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This noted scientist has for many years been a strong and ardent believer in Phrenology. In 1896 he wrote to Mr. Fowler in England: “I am still as I have been all my life a firm believer in Phrenology, both in its scientific and practical aspects.” And in 1898 he wrote: “Phrenology is a science of whose substantial truth and vast importance I have no more doubt than I
have of the value and importance of any of the great intellectual advances already recorded."

Dr. Alfred R. Wallace, writing on Phrenology in his work on "The Wonderful Century," says: "This science, founded step by step on the observations and comparison of facts, confirmed and checked in every conceivable way, and subjected to the most rigid tests by means of large collections of skulls and casts of the heads of men and women remarkable for any mental faculty or propensity, and by observations and measurements of thousands of living persons, the correspondence of form with function, was first suspected, then confirmed, and finally demonstrated by the comparison of heads of individuals of every age, both in health and in disease, and under the most varied conditions of education and environment.

"Three men of exceptional talent and acuteness of observation devoted their lives to the collection of these facts. They studied also the brain itself, and discovered many details of its structure, before unknown. They studied the skull, its varying thicknesses in different parts and at different ages, as well as under the influence of disease. And it was only after making allowance for every source of uncertainty or error that they announced the possibility of determining character with a considerable amount of certainty, and often with marvelous exactness. Surely this was a scientific mode of procedure, and the only sound method of ascertaining the relations that exist between the development of the brain and the mental faculties and powers."

Speaking of the motor-centres, he says, "There is a close correspondence between them and the Phrenological organs of which the action or motions under exertation are the natural expression, which is very remarkable, and affords a new and striking test of the accuracy with which the Phrenologists have located the brain centres for the various mental faculties. With such confirmation, as regards most of the motor-centres yet discovered, the presumption is in favor of the accuracy of the bulk of the Phrenological organs more especially as their development also accords with, and explains, national and race character, which neither Physiology nor Anthropologists have even attempted to do; while, as regards individual character, the skilled Phrenologist has shown that he is able to read it like an open book, and to lay bare the hidden springs of conduct with an accuracy that the most intimate friends of the individual cannot approach. Yet, even now the advocates of this new and very crude method of brain study repeat the old vague objections to Phrenology as though they were true and unanswerable. The blinding effect of this prejudice against Phrenology has caused these modern investigators to overlook the circumstance that the often complex motions of the different parts of the body, resulting from the stimulation of various brain centres, were really the physical expression of mental emotions, and of the very same emotions as those long since assigned to the Phrenological organs situated in the same part of the brain. Instead of being, as so often alleged, a disproof of Phrenology, or in any way antagonistic to it, these modern investigations are only intelligible when explained by means of its long-established facts, and thus really furnish a most striking and most convincing because wholly unintended confirmation of its substantial truth."

Dr. Wallace also briefly states the main principles of Phrenology, all of which were at first denied, but all now forming part of recognized science.

(1) The brain is the organ of the mind.

This was denied in the "Edinborough Review," and even J. S. Mill wrote that mental phenomena do not admit of being deduced from the physiological laws of our nervous organization.

(2) Size is, other things being equal, a measure of power. This was at first denied, but is now generally admitted by physiologists.
(3) The brain is a congeries of organs, each having its separate faculty. Till a comparatively recent period this was denied, and the brain was said to act as a single organ. Now it is admitted that there are such separate organs, but it is alleged that they have not yet been discovered.

(4) The front of the brain is the seat of our perceptive and reflective faculties; the top, of our higher sentiments; the back and the sides, of our animal instincts. This was long denied. Even the late Dr. W. B. Carpenter maintained that the back of the brain was probably the seat of intellect! Now, almost all physiologists admit that this general division of brain organs is correct.

(5) The form of the skull, during life, corresponds so closely to that of the brain that it is possible to determine the proportionate development of various parts of the latter by an examination of the former. "The denial of this was, as we have seen, the stock objection to the very possibility of a science of Phrenology. Now it is admitted by all anatomists. The late Prof. George Humphrey, of Cambridge University, in his 'Treatise on the Human Skeleton,' page 207, expressly admits the correspondence, adding: 'The arguments against Phrenology must be of a deeper kind than this to convince anyone who has carefully considered the subject.'"

Dr. Wallace continues: "It thus appears that the five main contentions of the Phrenologist, each of them at first strenuously denied, have now received the assent of the most advanced modern physiologists. But, admitting these fundamental data, it evidently becomes a question solely of a sufficiently extended series of comparisons of form with faculty to determine what faculties are constantly associated with a superior development of any portion of the cranium, and of the brain within it. To assert that such comparisons are unscientific without giving solid reasons for the assertion, is absurd. The whole question is, are they adequate? And the one test of adequacy is, Do they enable the well-instructed student to determine the character of individuals from the form of their skulls whenever any organ, or group of organs are much above or below the average? This test was applied by the early Phrenologists in scores, in hundreds, even in thousands of cases, with a marvellous proportion of successful results. The men who first determined the position of each organ only did so after years of observation, and hundreds of comparisons of development of organs with manifestation of function. These determinations were never blindly accepted, but were tested by their followers in every possible way, and were only generally admitted when every ordeal had been passed successfully. To reject such determinations without full examination of the evidence in support of them, without applying any of the careful tests which the early Phrenologists applied, and on the mere vague allegations of insufficient observation, or unscientific method, is itself utterly unscientific.

"In the coming century," Dr. Wallace says, "Phrenology will assuredly attain general acceptance. It will prove itself to be the true science of mind. Its practical uses in education, in self-discipline, in the reformatory treatment of criminals, and in the remedial treatment of the insane, will give it one of the highest places in the hierarchy of the sciences; and its persistent neglect and obloquy, during the last sixty years, will be referred to as an example of the most incredible narrowness and prejudice which prevailed among men of science at the very time when they were making such splendid advances in other fields of thought and discovery."
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