of a supernatural power acting on him, the

attempt to reform him, to cure him of his evil ways, must be folly. If the teaching that man is tempted to evil by an unseen power be true, and he does the evil which he has been caused to do, then to punish him for that act must be folly. We ought, if we could, to capture and punish the invisible power who virtually did the act. This teaching is altogether too childish and absurd to be entertained for a moment. We will, therefore, put it on one side as utterly unworthy of the consideration of a rational man.

Though this teaching is current, it is not believed, as is proved by the fact that it is acted on neither by the Church (which teaches it) nor by the State. Religion teaches that man will

be punished for his actions, and the State punishes man for the evil which *he* does.

Religious, moral, and social law says that man must be rewarded and punished for the deeds he performs. Spiritual influences are not acknowledged as a plea for crime. Therefore we must hold it fact that all actions done by man are *his* actions, and caused by *his* nature—the result of his constitution. Our aim must be, then, man pure and simple. In considering this, we have nothing to do with the question, How came man to be what he is? Our business is with man as we find him. If we find man to be what we want him to be, then let him alone, touch him not; if he be perfect,

then let him be perfect still. But if we do not like him—if we find him imperfect—let us try to improve his brain, try to make him perfect. On all sides it is admitted that man is not perfect. My argument is that, when the brain is perfectly developed, the mind is healthy ; when the brain is imperfectly developed it is diseased, and the result is what we call evil action—that this brain must be corrected, and caused to be healthy, by allowing only those persons to marry who are known to be physically and mentally perfect. Why do we admit that physical disease can be stamped out, and not admit that mental disease can be? If we wished to prevent leprosy from spreading, we should not allow a

leper to marry. Then why, if we wish to stamp out theft, do we not prevent a man who is known to be a confirmed thief, or kleptomaniac, from marrying? *What would be the result if we selected only those who showed a strong inclination to steal, and mated them, and allowed none to marry but those who were kleptomaniacs?* Should we not in time have a race of robbers? If, on the other hand, we selected those who were noted for their generosity, and allowed those to marry, should we not have a race of people who would be generous to excess? I have before said that breeders of horses can breed almost what they like. Pigeon-fanciers can breed so as to regulate the details of a feather. Florists can convert

briars into roses, single flowers into double ones, and create new forms and colours. The dispositions of animals can be changed ; wild animals tamed, and their very form changed. The same can be done with the animal man. His mind can be improved, his moral nature can be improved, by *cultivation, by selection, by stirpiculture.*

If one animal's nature can be changed, another animal's can ; if we can breed fine horses, we may breed fine men ; if we can tame the wild beast and change its nature, we can change man's nature also. If we can subdue one evil faculty in man, we can subdue all.

I read a letter in the *Standard* of July 22nd, 1896, in which the author

proves that the sense of sight is being destroyed. If a sense can be destroyed a faculty can, and the sooner the *source* of certain evil propensities is destroyed the better for mankind.

A PLEA FOR THE UNBORN.

YES, I plead for the children not yet born. I ask that laws shall be made to prevent those from marrying who are unfit to bring into the world healthy children. I ask that those who are deformed in body and those who are mentally diseased shall not be allowed to marry. I ask that those who are known to have spent a life in debauchery and are diseased shall not be allowed to bring into the world creatures who will inherit loathsome disease and live a life of misery. I ask that the confirmed drunkard shall

not be permitted to bring into life a creature who will crave for drink, and ultimately become a curse to himself and society. I ask the physician, the philanthropist, I ask the clergy, I ask all good men and women, I ask our law-makers, to awake to the frightful fact that we are permitting human beings to marry and bring into the world children who are shockingly diseased both in mind and body.

This is a great crime and a disgrace to man's nature. It is a disgrace to Christianity—it is a disgrace to those who consider themselves too wise to believe in the Christian religion, and call themselves Altruists.

The old are mated with the young. Old men marry young girls. Young

men marry old women. Half-mad men marry diseased women. The lame, the blind, the deformed, the consumptive, the epileptic, the scrofulous, all and one, regardless of the consequences, are permitted to marry and bring into life creatures like themselves. Is this not a sin—a crying sin against nature? Is it not a *shameful sin against the unborn child*? If that diseased child could, when given to its father and mother, turn round and curse them with its first breath, it would be justified. If that child lived its life of misery cursing its parents, it would be justified in so doing.

Will the clergy, the doctors, the reformers, the law makers—will society

—continue to look on, and not move a finger to prevent thousands of being children brought into life deformed physically and mentally?

Shall we continue to treat the symptoms, and not attempt to remove the *cause* of the disease? Shall we continue to *punish crime*, and *make no attempt to remove the cause*? Or shall we attempt to create a perfect man? Let us remember Juvenal's lines: "*Mens sana in corpore sano.*" Let us cultivate a sound mind in a sound body.



JUST PUBLISHED.

PRICE SIXPENCE. BY POST 7½d.

THE CHRISTIAN'S LOOKING-GLASS.

A MIRROR OF CHRIST'S DOCTRINES.

BY

HENRY SMITH

(Author of "The Practical Value of Religious Belief").

EXTRACTS FROM PRESS OPINIONS :

"The Christian's Looking-Glass,' by Henry Smith, is a tender but searching test-appeal to professing Christians, which must sting many. No man, be he Catholic, Protestant, or Dissenter, who is honest can close this little book without a heart pang if he really believes in Christ. If Christianity *should* turn out to be true, what an awful doom in the Day of Judgment awaits those '*Christians*' whose utter neglect of Christ's plainest teachings has turned aside men like the writer ! One has little faith in tracts, but if we were a Roman priest, or an Anglican or Dissenting minister, we should buy a few dozens of this little treatise and lay them about in our churches, marking pages 45 and 46."—*Weekly Times and Echo.*

"The book is clearly and beautifully written, and is interesting in the best sense of the word."—*Perthshire Advertiser.*

WORKS BY HENRY SMITH.

“ Dr. Henry Smith embodies some excellent thoughts on an important subject, estimating professing Christians by the very words of the Master, and summing up that

‘ Deeds, not creeds,
Will our future make.’

It is a thoughtful little book, written in a judicious and suggestive spirit.”—*Western Mail*.

“ Much startling truth, unfolded in a forcible style, will be found within the pages of this little volume, and anyone will rise from its perusal with higher aims and a more elevated belief in the beneficent ends to which existence may be put.”—*North Devon Herald*.

“ He is very earnest and impressive, and dwells with great force upon the fact that he only is a true Christian who accepts all Christ’s teachings, and whose inward and outward life is conformed to the doctrines he professes to believe.”—*Catholic Times*, Nov. 27th.

“ The author is very sharp, and rightly so, on the richly-dressed men and women who drop pennies into the collection bag, ‘when their fingers are covered with diamond rings.’”—*Western Daily Mercury*, Nov. 19th.

“ It is, at least, thoroughly practical in character, earnest in tone, and therefore stimulating.”—*Dundee Advertiser*, Nov. 21st.

“ Mr. Smith’s book can only be wholesome in its influence.”—*Glasgow Herald*, Dec. 3rd.

London : WATTS & Co., 17, Johnson’s Court, Fleet Street,
London, E.C.

WORKS BY HENRY SMITH.

In Crown 8vo. Price 1s., free by post 1s. 2d.

THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF:

AN ARGUMENT ADDRESSED TO AN AGNOSTIC.

Some Opinions of the Press:—

“It is a calm and powerful appeal on behalf of religious teaching, and a keen exposure of the utter insufficiency of Agnostic teaching. Many who would be repelled by ordinary religious literature may be induced to read this conciliatory epistle, but will probably find beneath the velvet glove of a quiet style the iron hand of a logic that cannot be refuted.”—*Word and Work*.

“Dr. Henry Smith does not search far up in the Arcanæ and deep down in the Occult for his themes. He selects for the ordinary incidents of every-day life suitable incidents and occasions for the exercising of his moralising and the illustration of his practical philosophy. Dr. Smith is concretely practical, and takes no transcendentalist view of ethics, or aught else.”—*Agnostic Journal*.

“The writing is clever, and is marked by a refreshing spirit of earnestness. An Agnostic would be hard put to it to reply logically to Mr. Smith’s argument.”—*Bristol Times*.

“We frankly acknowledge that the new treatise is a powerful intellectual performance.”—*The Literary Guide*.

“Sensible Agnostics will find food for reflection in the plain earnestness of the author’s words.”—*Perth Constitutional*.

“A well-considered argument in favour of religion, addressed to an Agnostic. The book is well worth reading, and deserves a wide circulation.”—*Torquay Directory*.

“The argument Dr. Smith advances is a clever one, and is well followed up, the reasoning being clear and close.”—*Torquay Times*.

“The writer is well meaning. His style, too, is graceful and winning.”—*The Presbyterian*.

London: ELLIOT STOCK, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C.

Gilt lettered, small quarto, 1s., by post for 1s. 2d.

NEW YEAR'S EVE.

A DREAM OF TIME: PAST, PRESENT, & FUTURE.

A POEM.

With Eight Illustrations of Cockington, Torquay, in Moonlight and Snow, by OWEN DALZIEL.

"A really beautiful specimen of the artist's work. Mr. Owen Dalziel has excelled himself in his sketches of Torquay scenery, while Mr. Smith is exceptionally happy in his mystical retrospect and forecast. The little gem is well worth preservation, and those of our readers who desire a New Year's offering for presentation to their friends will be well advised in procuring a copy of this original and exquisite booklet."—*The Literary Guide*.

London: ELLIOT STOCK, Paternoster Row.

Torquay: IREDALE, Strand.

Enlarged Edition, Cloth, Gilt Lettered, cap quarto, 2s. 6d., with Portrait of the Author.

SIMPLE THOUGHTS,

IN PROSE AND VERSE,

Jotted down on the Journey of Life.

Extracts from Press Opinions:—

"This charmingly got-up volume records the life experiences of a truly remarkable and characterful man. Dr. Smith succeeds in investing almost every page with living human attraction. We recommend the book to those of our readers who appreciate counsel from a keen observer, an acute reasoner, and a fearless thinker."—*Watts's Literary Guide*.

"Not a page but what speaks of his intensely sympathetic nature and his regard for everything that is good, and true, and beautiful. 'Simple Thoughts' are often noble in their wisdom and wholesome in their philosophy, addressing themselves to young and old, to those who have hearts to feel and brains to think."—*The Liberty Review*.

"The 'Thoughts' are chaste and pure, and suggest to the tired townsman the purposes of insects in the fields of green grass, and the odour of English lanes, drest with wild roses. All the pieces are marked by Wordsworthian simplicity and directness."—*The Agnostic Journal*.

London: WATTS & CO. Torquay: ANDREW IREDALE.

WORKS BY HENRY SMITH.

Second Edition, Crown 8vo, Cloth, 2s. 6d. Paper Boards, 1s.

THE RELIGION OF THE BRAIN.

(BASED ON THE SCIENCE OF PHRENOLOGY.)

LIFE AND MIND. WHAT IS MIND?

PHILOSOPHICAL NECESSITY.

AND OTHER ESSAYS.

Extracts from Press Opinions:—

“It is a little book which we have read with profound interest.”—*Agnostic Journal*.

“Has considerable merit both as a literary and argumentative work, and is deeply interesting as marking the progress and evolution of modern thought.”—*Watts's Literary Guide*.

“An idea of religion dissociated through science from theology.”—*Bristol Mercury*.

“The conclusion at which the author has arrived is, that a man is as his brain lets him be, and if we would have a good race of men we must breed them.”—*The Inquirer*.

“‘The Religion of the Brain’ is a well-argued plea for stirpiculture. Science teaches how, by *selection*, a great brain can be built up which will cause great and good actions only.”—*Weekly Times*.

“What Mr. Henry Smith means by the Religion of the Brain is that man is a creature of necessity, and that the only ‘religion’ possible is the improvement of the parts of the brain productive of good impulses. Science will teach how to cultivate the good and suppress the evil, and, therefore, the religion of the future should be the application of science to the brain.”—*The Literary World*.

London: WATTS & Co.

Second Edition, enlarged, Fcap. quarto, Illustrated, 1s. net.

GENIUS AND ART,

PAST AND PRESENT.

Also Common-Sense Remarks on Bookmaking and Printing.

“Starting with a dissertation on ‘Genius and Art,’ illustrated by two beautiful reproductions of engravings of the Bartolozzi period, the author draws a contrast between Genius and Art, Past and Present. He contends that the work of the present day does not equal that of the past.”—*Torquay Directory*.

Torquay: IREDALE & Co., and all Booksellers.

New and Enlarged Edition Now Ready.

Cr. 8vo, boards, price 1s., by post 1s. 2d.

WHAT DO I BELIEVE?

*Two Essays in Justification of the Argument advanced in
"The Practical Value of Religious Belief."*

I.—KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF—CAUSE AND EFFECT.

II.—WHAT I AM—WHAT I KNOW.

With Appendix, "A Letter to an Agnostic."

"The author of 'What Do I Believe?' says that 'the work of the science of the future must be the creation of a perfect man. This can be done by the building up of a better brain, by suppressing those organs which are the cause of evil, and developing those which cause good actions.'"—*North Eastern Daily Gazette.*

"Dr. Smith is always interesting and instructive. This new work has the merit of being deeply suggestive and thought-provoking. Dr. Smith is a bold and fearless thinker."—*The Literary Guide.*

"'What Do I Believe?' by Dr. Henry Smith (Watts & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street; 1s.). It is a difficult task to say what manner of mental man the author of this book is. One can only hazard that he thinks, and that he has the faculty of putting his thoughts into fresh, lucid sentences, that startle by their simplicity and persuasiveness. His creed is embodied in the word 'Good,' and the root maxim of it is: 'Those who possess the higher light and do good for good's sake require no other incentive; but those who can only be guided to righteousness by the hope of reward must not have that taken from them.' Dr. Smith is evidently an Altruist who has freed himself, so far as frail humanity may, from prejudices and prepossessions. His little book possesses a high interest for the thoughtful, who are tired of complex theorising on 'things that be.'"—*Reynolds.*

London: WATTS & CO., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E.C.

Now Ready. Cap quarto, One Shilling.

CHERISHED MEMORIES:

A VISIT TO ST. OMER.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS.

Torquay: ANDREW IREDALE, Strand.

