THE

FREE SUNDAY ADVOCATE

AND

National Sunday League Record.

"LIBERTY AND LIGHT."

VOL. VIII.—No. 7.] LONDON, JANUARY 1st, 1877. [Monthly, One Penny.

CONTENTS.

DARWINISM IN ITS INFLUENCE ON OUR TIMES.

THE following Lecture was delivered by Dr. G. G. Zerffi, F.R.L.S., &c., at the "Sunday Evenings for the People," South Place Institute, Finsbury:—

EVERY grand idea has had to be forced on humanity by a slow process of growth. To spread light, when every one shuts his eyes, or has his mind enveloped in a thick veil of prejudice, or his mental organs clouded by impenetrable ignorance, is rather difficult. Sacred books proclaimed that the world sprang from a cosmical egg; others said that it was a square resting on pillars; others that it was a flat, circular, earthly pancake, swimming in the surrounding ocean, as its salt sauce; others held that it was made out of fire; others that it was formed out of water; some thought that the earth, with all its creeping, swimming, crawling, flying, and walking creatures, was created out of nothing, as though nothing could produce something; others considered that somewhere there sat a kind of "maker," who manufactured, according to his special whims and fancies, all the different species of plants and animals. All these theories have no scientific basis. They all assume special creations, and simply assert that at a certain period—we do not know *when*—it pleased some kind of force or person, power or individual, to make all sorts of creatures—we do not know *how*—and place them on this earth to pinch, sting, annoy, eat, devour, and annihilate one another—we do not know *why*. Though we may constantly dogmatise on these theories, we shall always be as wise as before and know nothing, a state of mind which is undoubtedly the happiest of all, for it does not cost much trouble to attain.

The question how the different inorganic and especially organic beings have come into existence—in fact, the Genesis of all things visible and invisible has always been the great mystery of mysteries. The endeavour to find an answer has occupied priests, prophets, law-givers, naturalists, and philosophers of humanity from the first dawn of our consciousness down to our own times. All holy books, with the exception of those of the Chinese, attempt to explain the beginning of all things; and the less the authors of the books knew, the more dogmatic they were. Leibnitz, more than 200 years ago, starting with a "monas monadum," in the Pythagorean sense, propounded the axiom "Saltus non datur in natura," which I may translate in these words: "There is no sudden transition in nature." The grand mystery may be very simply stated in two different questions:—

1. Were suns, planets, minerals, plants, and animals the works of *separate* acts of creation?

2. Or were they the mere effects of cosmical forces, possessing certain properties, combined into distinct forms according to certain inherent laws, with which matter was endowed by the great Architect of the Universe?

To assume that the hen was made all ready for hatching eggs, and that it did lay eggs, and then hatched them, and that this process of hatching eggs went on for the last six thousand years in an eternal, undisturbed circle from a primitive hen, is a very comfortable assumption; but where did the first hen come from? and why have so many useless hens been engendered that can neither sing nor be eaten, that have beaks much too large for their heads, legs much too large for their bodies, wings with which they cannot fly, and legs with which they cannot run? Again, what are those small, scarcely visible creatures that grow under the skin, on the skin, or in the liver, and live on other creatures? Of what good is a poisonous serpent, a hyena, jackal, leopard, or tiger? Why should crocodiles have a peculiar propensity to eat up babies, or wolves to prey on sheep? why are thousands of species, living on thousands of other creatures, apparently created only to serve with their life to protract the life of other not less useless creatures. The theory of separate creations has no scientific basis, and as we cannot assume that an omnipotent, omniscient, all-wise Creator, an Architect of the Universe, can have committed incongruities, and used the cosmical forces and materials of the universe for producing shapes and forms shapeless and formless, for no intelligible purpose; the more humble, devout, and active creatures, endowed with the faculty of thinking and reasoning, have tried to find some other answer to the question, How have all things been created? The theory of a primitive, independent, special creation did not satisfy man because it explains no facts. It assumes a beginning of all things, but does not tell us how the beginning began. It assumes an effect without assigning to it even a plausible cause. Another theory which is as unintelligible as that of a separate special creation, assumes the *variability* or *inconsistency* of the laws of nature. It attributes to the first immutable, incomprehensible Cause, an ignorance of his own laws. All facts of Palæontology and Geology battle against this assumption, and prove that different causes have produced different effects, varying the flora and fauna according to the varied atmospheric, caloric, and chemical influences. Both theories are not wholly unscientific, but at the same time utterly immoral. For the tiger, the thief, and the murderer might well argue: "I cannot help being a ferocious animal. I cannot help stealing or killing. I was specially created as I am by a higher uncontrollable power." The question of creation has been answered in an entirely different manner in modern times. Man tried to argue backwards: he started with the known, the perceptible, and the observable, and tried to realise every fact as the result of a cause. This cause, in its turn, he assumed as the effect of some previous cause, and so back to a first cause. By this means alone we can arrive at the scientific treatment of a subject. We try to ascertain a continuous connection between cause and effect, which in itself is law, engendered by causation. Even were we to arrive at nothing by this method, we should in any case have reaped some advantage: we should have traced the slow and gradual development of

any phenomenon step by step as far as possible. We should not have committed the gross mistake of starting with a preconceived statement, based on ignorance, which, however, in times in which we have, as thinking beings, every opportunity of verifying our errors on the path of information, becomes wilful falsehood, which ought no longer to be allowed to dishonour man in his progressive *development*. Evolution and Development are the two mightiest words that have been yet uttered with reference to the future basis of all our learning, inquiry, study, and proceedings in a scientific form. Formerly, and even now, many people argue like that pious schoolmaster who "thanked God that He had allowed all the big rivers to flow through the big towns." The Seine flows through Paris, and the Tigris flowed through Niniveh, the Thames flows through London, and the Euphrates flowed through Babylon, the Danube flows through Vienna, and the Tiber flows through Rome—what more conclusive evidence could we require! The philosophers or right-minded thinkers who would have doubted this assertion would have been looked down upon by this pious schoolmaster and his fellow-thinkers as rank infidels, who dared to deny the wisdom and almighty power of God. But the philosophers would have only turned the argument and shaped it differently. They would have reasoned in this way. It is true that in olden and modern times the large towns were and are all situated on large rivers; but were the towns there *first*, or did the rivers cut their beds through the valley-plains, serving as watery high roads at times, when man did not yet know how to construct a hovel, but slept and dwelt in caves or under bushes? A philosopher would be compelled to answer that the rivers were there first, and following man's gradually-increasing use of his constructive powers, he would come by degrees to the moment when the banks of great rivers were chosen as dwelling places. He would then become convinced that God had endowed man with intellect and reason; that He did not directly make the rivers flow through the towns, but was indirectly the cause that man, in using his brain, chose the banks of rivers for a dwelling-place, because the rivers afforded easy means of communication with the inland, and connected him with the sea—the grand promoter of commerce, and the mighty chain, that links distant countries together, and embraces the globe in its watery arms, spreading union and concord? Who is the more pious of the two? The schoolmaster is pious in his immortal stupidity, and false mode of arguing; the philosopher is conscious of the might of the Creator and of the slow and gradual growth of man's intellectual faculties, with which all that the other attributes to a direct and ridiculous interference of the Divinity has been accomplished. The people at large, as regards their notions of the Creation, are in exactly the same position as the simple-minded schoolmaster, whilst the immortal Darwin stands firm as a rock, like a Newton, as the proclaimer of a new method of studying, inquiring, seeing, hearing, learning, and arguing. Before Darwin systematised the theory of Evolution and Development, which dimly haunted the greatest thinkers of humanity like Lamarck and Goethe, all our studies were isolated, detached, and without philosophical coherence. Whether we studied history or art, theology or natural science, we began like our schoolmaster by humbly thanking God for having made Greeks and Romans who played history, Hebrews who framed divine laws, and man to go devoutly to church on Sundays. That man himself should have been an evolution of the gradually progressing combination of the elements of nature, was an idea so horrible, that Darwin was at once accused of having stated "that man was the direct descendant of monkeys." Those who, according to their relative amount of brain or the neglected use of that element, stood nearest to these our forefathers, generally clamoured most loudly against this terrible theory. We all have been at one time nothing but small, only microscopically visible, cellules. Does this fact in any way militate against our faculties? Let us for a moment consider what is meant by the word creation. If by this word is understood the origin of a body produced by a creative force, we may consider it under a two-fold aspect:—

1. As to the origin of its component elements from a *material* point of view. Or

2. As to the origin of its shape, from a *formal* point of view.

How the component primitive parts originated, what they are in their essences, we do not know, and I doubt whether we shall ever know what the cosmical essences are. We only know that there are crystallisations, fungi, infusoria, and that these forms consist of material elements, that they are formed according to certain influences, and that they assume different shapes under different conditions. Nature or the Universe, as one great whole, eternally produces through combination various phenomena, and we cannot imagine that one single atom can ever have been lost or disappeared, for it would be impossible to find a *place* for even an imponderable atom beyond the Universe. The second point may be further elucidated, and in this lies the grandeur of Darwin, that he has assigned to man what he may study and know, in order that he may not waste time with matters that make him neither wiser nor better, but only conceited in his ignorance. What the immortal Kant, the great German philosopher, did in the realm of metaphysics in pointing out the limits of man's understanding with incontrovertible logic, clearness, and truthfulness, Darwin has done in the realm of all those studies which have reality as a basis, whether such realities be composed of facts in history, forms in art, creeds in religion, words in languages, or phenomena in nature.

Whenever we want to know, we have to go backward step by step, always considering the influences under which forms have assumed their shapes as facts, products of art, religious systems, different languages, or created things from the remotest antediluvian times to our own. Permit me to illustrate briefly my assertion, and you will come to the conclusion that Darwinism must become the new method of all our future studies, as it is the only one that leads honestly to knowledge, or enables us still more honestly to say we do not know. I will not discuss the question whether Darwin proves his theory in regard to the origin of species, whether he succeeded in tracing step by step, without a missing link, how a Batrachian became through selection and descent a Newton.

The merit of a thinker, like Darwin, does not consist in proving a theory with mathematical precision, but in the power with which he has been capable of exciting the dynamic or intellectual, the thinking and reasoning force of mankind. His merit, like that of a Leibnitz, a Wolf, a Hume, a Locke, a Kant, or a Goethe, is to bring new active vitality into the stagnating every-day opinions of man. We know that our moral laws have not changed and cannot change; but everything referring to science has changed, is changing, and will change as we acquire a more correct knowledge of the laws of nature. Darwin's theory has produced in England about 36 independent works, essays, and articles; in France, 21; in Holland, 7; in Italy, 10; in Germany, amongst people undoubtedly the most philosophic of our times, not less than 250, besides some 30 translations; and a great number of works in America. We cannot fail to be impressed by the evident intellectual force of his principles, which have produced, during his life-time, such a mighty action. Darwin's grand principle of evolution and development, which, though he was not the first to enunciate, he has systematised, and proved to be the only possible basis for the scientific treatment of any subject, will make his fame immortal. It is a curious phenomenon that some learned men, who live entirely on Darwin's method, who could not make two steps either forward or backward in their studies without Darwinism, should often be the loudest in denouncing Darwin's theory as pernicious or dangerous.

If we consider language, we find that up to our own times, people believed that there was a heavenly schoolmaster somewhere, who taught us a kind of primitive language, which afterwards was either forgotten, or degenerated into a confusion of languages at the construction of the Tower of Babel. We have again the reasoning of our dear schoolmaster with reference to the great rivers before us. Following out the method of Darwin, we have learned to take entirely different views of the formation of languages. We know now that we have only three

principal sounds at our disposal, *a*, *o*, *u*, and that by means of these three sounds, and their modification and combination, and the help of labials, dentals, sibilants, liquids, and gutturals, all the different languages of the world have slowly evolved themselves. We are able to group these languages, and find them either monosyllabic, agglutinative, or flexible. We have been enabled to draw comparisons between languages and languages, to group them again on an Ethnological basis as Aryan, Turanian, or Savage; and we have found that the Savage languages are monosyllabic, the Turanian agglutinative, and the Aryan with their subdivisions flexible.

Turning to history, we now study it on totally different principles. The Darwinian method has led us to read history backwards. To look upon humanity as one grand, growing, evolving, progressively developing whole. Man in history had his savage beginning, his nomadic childhood, his pastoral boyhood, his agricultural youth, his commercial and warlike manhood, and will have his philosophical and moral old age. There is here, as throughout all nature, a certain *One-ness* (the law of causation), but there is also an eternal change and life, an expansive life, that is never to-day what it was yesterday, that in spite of thousands of survivals in savage prejudices and inherited false notions, continually extends, drawing larger numbers into the vortex of a self-conscious higher life of mental culture. The burning of heretics in Smithfield market is as impossible now as the attempt of Abraham to sacrifice his innocent first-born son to the glory of the Deity. For the conception of the Deity has been entirely changed through the progressive, higher, intellectual, and moral development of man. Further, in studying the history of man, whether as isolated individual or grouped into nations, forming kingdoms or empires, we find that in the struggle for existence the fittest survives. Are we in society not exposed to an eternal competition? does this competition, bodily and mental, not strain all our nerves, all our vital energy, and only the fittest succeeds? How much encouragement we may gather from this! Instead of trusting to mere chance or to a special interfering power, we are inspired to exert ourselves, and to strive in the battle of life, in whatever position we may have been placed, to make the best of everything, to do our best cheerfully, according to our capacities, and to look for comfort to the very consciousness of having done our duty. These are not new ethics, they are only expressed in a different way. Instead of arguing like my dear schoolmaster, I try to argue in the sense of my philosopher, taking Darwin's method as the basis of our political and social progressive development; for progress consists in a constant increasing in the number of those who can stand competition, and in a continual decrease in the number of those who formerly were accidentally fitted out, either by birth, nepotism, or simony, to withstand the destroying pressure of competition, without much merit of their own.

Passing next to art, we find that its study has entirely changed. Formerly we thought art had but to deal with an imitation of nature. We used to give a student a pencil and a piece of paper, and place before him an inkstand or a candlestick, and tell him to draw what he saw. If he had an eye, and could see the round flat on a plane surface, then he was an artist. Since Darwin has taught us how to look nature in the face, to trace varieties, and their causes in animals, we look upon art-forms and their varieties from a higher philosophical point of view. We see in art an intellectual and creative faculty which has kept pace with man's moral and intellectual progress, reflecting in forms his innermost religious and scientific power. We try to trace art back to its first component parts, and we have succeeded in finding an origin for art-forms in the straight and waving line.

The development of art is analogous to that of the oxygen and hydrogen of water, in which first, scarcely visible animalculæ slowly formed themselves. These by degrees turned into fishes, the fishes into birds; till at last mammals developed in different shapes and forms, going over into the gradually improving monkey tribes, which gradually evolved savages, and at last produced the three distinct groups of man—the black, the yellow, and the white. Art forms have gone through similar phases of evolution.

The component elements of a protoplasm are:—

Oxygen	Corresponding	form-elements	in Art	Straight Line.
Carbon	,,	,,	,,	Waving Line.
Water	,,	,,	,,	Circular Line.
Sulphur	,,	,,	,,	Waving and Straight mixed.
Phosphor	,,	,,	,,	Circular and Straight mixed.

Everything existing in nature endowed with life, has the protoplasm as its beginning; just as everything existing as art-form can but consist of the above-mentioned form-elements. In considering the life of any human being, in the relation of child, brother or sister, father or mother, similarities and dissimilarities are to be traced to a greater or less extent in the development of the different organs. This fact explains the infinite variety of any species in spite of its unity. And this is exactly the case in art. It is a Darwinian principle that the use of an organ develops its growth or capability, whilst the disuse of an organ decreases its activity. People who think only in one groove, become at last altogether unable to use their reasoning faculty. They use words without caring for their meaning, they combine thoughts that have no connection, and draw analogies where there are none. So in art, if we do not cultivate our senses, and enable them to distinguish between beautiful and ugly, indifferent or vulgar, sublime and awful impressions, we are neither capable of producing nor of appreciating a work of art.

Selection in science is as necessary as in art. As the phenomena in the world arise from endless combinations, so do the works of art. Numberless art-products were required to make one Raphael, Michæl Angelo, or Titian; an infinity of thoughts flitted as isolated sparks through humanity till they combined to form a genius like Shakespeare or Goethe. The whole Assyrian, Egyptian, and early Greek periods of art were required to produce one Pheidias. The Darwinian principle of *assimilation* in nature becomes proportion in art; *association* becomes multiplication, and combination of forms; the *evolution* of species corresponds at last to style in art.

The Darwinian theory fights against isolation. Everything works harmoniously for one grand universal purpose. Darwinians abhor intolerance and egotism, they fight against fatalism and chance, seeing everywhere law and order. Darwinians do not rely on self-constituted authority, do not crouch under the influence of a voluntarily created supreme power, the sanity and morality of whose actions appear sometimes extremely doubtful. The Darwinian tries to develop self-thought and self-reliance, elements that are of vital importance in the progressive development of humanity, and he eternally battles against ignorance as the only pillar of superstitious fear and dogmatic stability.

Let those who have no eyes to see and no ears to hear please themselves with the thought that we have continually to live on the past, that the past has exhausted all wisdom, that we can learn nothing, and can improve no more. Let them dream that to know is of evil, that the ancient Holy Books, such as the Vedas, the Zend-Avesta, the forty-two Sacred Books of the Egyptians, the five Kings of the Chinese, the Bible, the Canons of the Romish Church, and the Koran contain everything that man, in his different creeds, requires for his happiness in this world and for his salvation in a next; but do not let them dare to obstruct the path of men of science, who press onward to trace a continuous connection between cause and effect. Scientific men sacrifice that which is dearest to a human being, the arrogant conceit, that he knows by rote what life, or soul, or God is; let their opponents walk about in their impenetrable cloaks of dogmatism—opposing every higher striving of humanity—the spirit of our times can afford to ignore them. They cannot see the action of that eternal law of causation, which on the field of metaphysics long ago destroyed their low notion of the Deity, and annihilated the fancy that the supreme, eternal, universal Spirit could have created one day to counteract again what he had done on the next. Motion, force, and matter are the only possible agents in the physical world—acting under one immutable law of causation. We must also endeavour to prove this universal law of necessity in our intellectual world. Our times no longer believe in maddening self-denial and self-abnegation, in the sanctimonious turning up of eyes, in suppressed

humble sighs, in the dread of a wrath-begotten sinfulness, and similar admirable ingredients, out of which the piety of past times was concocted. Man sees himself one link, the last and most glorious link, in the long progressive chain of earthly creative force. He sees that he is made of matter, and endowed with one spark of the divine pervading spirit, self-consciousness, and knows that the laws of ethics can only differ in application, and must be analogous to those under which matter has to bow. It is easier to put on the mask of bigotry, to swim with the stream, to brand with heresy, or infidelity, anyone who does not see the unseen, as some people see it, who does not agree with them about the unknown (of which they know everything), who cannot eat and drink and be merry, whilst he praises sorrowfulness and abstinence. The Brahmans of old, like the Brahmans of our times, under the cover of benignant kindness, have always excelled in this charitable condemnation and cursing.

Morally or ethically we may look upon Darwinism as the last glorious evolution of pure Christianity. The joyful and just tidings, "that we are *all* children of one Father in heaven," was hitherto used in the sense of our schoolmaster, for every child pictured to himself the Father in a peculiar shape, dress, and form, and woe to any one who could not at once comprehend the child's child-like abstraction, but formed for himself a subjective conception, to which, as the divine object is reflected throughout the Universe, he had the same right as any dogmatist to another. Being all children of one Father, however, means also that we are subject to the same laws, and with these it is our peremptory duty to make ourselves acquainted. He has a poor mind, and is indeed a pitiable creature, who can only read God's works in dim books, and cannot study them in crystals, insects, flowers, lower and higher animals, in the marvellous works of art, the genial products of poetry and philosophy, and the heroic deeds of self-sacrifice for the sake of science, as so many indisputable manifestations of the Creator's working forces throughout nature.

The next great Christian law is "love thy neighbour as thyself." The ancient world divided humanity into races, tribes, castes, generations, houses, and families; into freemen and slaves, patricians or plebeians, clergy and laymen, soldiers and civilians, rich and poor, and a man considered him only his neighbour who had an equal weight with himself in the social scale, or at least had an equal balance at his banker's. Darwinism shows us that all these phenomena are mere outgrowths of the law of selection. Everywhere equals seek equals; there are variations, but also adaptations, and there are mutual affinities. Notwithstanding the variety there is sameness, and from Darwinism we learn that the egg should not think itself wiser than the hen. Much energy is lost by dividing and subdividing humanity into sects and castes; a consciousness of our sameness must produce greater union, greater union engenders greater strength, and it must be the tendency of humanity to expand in looking upon every individual as part of one grand whole, which, if pervaded by mutual love, will carry out the fundamental law of Christianity in spite of all dogmatic dissensions.

Our greatest duty on earth is continually to modify our preconceived prejudices, to strive onwards, indefatigably seeking for truth, in the sense of the immortal Darwin:

"There must be grandeur in a life, with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that, whilst this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been and are being evolved."

OXFORD UNIVERSITY AND THE SUNDAY QUESTION.

CONSIDERING the part that the present Fellows of our Universities are to play in the future of this country, the recent debate is highly important. Strong as is the feeling on our side at Cambridge, at Oxford it would appear to be unanimous, or if there be any of Sabbatarian tendency, they feel their ground to be too weak to submit to argument. We are surprised that the *Rock*, when inserting the following, did not utter lamentations and prophesies for the falling of England:—

"At the Oxford University Union, the subject of the debate on Friday was 'That, in the opinion of this house, public museums, picture galleries, and libraries ought to be opened on Sunday.' A rider was moved, 'That this house, while approving of the principle of the Sunday opening of public institutions, would restrict its application to afternoons and evenings.' Both the motion and rider were carried without a division."

THE BISHOP OF MANCHESTER ON SUNDAY AND SOCIAL CLUBS.

THE Bishop of Manchester presided at a public meeting held in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, on Tuesday night in connection with the Church of England Temperance Society. He said he desired to see a temperance organisation in every parish founded upon the wide meaning in which the Apostle Paul spoke of temperance—viz., in all things. Any way in which they would counteract the evil, if not directly, at any rate, indirectly, he considered to be an enterprise in which they might engage. Let them take, for instance, working men's clubs. He was familiar with two, one at Rochdale, and one instituted by his friend, Mr. Henderson, at Didsbury. There were some features about these clubs which they might not admire. The Didsbury club, for example, was open on a Sunday. The club to which he himself went when in London was open on a Sunday, and he confessed that he should sometimes not know what to do with himself for many hours on a Sunday if he could not go to the Athenæum Club, with its quiet room, between the services of the Church, and what he thought good for himself he could not deny to working men. He was prepared to trust the working men in these matters. They might say, "But what a scandal it is to open a club on a Sunday!" But he asked if that club were not open on a Sunday where were the young men who were its members to go? (A voice, "Open the church door.") The church is open two or three times on a Sunday. Nonsense should not be talked about this matter. (Laughter and cheers.) The people were not to be got out of the public-houses into our churches by a wave of the hand. There must be some intermediate place by which men should be led on from the public-house to the church. If these working men who frequented the Didsbury Club on a Sunday had not that place to go to they would probably be found loitering at the corners of the streets —more or less a peril to every modest girl who went up the road—(hear, hear)—or else they would be in the public-house sotting over the beer. Therefore, though he was a Bishop of the Church of England, he could not say nay when the promoter of this club at Didsbury asked him if he thought it would be prudent to have the club open on Sunday. He had gone into the club one Sunday, and nothing could be more orderly, decent, or well-behaved than the conduct of the twenty-five or thirty young men he had found there that Sunday. If a man had to go out he might sit in a public-house two or three hours. His wife, perhaps, wanted him out of the way while she was putting away the washing or putting the children to bed; and where was a man to go? He could not go and sit over a twopenny glass of beer all the evening "for the good of the house." For his own credit as a liberal-handed men he must have two or three or four glasses, and this made a great difference in an operative's week's wages. He found that at the Didsbury Club, where beer was allowed to be drunk, the consumption last year had been at the rate of 3½d. per week per man, and at the Rochdale Club the consumption had been 3½d. per week per man. He did not think that a man would get drunk who did not spend more than 3½d. per week on drink. (Hear, hear.) He regarded institutions of this kind as a great help to their cause. They might not do all that they wished; they might not apparently move on so high a plane of motive and example as they might desire; but they must remember what they had got to deal with. They had got to deal with human nature, which was somewhat stubborn and wayward. They must humour it and lead it along gently, and if they could persuade a man who had been gliding into habits of intemperance to spend his evenings in a quiet room with sober companions, they had done a great deal in the direction of temperance. (Hear, hear.) He had observed that at the Conference held on Tuesday, a controversy had arisen with regard to the Gothenburg system. There were few men with whom he differed more widely than with Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the member for Birmingham; but let them give honour to whom honour is due. He was not one of those who said that to give a sound secular education was playing into the hands of the Devil. (Hear, hear.) That he considered mere fanaticism. What Mr. Chamberlain had done in the direction of education at Birmingham he admired, and when he saw also that he had gone out to Sweden to examine the Gothenburg system upon the spot, and had come back and told them that if they adopted this system they could reduce the number of public-houses by one-half, which would mean reducing intemperance by one-half, he thought such an experiment in Birmingham would be of incalculable value.—*Salford Weekly News*, Nov. 2, 1876.