

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jtvi-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

JOURNAL OF  
THE TRANSACTIONS  
OF  
The Victoria Institute,  
OR,  
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

---

VOL. LVI.



LONDON:

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

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1924.

665TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,  
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, APRIL 28TH, 1924,  
AT 4.30 P.M.

LIEUT.-COLONEL G. MACKINLAY IN THE CHAIR.

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

The CHAIRMAN read a letter from Lord Stamfordham acknowledging the receipt of the last annual volume of the Proceedings of the Victoria Institute, saying that he is commanded to express the thanks of His Majesty the King.

The Chairman then referred to the recent death of Mr. E. J. Sewell, a valued Member of the Council of the Victoria Institute as well as of other bodies. Mr. Sewell had served as an Honorary Secretary for some two years during the war, and did excellent service at a time when the Institute was passing through a period of stress. He gained the last prize granted by the Gunning Trust Prize Fund, by his paper on Jonah which is much valued. It may be mentioned incidentally that he generously gave £10 of the sum he had gained towards the finances of the Victoria Institute.

He was a distinguished (retired) member of the Indian Civil Service, and he freely employed his great linguistic talents in the service of the Victoria Institute, and of the Bible Society, of which he was a Vice-President, and for many years Chairman of the Sub-Committee which deals with the numerous translations of the Bible into a very large proportion of the languages of the world.

He was a modest, kind-hearted Christian man, beloved of all who knew him, and his loss is much felt by a wide circle; we respectfully tender our hearty sympathy to his widow, Mrs. Sewell.

The Chairman then called on Dr. Schofield, so well known and valued among the members of the Victoria Institute, to read his paper on "The Making of Men."

---

*THE MAKING OF MEN.*

By ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D.

I WOULD preface my remarks on this somewhat difficult theme by saying at the outset that I use the term "men" in this paper definitely without distinction of sex. This must be clearly understood, and is essential to my arguments—that in

all cases "men" is a generic term and here includes the female equally with the male. To this I would add that any discussions of larger questions of the "why" and "wherefore" will find no place in this paper. Accidents of birth and of environment operate no doubt universally in the making of men; but proceeding as they do from inscrutable causes are regarded as beyond the scope of my subject to-day.

The terrible disadvantages that handicap so many in the race of life are, to the writer insoluble mysteries, as indeed are most ultimate origins and causes. I think we shall be more profitably employed this afternoon if we confine our study to such matters as belong to our province, and are within our grasp.

There can be no doubt of one fact, whatever many be its cause, that though all people are human beings all are not men.

It may be fairly asked here that I should define my terms, and say what I mean by "men." Perhaps, however, I may be allowed to defer my definition to the close of my paper, and confine myself here to quoting one verse of Kipling's solution of the question:—

"If you can talk with crowds, and keep your virtue,  
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch,  
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,  
If all men count with you, but none too much;  
If you can fill the unforgiving minute  
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run  
Yours is the earth, and everything that's in it,  
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son!"

What then are the forces by which men are made?

Leaving on one side for the moment the last and greatest of them all—the Spiritual—I may take them for the purpose of this paper as being three in number:—

1. Prenatal.
2. Parental.
3. Personal.

and we will briefly consider them in this order.

### 1. PRENATAL OR HEREDITARY.

This force is much better understood than it was fifty years ago. Of course, the archaic idea, that infants were born into the world an absolute *tabula rasa* to be written on at will, needs hardly be

refuted, at any rate to this audience. But granted this is never true, and that all infants come into the world as complex masses of predispositions trailing many things besides Wordsworth's "clouds of glory"; the question is, what is exactly the force of heredity in the making of man?

In heredity we must remember that we no longer believe that we inherit fixed qualities, but rather tendencies and potentialities, which by education and culture can be converted into flowers or weeds, into virtues or vices. This is true physically as well as mentally. It is very rare indeed for a man to inherit a disease, but very common to inherit tendencies to diseases: that is, an hereditary lessening of our resisting power in certain organs which, however, if successfully resisted (as it can be), or through three generations, absolutely disappears in the fourth!

To me this is a glorious truth, as it lifts from the race the dead hand of heredity which has rested so heavily on our newly-born.

Only the other day at a great scientific meeting I heard the assertion that absolute vices and diseases were inherited, and the new-born child was an almost necessary victim. That this is not so I shall prove later, not only by the fact above stated, but from another reason more remarkable still.

Battered and defaced though the Divine image may be in humanity mind, it can still be clearly traced in infancy.

All infants are distinguished soon after birth by two remarkable natural tendencies or principles: one is love and the other is justice. All children love; and all, in infancy, have a marked sense of justice or right; which often causes them great distress when they find any injustice in those whom they are taught to believe are wiser than themselves. Now love and justice are simply love and light—the essential nature of God. God has impressed these two qualities on every infant mind. But, observe, love may be changed into a positive vice by becoming simply love of self or pure egotism. Justice itself may be turned to evil, if it is developed into nothing else than caring for one's own rights. On the other hand, both may be made to blossom into beautiful virtues in proportion as they become altruistic. In short, our tendencies which are inborn may develop into vices or virtues by training.

The quality of the man himself in this light evidently depends on nature and nurture—nature that implants the tendencies, and nurture by which they grow into virtues of character.

Environment and suggestion are undoubtedly two strong

forces by which the early life should be trained, suggestions of good and not of evil, for suggestions have an overwhelming weight when they come from such a powerful influence over a child as its mother. It is hardly too much to say that a mother is nearly as dominant over a child's mind as a hypnotizer is over his patient. The results of such training are, of course, not seen till long after. The springs and roots of character lie in these hereditary potentialities deep in the unconscious mind—the flowers and fruit appear later in consciousness.

Mrs. Browning's beautiful lines show the force of which I speak :—

“ The baby has no skies, but mother's eyes,  
 Nor any God above, but mother's love.  
 His angel sees the Father's face,  
 But he his mother's, full of grace ;  
 And yet the Heavenly Kingdom is  
 Of such as this.”

The second glorious truth—and none will think my words too strong who know how the slavery and cruel power of heredity has been proclaimed—is, that not alone do we inherit tendencies and potentialities only, but that there is a greater force over a man than heredity itself.

Darwin is the apostle of the dominant force of heredity ; but Herbert Spencer has discovered a greater. His words, never to be forgotten, are, “ A man becomes more like the company he keeps, than that from which he is descended.” In other words, that *environment* is the stronger of the two forces.

It is true, alas ! that with many unfortunates the environment only partakes of the nature of the heredity ; and that vicious parents often connote vicious surroundings, from which, for the infant there is no escape. We state the fact, but refuse here to pursue the subject further.

Where, however, the environment is the opposite to the heredity, it absolutely overcomes it.

This has been proved in a most remarkable way for the last thirty years by Mrs. Meredith's Prison-Gate Mission, and Herbert Spencer's immortal dictum shown to be true in practice. Babes taken from their mothers' breasts in prison, with four generations of hereditary crime behind them, are brought up by her in the nurture and fear of the Lord, and with a surrounding of the best forces for a dozen or twenty years ; and over

ninety per cent. turn out respectable, honest and often God-fearing Christian citizens fit for any post of trust.

Am I not right in speaking of this discovery as a glorious truth ?

## 2. PARENTAL.

Here I reach a large and little understood, and yet all-important, subject. Again I would divide it into three heads, as laid down by Matthew Arnold in another immortal saying :—

“ Education is an atmosphere, a discipline, a life.”

To explain this it will be absolutely necessary here to briefly explain the unconscious mind, to which this alone refers.

I may in the first place draw attention to the word “ education,” which is generally wrongly used—though rightly by Arnold. Education (*e-duco*) means to “ bring out,” not to put in ; and is the opposite of instruction. Instruction is what is given by schools, schoolmasters and books to the conscious mind (which until recently was the entire mind). But this in itself is never education ; which, on the contrary, is not addressed to the conscious but to the unconscious mind. The atmosphere, the discipline, the life—the three forces of true education—are not primarily exercised on the conscious, but on the unconscious.

And here I must make a short digression to explain what I mean by this, which is, I fear, still but imperfectly understood.

It is now over a quarter of a century since I introduced the “ unconscious mind ” into England, at a learned society which emphatically declared it was nonsense, and reproved the chairman for allowing the paper to be read. To-day it is a commonplace, and a somewhat fashionable topic, and I’ve lived to see it everywhere accepted.

It is true that in 1888 the Aristotelian Society held a special meeting to declare “ If mind is synonymous with consciousness,” and decided in the negative. But ten years after I still found no mind recognized but the conscious.

Mind is the total of psychic action, and the conscious mind is that part of it that is within our mental vision ; but sight is not our only method of investigation.

I see an island in the South Pacific, but I know it is but the visible summit of a vast mountain, whose unseen part far exceeds the visible. The latter represents the conscious part, and the former the unconscious, of the same mind. But between the

two is the tideway, and that part, sometimes visible and sometimes not, corresponds to the subconscious which lies immediately below consciousness.

A thermometer in like manner merely measures heat so far as the visible scale extends, but temperature extends indefinitely at both ends.

The spectrum only shows visible colours, seven in number, but far beyond extend others, generally unknown because invisible.

Gradually, very gradually, we are at last ceasing to deny the existence of what we cannot see—hence the unconscious mind becomes a possible truth.

Now the reason of this exordium is simply that the real distinction between instruction and education is, and it will bear repeating, that while the former develops the conscious, the latter develops the unconscious part of the mind ; which, after all, is the true self.

Let us briefly review the three forces at the disposal of the parent.

A. An "*atmosphere*" is the spiritual counterpart of our physical environment. It is what the mind breathes, that in which and by which it lives.

Moreover, an atmosphere is largely to character what a tin mould is to a pudding. You pour the cornflour into the latter and let it set, and then turn it out the exact shape of the mould.

Again, atmosphere is neither more nor less than the environment of the mind. But we have seen that this rightly used is a greater force than heredity.

How mighty then the power to make men which is in the hands of parents who understand even the first of these three great forces. They have but to arrange the environment in which the child is to live, say for the first twelve years of its life, with due reference to its heredity and its growth ; counteracting all that is evil in it with positive good, and fostering all that can be developed into virtues. Do not think I am romancing in describing parents as possessed of such a power : with the will and sufficient time to carry out their ideas, the atmosphere of the house can be made to beat with practically irresistible force on the young child.

One caution is, however, specially needed ; and that is to see that the good done by the mother is not undone by others, and that the atmosphere of the nursery is that of the house. Such is the ideal picture, but I have known houses replete with luxury



where the only atmosphere the child should breathe is in the nursery ; others, again, when the loss of a nursery through poverty brought the child under the mother's good influence for the first time.

As the child develops it is thus shaped by its environment, moulded on right lines, and its true education proceeds. More over, hereditary traits begin to stand out with greater prominence, and must be fostered or repressed as the case may be, all unconsciously to the child. The Jesuits, past-masters in child education, have always maintained that the great lines of character are practically formed by twelve years of age. In other words, the unconscious mind is educated before the instruction of the conscious in school-life seriously begins.

It is difficult to conceive a more delightful task than studying the seed plot which we call the child, with the power of arranging the atmosphere down to the smallest details (clothes, food, etc.) that will develop the growing plant to the best advantage.

What parents miss who know neither their responsibilities nor their powers in education, but foolishly think such matters are the provinces of governesses and schoolmasters, it is impossible to say. To my mind the two pleasures of greatest delight to parents worthy of the name, is the share they can take in the making of men, by the three great forces at their control, and in seeing the finished product of their labour in after life.

B. *A discipline.*—What this is is not obvious at first sight. The idea is that, while trucks are under discipline, carts and vans are not ; the difference being that while the former can only run on the rails, the latter can go where they will. In a similar manner the discipline of the Services make soldiers and sailors move in fixed directions. Now habit is well called the railroad of character ; and just as a railroad is physical discipline, a habit is mental discipline ; and it is this that is such a force in the formation of character, in the making of men.

With regard to habit, Professor Hill at Cambridge, and many others, have demonstrated that sensations and impulses that at first rise into consciousness and require voluntary effort and will to produce action, after a time do not rise into consciousness at all if repeated sufficiently often, but are "short-circuited" and performed without either effort, will, or knowledge. In other words, actions at first consciously performed become unconscious as they become habits, as, for instance, walking, dressing, etc.

If while walking I get into a brown study I may find my legs

have unconsciously taken me up a doorstep where I go every day. If I dress I pursue unconsciously a certain routine (to do otherwise makes me awkward). I always put the same foot first into my stocking and dress in a fixed order, and this without conscious thought.

Observe specially here, that so long as an action proceeding from a new principle is performed consciously, it requires a certain amount of effort and forms no part of my self or my character. The moment, however, that I have done it sufficiently often to become a habit, or, as it is called, an artificial reflex, it is not only done unconsciously and with perfect ease, but becomes for the first time a new quality in my character, another ingredient in the making of men. It becomes a spring of conduct that can be relied on. If I make a dirty boy wash his hands, he does it with effort and probably with reluctance, for cleanliness in this respect is no part of his character; but if he does this several times a day for a number of weeks under the guidance of one who knows the power of this second force, one day the washing becomes a habit; that is, the reflex action short-circuited runs in the mid-brain, never rises to the cortex or upper brain as consciousness, and is performed with perfect ease and no reluctance. For now cleanliness has formed, for the first time, a part of the ego; and the making of the man has proceeded another step.

Nothing, indeed, is mine, or a part of myself or of my character, until it is a quality of the unconscious mind, and performed naturally (unconsciously) and not artificially (consciously). Take another familiar instance in business life how ease and efficiency depend on habit. An office boy is engaged to put letters into envelopes and close and stamp them. New to the job, every action is consciously performed, and he gets through thirty in the hour. If another boy comes in for a chat, he goes all wrong and makes constant mistakes; for his conscious mind is fully engaged with his task, laboriously got through. Come again and see him in a few weeks' time. He is banging and stamping away at railroad speed at the rate of one hundred an hour; and not only so, but is laughing and chatting to a friend all the time and making not a single mistake. What is the secret? It is, that on a certain day the oft-repeated action became short-circuited in the mid-brain and never rose into full consciousness. The moment this was so, the habit was formed, the conscious mind released for other

work, and the boy, doing all easily and accurately, was worth twice as much to his employer.

Habit gives speed and accuracy, and is absolutely essential in business life.

As to habit, it is interesting to note its action in chess and billiards. In the former the moves are so intricate and varied that they never can become habits. It is therefore a laborious game, and must be played entirely with the conscious mind ; and the sigh of relief after the intense strain of a move in a master's tournament is most significant. Billiards is the complete opposite. The first thing that strikes an observer in a tournament is the consummate ease with which most of the strokes are played. The fact is, they have become so habitual that they are short-circuited habits, which means ease and accuracy ; and the stroke is performed with unconscious skill.

Again, habits are so powerful that they may change the whole man, even so far as his actual personality, the intimate thoughts of the individual, the character of the ego.

A father has six sons all pretty much alike at school, but the time comes for them to take up different callings in life. One becomes a soldier, another a sailor, another a merchant, another a farmer, another a parson, and another a scientist.

Go and see them after a few years ; and, lo and behold ! they are changed beyond recognition. It is not merely that one son is in the army, but that he absolutely *is* a soldier ; and a soldier is not a civilian. His very personality and the character of his thoughts are changed, and the outlook on everything in the world is changed to him ; all is seen from a new military angle. It is so with the sailor, who is not only completely different from what he was, but also from his brother the soldier. The merchant stands out in violent contrast to the other two. He is the absolute outcome of his environment and of his habits, as they are of theirs. The farmer looks almost as if he belonged to a different age and race by reason of the same forces. The parson appears as if he had been born a clergyman, while the scientist gazes abstractedly at his strange brethren and wonders how they could be so changed. Such is the discipline of habits.

The difference between a rich boor and a gentleman cannot always be seen in their conscious minds. When these are in action the boor can make a very praiseworthy effort of a more or less successful nature to imitate culture and breeding.

It is when they both forget themselves that the unconscious mind acts and gives them away. The boor is at once seen to be what he is, while the refinement of the other is self-evident.

In both the man himself is revealed; for my secret is now out, and the making of man is seen in its last analysis, mainly (though not entirely) to be *the education of the unconscious mind*.

It is always in our absent moments that we give ourselves away, our true personality is revealed, and the essential truth of the well-known lines is proved:—

“ Still, as of old,  
 Man by himself is priced;  
 For thirty pieces Judas sold  
 Himself—not Christ! ”

The real value of the railroad of habit is that when once the line is laid down the nerve current moves more easily along it than in another direction; hence habits become more and more fixed, until in extreme old age the man becomes little more than a bundle of them.

They give an added force to Solomon's dictum: “ Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it ”; to which I may add with reverence, “ because he cannot.”

Pardon an illustration here that well proves this, even if it be of a somewhat lighter nature than is common in our Institute papers.

You are a lady at tea with a friend, a grand-daughter of an earnest follower of Matthew Arnold. The house is small, and you hear, after a ring at the front-door bell, someone coming into the little hall; and you ask your friend, “ Who is that, dear?”

“ I think it's Uncle John, but we shall soon know: Listen! ”

And then you hear a shuffling noise repeated six times.

“ Yes,” says your friend triumphantly, “ I'm right.”

“ But how did you know?” is your puzzled reply.

“ Didn't you hear him, dear? One, two, three—six times. Uncle John, I am told, was a very careless little boy and never wiped his feet; and grandmother determined to implant a habit that would cure him. So every time he entered the house from the garden or the road she made him, for many months, wipe his feet six times on the mat. Not five or seven times, but always six, which he counted. That's sixty years ago, and now he is known everywhere by the six wipes on the mat.”

If character be defined as the shape the mind acquires by use, it will be seen what a power the formation of habits becomes.

A glove or boot in a shop has no character ; but it soon acquires in a special way the physical characteristics of its wearer. In like manner, a new child has no character when he is just born, though full of potentialities. This has gradually to be formed, partly through his conscious, but mainly through his unconscious mind. But though in character the unconscious is predominant, we must guard against asserting that nothing that is done consciously can be a part of it. I may be a most truthful person naturally, and also consciously on principle.

The Greeks were very fond of the word "wisdom." Ο Σόφρων, or the wise and prudent man, was really the product of perfectly organized habit, who could be relied on to act wisely in every path in life, as the result of a formed "character," which word, by the way, is derived from the stamp on a Babylonian brick of its maker. To return to our ideal parents. They have full power to use this reflex force by forming what habits they please in the child, and when the act becomes unconscious it forms a fresh part of the child's character.

The habits may be physical—connected with health, with cleanliness, with manners, with the appearance or dress, etc. ; or they may be mental and moral. Truth, purity, beauty, accuracy, and the whole gamut of small virtues can thus be certainly and successfully implanted by the mechanical means (not the highest, of which I speak later) of laying down the rails which form them.

One word on the minute anatomy of the brain may be allowed here as helpful. The grey matter consists essentially of millions of cells, each the beginning of two or more nerve threads.

In a child there is but little actual nerve connection between associated cells, but as life proceeds and habits are formed the threads uniting groups of cells increase till a most intricate network appears.

It would appear that the brain when born may be roughly compared to a common, with buildings dotted at intervals round it, such as a church, a school, a shop, an inn, and a post office. You, who live with your family on its edge, will soon make a series of well-worn paths across it, which have very much the appearance of tram lines, to the various places of interest. These are much easier to traverse than the long grass of the common in other directions. In this way habits have a

certain physical basis in the brain in adult life, as nerve threads connect the cells used in habitual acts, so that character may in this sense be connected with actual nerve formation.

In this connection Ruskin has given us a beautiful thought—a key indeed to many others. He tells parents they can paint, and teach their children painting, with words instead of colours, with the result of forming habits of truth and accuracy in the child, so that these become to him objects of pursuit and pleasure. Your boy rushes in with some wild and very inaccurate tale of what he has seen. You make him tell the story again more exactly, and then again. You make him choose better words, till at last you have got the word picture in its true colours. This you do with every tale he tells, till he learns ethics artistically, and takes a real pride in conveying the exact truth by his choice of words. Again, I do not say this is the best method, but it is a most useful and beautiful help in the right direction. When the result becomes unconscious the boy himself becomes truthful.

C. *A life*.—We come now to the last of the three great natural forces in the hands of the parents, and in this we begin to touch the spiritual and highest part of our nature. “A life” means an inspiring life; not an idea, but an ideal, a vision that grips the child’s imagination; in short, hero-worship.

Nothing is more lamentable than the way in which this inspiring force has been neglected and ignored in education. Children are essentially hero-worshippers, and if they are not provided with right and worthy objects, they will make idols of their own and bow down and worship them. The imagination is so active in childhood that to a great extent it dominates the life. All with whom the child is brought in contact should be objects of inspiration and patterns worthy of imitation. Dreadful, indeed, is the outlook of the boy when he shrinks in horror from the thought of a Father in Heaven because of his unhappy experience of a father on earth. Terrible is the injury to a child when it detects a mother’s lie. All children are natural hero-worshippers, and few fathers would recognise the noble and beautifully heroic figure they present to their son’s imagination, one which should never be shattered even if it cannot completely be lived up to. It is thus that the lives of the parents themselves are an essential part in the making of man.

The counsel of perfection here is only to bring the child in close and constant contact with those to whom it can look up, and not down—personalities that inspire it; and in childhood this is

comparatively easy. The definite teachers and friends come next after the parents and help according to their quality.

Ever since, however, the Son of God has visited this little world of ours there remains a further transcendent Ideal for a child, the effect of which is so overwhelming that it requires God-given wisdom to know how to present it to the young mind, so that it may remain throughout life an inspiring force and a power in the making of the man that is unrivalled.

The simplest and best way is to adhere strictly to the absolute truth as told us in the Gospels, speaking ever with the deepest reverence, so that the sacred Figure in all its beauty is enshrined in the inmost recesses of the child's heart as its most cherished possession, shared only, if at all, by its idolised mother. Doctrines are here, to a certain extent, out of place, for it is not by them men are made. It is in the impact of the overwhelming personality—the Divine on the human, perfection on imperfection, as portrayed by the inspired pens of the evangelists—that the power lies.

Most of our greatest thinkers are agreed that in this Life, rightly presented, lies the supreme power for the making of the true man. Emerson gives us a lovely picture of one formed on such an Ideal which I must reproduce here: "When a man lives with God, his voice shall be as sweet as the murmur of the brook and the rustle of the corn. He will weave no longer a spotted life of shreds and patches; but he will live with a Divine unity. He will cease from what is base and frivolous in his life, and be content with all places and any service he can render. He will calmly front the morrow in the negligency of that trust which carries God with it, and so has the whole of the future in the bottom of his heart."

Observe, I say nothing here of the future and eternal results of the knowledge of the Person and Work of Christ, for such is not here my theme; but simply of His actual power in the formation of character, in the making of man.

Having briefly discussed pre-natal and parental forces before proceeding to consider the last power that forms character—the personal—I may say a word of encouragement to those parents who have heard or read my description of their powers, but may feel them to be absolutely visionary. "Such fathers and mothers as I have described," they say, "may live in Utopia, but certainly not in London! The standard is hopelessly too high and absolutely impossible for ordinary parents."

Perhaps it may help these despairing ones if I outline, one by one, a few simple things that all willing and earnest parents can certainly do if they wish :—

(1) They *can* undoubtedly form habits of moral value, as none other can, in the child.

(2) They *can* so control the child's environment as ever to suggest good and not evil.

(3) They *can*, by example, furnish the child with inspiring ideals.

(4) They *can* feed the child's mind with good ideas.

(5) They *can* strengthen the child's will power so that he acts, even in small things, with decision.

(6) They *can* educate the moral sense in every way.

(7) They *can* present the Divine Christ to the child so as to be a true inspiration.

(8) They *can* at least obey these two precepts : "Train up a child in the way he should go," and "Offend not, despise not, hinder not, one of these little ones."

### 3. PERSONAL.

Once again, without dwelling further on the spiritual force on which I have briefly touched, I may say the greatest remaining power is the man's own will. Having passed beyond constant parental control he can, by the force of will, use now for himself and form for himself the three powers on which I have shortly dwelt.

1. The *atmosphere* or environment in which he is to live can now be determined by himself. There is no purer air to breathe than that so beautifully described in Philippians iv, 8 : "Whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report . . . think on these things." To do this effectively, however, requires will power.

2. Then *habits* can be formed at will and by the will ; and with regard to this, one point may be mentioned. It is no question during our whole life whether we will form habits or not, any more than it is a question whether we will breathe or not, for both are necessities. The point is, that the atmosphere shall be pure, that the habits which we are incessantly forming shall be good ; and that both go to the making of men.

3. *Ideals* also still inspire adults, though perhaps not so



wonderfully as in childhood. These can be deliberately set before the soul as standards of attainment. One value of a noble ideal is that it turns the eye outward and not inward. These ideals, in adult life, may vary from the highest to the lowest. With regard to the latter there may be some who say "Evil, be thou my good"; and in this connection I cannot but class that literature as most pernicious that glorifies evil in the shape of gentlemen burglars and forgers steeped in immorality. I have known a young man of family actually set before himself, as his ideal of life, that of becoming a prince of swindlers.

Then there are what I may call morbid ideals rather than evil, which, if not decadent, are certainly not heroic types.

There are those whose ideal is pleasure, and others again riches. There are many with nobler and higher ideals of duty, playing the game, honour and honesty. The higher and loftier the ideal the nobler and more spiritual the character. Indeed, the quality of the man is largely due to the character of his ideal. All men live by certain standards which, if they attain them, conscience condemns them not; if they fail, it does. Every school, college, profession, as well as every nation and country, has its own standards, which largely form the local concept of right and wrong.

When adult life is reached another force comes into play which is the theme of Kipling's wonderful poem "If," from which I have quoted a solitary verse, and that is opposition. The value of a bitter east wind, of having to swim against a strong current, of having to climb a rugged steep, are more or less physically familiar, but mentally and morally the same opposition makes the man. Here I must quote a few lines of Browning's, simply because I know no prose to equal them:—

" Then, welcome each rebuff  
That turns earth's smoothness rough,  
Each sting that bids nor sit nor stand but go."  
\* \* \* \*

" And so I live, you see,  
Go through the world, try, prove, reject,  
Prefer, still struggling to effect  
My warfare; happy that I can  
Be crossed and thwarted *as a man*,  
Not left in God's contempt apart  
With ghastly smooth life, dead at heart,  
Tame in earth's paddock as her prize."

We must be overcomers or be overcome. Therefore difficulties, opposition, evil surroundings, bad circumstances all are good, *providing they can be overcome*. In many sad cases this is not possible, and when the current is so strong that no headway can be made, as is so frequent in the squalor of our great cities, the opposition becomes a curse and not a blessing. Browning's inspiring lines only conceive of difficulties that are surmountable. We are told, not without reason, that to no small extent it is the execrable English climate that makes Englishmen. That if we had not continually to overcome its evils, and lived instead under Italian skies, we should lose much of our national character and become soft and pleasure-loving.

To dash one's brains out, however, against a stone wall is not courage but suicide. To put a horse at a seven-foot fence would not teach it to jump, but probably ruin it.

All difficulties are not, then, blessings even in disguise. It is not, indeed, the difficulty, but the overcoming, that is always the real blessing. I make these remarks here, for as I read this paper I am greatly saddened by thinking of masses of our fellow-men to whom it is practically inapplicable. The audience before me can, I know, not only grasp my points, but in many cases may be able to use them in their lives; but I cannot shut out from my thoughts those whose lot is beyond the pale of such possibilities.

I have, however, still, alas! before closing, to define the word "man" as used here, and the more I think of it the less I feel inclined to fulfil my promise. I may, of course, say that a man *who is a man* is straight and fair and just and true; I may add that he is both upright and downright, and so on; but when I've said all, I come immeasurably below the definition I have already given from Rudyard Kipling's wonderful poem "If." Here is the most powerful and accurate definition I know of what a real man is naturally; and if to this I add the "super" touch that further inspires him and transfigures him when in contact with the Divine, I reach the highest concept of humanity.

The loftiest of all ideals unquestionably is Christ's, and that is to do the will of God; and the Christian who has this as his standard in life (and how few there are) has attained the full stature of a man. The seven forces which I have shown make this man are:—

- |                           |                         |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Birth.                 | 4. Education of the Un- |
| 2. Atmosphere or Environ- | conscious.              |
| ment.                     | 5. Ideals.              |
| 3. Habit.                 | 6. Standard of Life.    |
| 7. Divine Inspiration.    |                         |

I close with a statement that may be questioned by many, but is much valued by me.

The pursuit of the impossible is in itself ennobling, and has a wonderful power over character. To be always following after, and yet never attaining, as is the lot of the one who seeks the likeness of the Divine, has the twofold effect of transfiguring the character and stamping it with true humility. Such an one is growing holier and loftier each day, and yet is ever becoming more and more lowly in heart, for he never reaches his ideal. No pride is possible where the standard before the soul is never attained, where the reach is higher than the grasp; but the movement is ever upward and onward:—

“ That low man seeks a little thing to do,  
 Sees it and does it :  
 This high man, with a great thing to pursue,  
 Dies ere he knows it.  
 That has the world here—should he need the next,  
 Let the world mind him !  
 This, throws himself on God and, unperplexed,  
 Seeking shall find Him.”—R.B.

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: This paper is a most valuable one, and I feel sure it will lead to a valuable discussion. I therefore propose a hearty vote of thanks to Dr. Schofield. (This was given by acclamation.) He proceeded to say: The only difficulty I have felt in reading it through, with some care, in preparation to leading this discussion, is that it contains such abundant and good matter that it is hard to pick out any special matter to discuss which could be contained in the brief period allowed to a speaker upon the paper. I proceed, however, to make an attempt to do so. Dr. Schofield tells us that a little while ago heredity was held to have an almost overwhelming influence on a child; now he has almost gone to the other

extreme in belittling its influence. He tells us that diseases inherited will disappear entirely in four generations. Granted that it may be so, but what about the three intervening generations? Are not a father and mother more interested in their own children than in their great great grandchildren?

I can cast my memory back to unfortunate marriages in my own family circle, as probably many present can also do. In one case, noting that a very near relative was evidently seriously thinking of matrimony, I gave him information about the health of the family he was thinking of entering. He made enquiries for himself and the marriage did not come off.

Some may say that love is blind and that lovers will marry without thought, but my experience is that more people realise the great responsibilities of marriage, and they will act with prudence if they are warned in time to look for themselves at the probabilities which lie before them.

Closely connected with this is the folly of some parents who will not take preventive steps to cure blindness or other evils which may fall on the newly-born infant.

Passing on to the main features of the paper, I fully agree with the lecturer in the preponderating influence of the mother over the child in the early years of life, while the main responsibilities of the father begin, specially with boys, somewhat later, in the selection of a school and in the formation of the friendships of childhood. The selection of a school is most important and in many cases difficult, since there are many schoolmasters with good degrees from the universities who are utterly unfit for their work, being ignorant of what goes on among the boys under their charge, and who consequently are unable to stop evil practices which a schoolmaster with tact would recognise and stop at once. It is well to recognise that the passing of examinations and the knowledge of subjects by boys and girls is only one part of education. The training of the mind in habits of industry, self-denial, and the formation of character are of the first importance, and these can best be attained by the highest Teacher, the Lord Himself.

The lecturer has well said, that boys and girls are hero worshippers; and it is well to recognise this trait in their dispositions.

Advantage of this fact is well taken by the Children's Special Service Mission, in which young men and young women, under the

guidance of some one a little more advanced in life, seek for the real spiritual food of the young people at seaside resorts and holiday camps. This is a line of action well suited to the modern conditions. The children naturally look up to those a very few years older than themselves, and if they be real, bright Christians this has an immense influence; the children see that Christians can be bright and happy, and they may become converted.

On the other hand there are some parents who wish for their children's good, but, in an unsympathetic manner, to use a common phrase, have forced religion down their children's throats, with the result that the children think their parents are of a different nature to themselves; they think religion a very dull thing, and in many cases, alas! have strenuously resisted the well-meant but ill-directed efforts of their parents with disastrous results.

The C.S.S.M., on the other hand, have further developed their methods with much encouragement and blessing during the last couple of winters; large parties have been taken to Switzerland for winter sports with a large proportion of earnest Christian young men and young women, who enter warmly into the sports, and also enter warmly in the evenings into simple Gospel meetings and in singing hymns in an informal way with the children, with most happy results. As an instance, I may mention a near young relative of ours who was much surprised at the spirit of mutual good-will shown by his party of 150.

MR. SIDNEY COLLETT wrote: As I am unexpectedly hindered from attending Dr. Schofield's lecture to-night, I should like to offer the following brief remarks.

I consider his three points, in the making of men, viz., heredity, parental training and environment, are admirably dealt with *so far as they go*. But I am bound to say that, in my judgment, the lecturer has lost an opportunity in limiting his treatment of this important subject to *mere human efforts*. And this, according to the fourth paragraph on page 195, seems to have been done by design.

This seems, to my mind, to be very unfortunate, for, even supposing all the teaching of his lecture were faithfully carried out, the man would still be an *imperfect man* in the *most important* sense of all!

A *railway engine* might be constructed with consummate skill, but without the fire and the steam to generate the *power* it would fail of its real purpose and be useless.

A *sailing vessel* might be built according to the latest scientific measurements and shape, but without the *heavenly breezes* to fill the sails it also would be a failure.

So, in like manner, man, however much he might conform to the highest ethical ideals, would still "come short"; and, from the most important point of view, would be an *everlasting failure*, without that *change of heart* which can only be brought about by the operation of the *Holy Spirit*, leading to a personal appropriation of the substitutionary work of Christ, thus producing a *new man* (Eph. ii, 15, and iv, 24).

Had Dr. Schofield laid greater stress on this vital point his lecture would, in my judgment, have been far more valuable. For the Word declares *ye must be born again*.

The Rev. CHARLES GARDNER said he wished to protest against Mr. Sidney Collett's criticism of Dr. Schofield's paper. There was no man living who knew better than Dr. Schofield the need for the new birth. But surely it was not necessary for a man to reaffirm his faith in the doctrines of regeneration and atonement every time he wrote a paper.

Mr. Gardner expressed special interest in all Dr. Schofield said about the subconscious mind. He remembered the extravagant claims made twenty-five years ago by Maeterlinck, who called it a buried temple, and claimed something like omniscience for it. Later there was a reaction, and someone called it the dustbin. Dr. Schofield took a sounder line. It was a comfort to know that unconscious influence is much stronger than conscious. We used to be told to set a good example, and some people set about in a terribly self-conscious way to improve their neighbours. If influence flows from "being," we may safely leave it to our subconscious self, and escape at the same time being disagreeable.

The Victorians did not formulate completely the philosophy of the unconscious, though the attempt was made in Germany by Von Hartmann. But they were aware that unconscious influence is the most potent. Browning tells that Pippa passed, and a community was regenerated by her unconscious influence. In the *Ring*

and the *Book* the unconscious influence of Pompilia was a touchstone to all the persons in the strange old drama.

George Eliot tells how a little child put its tiny hand into the crabbed old hand of Silas Marner, and led him gently back into a life of fellowship. The child's influence was certainly unconscious.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS asked the lecturer whether the meaning of the sentence at the bottom of page 185 was that the tendencies to diseases disappeared in the fourth generation. He thought too much was made of habits as forming character, and regarded them as not more than skin deep and only occupying the fringe of character. He thought that the formation of habits set the mind free to take decisions in more important things, as the lecturer seemed to acknowledge on page 196, under head (5). It had been observed that a man took his character more from his mother than his father, and this appeared to be in accordance with Holy Writ, where we find the mother's name of each of the Kings of Judah mentioned in immediate connection with the statement as to whether he was a good or a bad king. In the case of Abraham's two sons, the whole teaching of Gal. iv was that they each took character from their mothers—Isaac from the free-woman, as Ishmael from the bond-woman.

There was one exception to all this, and that was our Lord Jesus Christ, who took nothing of His character from His mother, but brought all that made Him what He was with Him from Heaven. In His case environment did not form character, and thus He became the ideal for the human race.

Colonel HANS HAMILTON said : Can Dr. Schofield give us his views on the propensity of children, when left entirely alone, of being cruel to each other, and of their tendency to kill and destroy their own companions ?

My father, as vicar of a parish, when visiting his parishioners many years ago in a very poor part of a town, found some eight or ten children, from 3 to 6 years of age, left entirely to themselves, engaged in stoning the youngest of them against a wall. Will Dr. Schofield tell us how he accounts for this "predisposition" ? Is it prenatal, hereditary, or a part of the fall of man ? We can hardly call it, with Wordsworth, "a cloud of glory" !

In my long experience I find the secret of bringing up a child from

distinction, which, however, does not invalidate my argument ; for at the last analysis the spirit *is* the man, and, whatever concerns it, is the greater force in the “ making of men.” Mrs. Boyd’s illustrations are apposite and felicitous, and I accept them as such. It is well to note that practically heredity does not extend in force as a rule beyond parents and grandparents six in all ; but that, of course, in some families these six can be compounded in various proportions so as to make entirely different products from the same stock, which answers Col. Hans Hamilton’s question.

In reply to Mr. Avary H. Forbes, Dr. Schofield writes :—

(1) The unconscious mind, not subconscious, was practically denied by psychologists less than 30 years ago, when the President of the —— Society was taken to task for allowing me to read a paper on it.

(2) The “ subconscious ” self is not the subject of Lord Bacon’s remarks still less the “ unconscious ” self first quoted. It is the unconscious self that is man’s true nature as lauded by Lord Bacon. I would suggest that my critic re-reads the passage.

(3) The answer to question (1) is : No. It makes it an integral part of the “ ego.”

The answer to question (2) is : Yes, and I am careful to point out this is not the highest or best way to inculcate morality, &c., but by the transcendent ideal of Christ Himself.