

ADDRESSES & ESSAYS ON VEGETARIANISM

BY

ANNA (BONUS) KINGSFORD
(M.D. OF THE FACULTY OF PARIS)

AND

EDWARD MAITLAND
(B.A. CANTAB.)

“Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it.”

Ps. cxxvii. i.

BIOGRAPHICAL PREFACE, AND EDITED

BY

SAMUEL HOPGOOD HART

LONDON

JOHN M. WATKINS

21 CECIL COURT, CHARING CROSS ROAD

1912

Duke University Medical Center Library
Trent Collection

Gift of

The Associates of the Trent Collection

use
rep
int
an
“
us

ND
g into
which
ch, by
ligion
nich—
therto
point

is that Christian doctrines, when rightly understood, are necessary and self-evident truths, recognisable as founded in and representing the actual nature of existence, incapable of being conceived of as otherwise, and constituting a system of thought at once scientific, philosophic, and religious, absolutely inexpugnable, and satisfactory to man's highest aspirations, intellectual, moral, and spiritual.

The Perfect Way; or the Finding of Christ. Fourth Edition, with additions. Cloth, 8vo, illus. Pp. lxxxv—376. Price 6/- net. Popular edition, paper covers, 1/- net; post free, 1/3.

“**Clothed with the Sun**”; being the **Book of the Illuminations of Anna (Bonus) Kingsford.** Edited by EDWARD MAITLAND. Second Edition, edited by SAMUEL HOPGOOD HART, complete, with Appendix, 396 pp. Cloth covers. Price 3/6 net. Popular edition, paper covers. Price 2/- net; post free, 2/4.

The Story of Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland, and of the New Gospel of Interpretation. By EDWARD MAITLAND. Edited by S. H. HART. Cloth, 8vo, pp. xxii—204. Price 3/6 net.

The Bible's Own Account of Itself. By EDWARD MAITLAND. Second Edition, edited by SAMUEL HOPGOOD HART. Complete with Appendix. Crown 8vo, 96 pp., stiff paper covers. Price 6d.; or in cloth covers, gilt, 1/6 net.

“Lucid and instructive. . . . Will be welcomed by many who desire to apprehend more fully the significance of the Bible from the esoteric standpoint.”—*The Herald of the Golden Age.*

Dreams and Dream-Stories. By ANNA (BONUS) KINGSFORD. A Third Edition. Price 3/6 net; post free, 3/10.

Rosamunda the Princess. An historical romance of the Sixth Century, and other Tales. By ANNA KINGSFORD. Illustrated. Cloth, 8vo, pp. 365. Price 2/6 net; post free, 2/10.

JOHN M. WATKINS, 21 Cecil Court, Charing Cross Road, LONDON, W.C.

Press

£2

ADDRESSES AND ESSAYS
ON VEGETARIANISM



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

ADDRESSES AND ESSAYS ON VEGETARIANISM

BY

ANNA (BONUS) KINGSFORD

(M.D. OF THE FACULTY OF PARIS)

AND

EDWARD MAITLAND

(B.A. CANTAB.)

“Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it.”

Ps. cxxvii. 1.

BIOGRAPHICAL PREFACE, AND EDITED

BY

SAMUEL HOPGOOD HART

LONDON

JOHN M. WATKINS

21 CECIL COURT, CHARING CROSS ROAD

1912

CONTENTS

	PAGES
BIOGRAPHICAL PREFACE	I

By ANNA KINGSFORD

YEAR		PAGES
1881.	SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS	61
1881-2.	LETTERS ON PURE DIET	64
1882.	A LECTURE ON FOOD	77
1884.	THE BEST FOOD FOR MAN	101
1885.	THE PHYSIOLOGY OF VEGETARIANISM	113
1885.	HISTORICAL ASPECT OF FOOD REFORM	119
	SOME ASPECTS OF THE VEGETARIAN QUESTION	124
	ADDRESSES TO VEGETARIANS	145
	EVOLUTION AND FLESH-EATING	151

By EDWARD MAITLAND

1877.	EXTRACTS FROM "ENGLAND AND ISLAM"	153
	VEGETARIANISM IN ITS HIGHER ASPECTS	159
1885.	VIVISECTION AND VEGETARIANISM	170
1885.	THE HIGHER ASPECTS OF VEGETARIANISM	175
	EVOLUTION AND FREETHOUGHT	179
1893.	THE HIGHEST ASPECT OF VEGETARIANISM	181
	VEGETARIANISM—THE COMMON SENSE OF IT	195
	MAN'S BEST FOOD	202
	VEGETARIANISM AND ANTIQUITY	206
	VEGETARIANISM AND THE BIBLE	214
	INDEX	225

O CONSIDER THIS, YE THAT EAT FLESH.

“THE Lord will abhor both the bloodthirsty and deceitful man. . . . Their inward parts are very wickedness. Their throat is an open sepulchre.”—Ps. v. 6, 9, 10.

“The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that would understand, and seek after God. But they are corrupt, and become abominable in their doings. . . . They are all gone out of the way. They are altogether become abominable. . . . Their throat is an open sepulchre. . . . Their feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and unhappiness is in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes.”—Ps. xiv. 1-7.

“I will take no bullock out of thine house : nor he-goat out of thy folds. For all the beasts of the forest are Mine : and so are the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls upon the mountains : and the wild beasts of the field are in My sight. If I be hungry I will not tell thee : for the whole world is Mine, and all that is therein. Thinkest thou that I will eat bull’s flesh : and drink the blood of goats ? . . . Why dost thou preach My laws, and takest My covenant in thy mouth : whereas thou hatest to be reformed : and hast cast My words behind thee ? . . . And thou thoughtest wickedly, that I am even such a one as thyself. . . . O consider this, ye that forget God.”—Ps. l. 9-22.

“AS FOR ME, I WILL WALK INNOCENTLY.”—Ps. xxvi. 11.

ADDRESSES AND ESSAYS ON VEGETARIANISM

BIOGRAPHICAL PREFACE.¹

“All the earth is full of darkness and cruel habitations.”—Ps. lxxiv. 21.

“I know that at some distant day, now, indeed, perhaps very remote, the message we preach in a corner will become a religion of great nations.”—(A. K.)

“Man’s whole idea and habit of life have become to be so utterly at variance with all possibility of the perfection of which his existence is capable, that only by incessant and unsparing denunciation can he be in any measure impressed with their heinousness.”—(E. M.)

ANNA KINGSFORD was born on 16th September 1846, at Stratford, in Essex. She was the daughter of John Bonus, being the youngest of twelve children. From her birth until her death she suffered from ill-health, which she ascribed to improper feeding by her ancestors,² “her illness, weakness,

¹ In this Preface I have told the story of Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland as *food-reformers and non-flesh-eaters*, and have confined myself to such matters as throw light upon them and their work in this connection. My material, as will be seen from the references, has been drawn almost entirely from *The Life of Anna Kingsford*, which was written by Edward Maitland, and which was published in 1896. This book gives a very full and interesting account of Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland and their work. I have, by quoting as much as possible—within the above-mentioned limits—from this work, allowed them to tell their own story. I refer those who would know more of these two great teachers and reformers—those who would know the whole story of Anna Kingsford as a medical student, and of Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland as humanitarians—to the above-mentioned biography. There is, also, another biography. In 1893, while writing and in anticipation of the publication of *The Life of Anna Kingsford*, Edward Maitland wrote *The Story of the New Gospel of Interpretation*, in which he gave a short account of Anna Kingsford and himself and their work. In 1905, a third and enlarged edition of this book was published under the title of *The Story of Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland, and of the New Gospel of Interpretation*. I am indebted also to this book.—S. H. H.

² *Light*, 10th March 1888.

and suffering surpassing anything conceivable, save by those who had intimate knowledge of her life." But from her early childhood she believed that she had come to this earth to accomplish "some great and necessary work, on behalf both of herself and of others, which she alone could perform."¹

Deprived by her ill-health of the usual outlets, she early took to writing, her very first published production, a poem in a religious magazine, having appeared when she was but nine years old; and her first book having been written at the age of thirteen.² So keen were her perceptions of the ideal, that her disappointment with the actual, which she felt throughout her life, was rendered all the more bitter. Edward Maitland says: "Hatred of injustice and its correlative cruelty, especially towards animals, attained in her the force and dignity of a passion," and her sensitiveness on this score was the cause of "the chief mental misery of her life."³ The death of her father in 1865 put her into immediate possession of some £700 per annum, and so made her independent as far as money was concerned.⁴

In relating to Edward Maitland some of the incidents of her early life, she said: "Between my leaving school and being married I was for a time passionately fond of hunting, and, when not disabled by illness, would spend the day in the saddle. . . . But suddenly one day, while riding home after a 'splendid run and finish,' as it is called, something in me asked me how I should like to be served so myself, and set me looking at the matter from the point of view of the hunted creature, making me vividly to realise its wild terror and breathless distress all the time it is being pursued, and the ghastly horror of its capture and death. It was even less, I believe, my sense of pity than of justice that rebuked and changed me. What right have I, I asked myself, thus to ill-treat a creature simply because it has a form which differs from my own? Rather, if I am superior, do its weakness and helplessness entitle it to my pity and protection than justify me in seeking my own gratification at its expense. And as for its lower position on the ladder of evolution, if there be evolution in one thing there must be in another--if

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 1, 2; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 2, 5, 6.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 4, 29; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 3, 5.

³ *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 4.

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 8, 9.

in the physical, then in the moral—so that for a man to act thus is to renounce his moral gains and abdicate his moral superiority. Of course that was the end of my hunting, and thenceforth I and my steed took our gallops by ourselves; for however much I may like a thing, I can never bring myself to do it while feeling it to be wrong. In fact, such a feeling would prevent my liking it.”¹

It will be noticed from this and, in fact, from all her writings how strong was her sense of *justice*. Thus: “She would recognise no hard-and-fast line between masculine and feminine, human and animal, or even between animal and plant. In her eyes, everything that lived was humanity, only in different stages of its unfoldment.”² It was this sense of justice—“the essential of which,” she said, “is a sense of solidarity”—that also made her give up wearing furs. Shortly before her death, when writing of “the horrors of the seal-fishery,” she said: “It is some years since I satisfied myself that the fur trade, and the sealskin trade in particular, were incompatible with the gentle life it should be the aim of civilised beings to lead, and since that time there have been no furs in my wardrobe.”³

On the last day of 1867, she was married to her cousin, Algernon Godfrey Kingsford, who was then in the Civil Service, but who shortly afterwards became a clergyman in the Church of England; and being “full of the ideas which possessed her respecting a work in store [for her], she made it a special condition of her marriage that it should not fetter her in respect of any career to which she might be prompted.”⁴ Of this marriage there was one child only—a daughter—who survived her.

Some two or three years after her marriage she undertook

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 9, 10.

² *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 6.

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 326; *Light*, 1888, p. 97. See also *Health Beauty and the Toilet* (Second Edition), p. 17; and *The Perfect Way in Diet*, p. 109. While she declined to use furs, she did not disapprove of the use of such feathers as were obtainable without slaughter and (as she was assured) without cruelty. These, it would appear, she wore in place of furs (*Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 326–351); although it has been said that she wore “neither fur nor feathers” (*Pall Mall Gazette*, quoted in *Light*, 1888, p. 97). She wore silk gloves in all weathers, and some vegetable material for her shoes (*Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 351; and see *Health Beauty and the Toilet* (Second Edition), p. 83; and A. K.’s Address, *The Physiology of Vegetarianism*, p. 113 *post*).

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 13; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 6.

the risks and conduct, and became the proprietor of *The Lady's Own Paper*, a London weekly magazine.¹ Her object in running this magazine was not to make money, but to make known her principles, which were everything to her; but as these compelled her, among other things, to exclude from the advertising columns thereof notices of any wares that failed to meet her approval, such as preparations of meats, etc., "in fact, whatever involved death in the procuring or ministered to death in the using"—she was, "after a two years' trial and a loss of several hundred pounds," forced to abandon her enterprise.²

When she renounced her magazine, being "under the impression that such a step was in some way related to the mission of which she had received such and so many mysterious intimations,"³ she had already come to the determination to devote herself to the study of medicine, with a direct view to qualify herself for accomplishing: first, the abolition of vivisection—the existence of which she, as editor of *The Lady's Own Paper*, had become aware of; and secondly, the abolition of flesh-eating, she having, under the tuition of her brother, Dr John Bonus, "adopted the Pythagorean regimen of abstinence from flesh-food, with such manifest advantage to herself, physically and mentally, as to lead her to see in it the only effectual means to the world's redemption, whether as regards men themselves or the animals."⁴

Writing, in 1879, to the Princess Marie-Christina of Austria, she said: "I am studying medicine in order to achieve the abolition of the slaughter and torture of animals, whether for food or for science."⁵

She must have given up flesh-eating in, or prior to, the year 1871, for, in her book, *The Perfect Way in Diet*, which was published in 1881, she presented herself as an example of "the beneficial effects of the Pythagorean system of diet," which, she said, "for a period of ten years," she had "uninterruptedly maintained":⁶ and, in 1886, when writing of facts and circumstances connected with her marvellous dreaming faculty and experiences, she said: "For the past

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, p. 16; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 7.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, p. 20.

³ *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 9, 10.

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, p. 21; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 7, 8.

⁵ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, p. 333; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 8.

⁶ Pp. 90, 91.

fifteen years I have been an abstainer from flesh-meats. Not a vegetarian, because during the whole of that period I have used such animal produce as butter, cheese, eggs, and milk.”¹

In the spring of 1873 she commenced to study medicine. She had scarcely commenced her studies when she had a very remarkable experience. She received a letter from a lady (who signed herself “Anna Wilkes”) who lived at a distance from, and who was a complete stranger to her. The writer stated that she had read with profound interest and admiration *In My Lady's Chamber*²—a story written by Anna Kingsford—and that after reading it she had received from the Holy Spirit a message for her (Anna Kingsford) which was to be delivered in person, and would Mrs Kingsford receive her, and when? After some hesitation, Anna Kingsford asked her correspondent to come and see her, and she subsequently gave to Edward Maitland the following account of the meeting. She said: “At the hour named I met her on the way while she was driving from the station, and was at once struck by her manner and appearance, and subsequently by her conversation, as much as I had been by her previous communication. She was tall, erect, distinguished looking, with hair of iron-grey, and strangely brilliant eyes. She told me that she had received a distinct message from the Holy Spirit, and had been so strongly impressed to come and deliver it to me in person that she could not refrain. Her message was to the effect that for five years to come I was to remain in retirement, continuing the studies on which I was engaged, whatever they might be, and the mode of life on which I had entered, suffering nothing and no one to draw me aside from them. And when these probationary and preparatory five years were past, the Holy Spirit would drive me forth from my seclusion to teach and to preach, and that a great work would be given me to do. All this she uttered with a rapt and inspired expression, as though she had been some sibyl delivering an oracle. And when she had ended, seeing, no doubt, my look of surprise, she asked me if I thought her mad—a question to which I was at some loss to reply, for I had encountered nothing of the kind before, and was disposed to share the impression which all ordinary and worldly

¹ *Dreams and Dream Stories* (Third Edition), Preface, pp. 22–23. See also *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, Preface, p. xli.

² This story appeared in *The Lady's Own Paper*, and it was afterwards published separately as by “Colossa” (*Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 21).

folk have always had concerning those who profess to be prophets. Having delivered her message, my prophetess kissed me on both cheeks and departed.”¹

In the summer of the same year there appeared in the *Examiner*, with a notice of a tale by Anna Kingsford, a notice of a book, *By and By: An Historical Romance of the Future*, by Edward Maitland. This led to her reading the book, with which she found herself so much in sympathy that she wrote to Edward Maitland—with whom she was then entirely unacquainted—proposing an interchange of ideas.²

Some correspondence followed, and later, Edward Maitland received an invitation to visit her and her husband at their home at Atcham, near Shrewsbury, her husband having been appointed Vicar of Atcham. This invitation he was not at the time able to accept, owing to the great age and infirmity of his mother, with whom he then lived at Brighton, and the necessity of his almost constant attendance on her.

Writing on 4th August 1873 to Edward Maitland, she said: “I have been the editor of a woman’s paper, and have addressed public meetings from platforms. By adoption and profession I am a member of that most conservative of churches, the Roman Catholic,³ but by conviction I am rather a pantheist than anything else; and my mode of life is that of a fruit-eater. In other words, I have a horror of flesh as food, and belong to the Vegetarian Society. At present I am studying medicine with the view of ultimately entering the profession,—not for the sake of practice, but for scientific purposes.”⁴

In a subsequent letter (dated 14th August 1873) to Edward Maitland, referring to her “peculiar ideas respecting diet,” she said: “These ideas are, I am very well persuaded, the future creed of a nobler and gentler race. I laugh when I hear folks talk hopefully of the coming age, which will decide all the quarrels of the world by means of international arbitration; and I have myself been scores of times invited to take part in ‘Women’s Peace Conventions’ and the like. These

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, pp. 22, 23; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 10, 11. “Some four years later, at a time when Mrs Kingsford was in great straits for want of a suitable home in London in which to carry on her studies, the same lady was spiritually commissioned on her behalf, while totally ignorant both of her whereabouts and her need, and with results entirely satisfactory” (*ibid.*, p. 11).

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, p. 27; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 1, 2.

³ She joined the R. C. Church in 1870 (*Life of A. K.*, vol. i, p. 15).

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, pp. 27–28.

poor deluded creatures cannot see that universal peace is absolutely impossible to a carnivorous race! If men feed like lions and tigers, they will, by the necessity of things, retain the nature of lions and tigers.¹ . . . I want to establish my theory about diet, and a few others belonging to the same category. Several physicians are on the same track, and all things appear to me to indicate that the real salvation of the human race lies in a return to its ancient obedience to Nature. This primitive condition is depicted in the Hebrew allegory about the Garden of Eden. Man has no carnivorous teeth. The whole formation of his internal organs plainly presupposes his subsistence on fruits, grains, and vegetables. He has the rudiment of the third intestine peculiar to the vegetable-eating creatures, and his saliva-producing glands are those of the same race. But he has degenerated it by his habits in regard to diet, and debased himself. Nevertheless, his moral instincts are still against the habit he has adopted. For what little child, what gentle woman, or even what noble man, likes to see a sentient creature, full of health and life, immolated by knife or cord? Much less who, save a butcher, would care to do the murder necessary (?) for a single civilised dinner? I would like to force everyone who feeds on flesh to slay his or her own prey. I would like to oblige the fine lady to go and cut the throat of the innocent lamb or the pretty rabbit she wants to eat for her dinner. If she really had the nature she imitates, that would be a pleasant task to her. But she has it not; because she is by nature a being of higher race than the tiger or vulture.

“I could bring forward endless proofs of my theory, proofs collected by dint of long and careful observation. And I *know* that in proportion as man abandons the diet of flesh and blood, and observes that of fruit and grain, his spirit becomes purer, higher, and diviner. So true is it that the body makes the soul.”²

A notice of Anna Kingsford in *Light*³ says: “The keynote

¹ See A. K.'s lecture on *Some Aspects of the Vegetarian Question*, p. 124 *post*, and A. K.'s *Addresses to Vegetarians*, p. 145 *post*.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 28, 29. Referring to the last sentence of this letter, E. M. says: “This she subsequently recognised as true only in the limited sense that they act and react on each other, the soul being the real maker of the body, but able to make it only out of the materials supplied to it.”

³ 10th March 1888.

to her teaching was the word Purity. She held that man, like everything else, is only at his best when pure. And her insistence upon a vegetable diet—which she justified upon grounds at once physiological, chemical, hygienic, economical, moral, and spiritual—was based upon the necessity to his perfection of a purity of blood and tissue attainable only upon a regimen drawn direct from the fruits of the earth, and excluding the products of the slaughter of innocent creatures.”¹

In the autumn she passed her preliminary examination at the Apothecary’s Hall, “with success so great as to fill her with high hopes of a triumphant passage through the course of her student life.”²

In a letter (dated 24th November) to Edward Maitland, she said: “I see everywhere in the universe inflexible, unchangeable Law; but Love I fail to see, unless the Law involves it in its course. I see everywhere prevailing the Rule of the Strong. In the depths of the sea, in the remote wilderness, in the open air of heaven, the swift and the powerful gain the battle of life. The dove is torn by the hawk, the fawn is murdered by the tiger, the tiny goldfish is victimised by some voracious cannibal of the waters. I see everywhere slaughter, suffering, and terror; and I score one to the theologians. For throughout Nature, Life is continued by means of Death. Is not the God who made all this just the very God who would delight in the death of an innocent victim? Is not the God who voluntarily surrounds himself with carnage and misery just the very God whom the sight of Calvary’s Cross would please? Some years ago I wrote these words in an essay for a magazine: ‘True religion is the infelt sense of harmony with the universe.’ . . . I must confess that I have lately moved from this standpoint of opinion. I do not find myself, when at my highest altitude of feeling, in harmony with the prevailing sentiment of Nature. If I were, I should not be a vegetarian. I should slay and eat, like the rest of my species. But, nevertheless, I know well that gentleness and horror of bloodshed characterise all noble and great dispositions, even though all these may not carry their ideas to a logical and practical issue as I do. How, then, reconcile this tenderness of soul with an admiration of Nature’s dispensations? Is not the morality of civilised man *alone* the morality of

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 347.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 30; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 11, 12.

Nature? Yet what a horrible inconsistency! What a ludicrous anomaly! For is not Nature the manifestation of God? and how, then, is it possible for man, who is part of God, to be more moral than the whole of which he is a fraction? How, in Christian phrase, can man be more just than his Maker?"¹

In replying, Edward Maitland said: "I suggest that—supposing the Supreme Cause to be intelligent and feeling in our sense—it is not unimaginable that He may totally disregard physical pain and death as of no consequence in themselves, and look solely to the evolution, through them, of the moral nature. If the human conscience be the supremest result of the universe, and the sole end worth attaining, may it not be that such discipline as is inseparable from the idea of pain is essential to the production of that end?"²

To this, Anna Kingsford replied: "Once or twice I have fancied that the key to the secret of the Universe might be found in the Transmigration theory of wise old Pythagoras. It has long been my serious and profound conviction that *if* men have immortal spirits, so also have all living creatures. We cannot logically arrogate perpetuity of being to our own species. And it is just possible that the germ of the soul, existing, perhaps, rudimentarily in the lowest forms of vegetation, may gather strength to itself by passing upwards through numberless modes of being, until it culminates in man . . . and at length mounts into higher atmospheres, and departs to inhabit the 'many mansions' of the Father among the starry spheres. But this, of course, is the merest conjecture, avowedly set forth to account for the fact of earthly suffering among men and other living creatures. . . . As your son has a taste for medical study, it would be interesting and useful to him to investigate the influences of diet upon the system, and the relation of the human digestive organs to food. This is one of the most important items of the 'sublime science.' I mean to study it specially myself, and am going to Paris for this purpose next March. Women are admitted to the medical schools *there*. I am disappointed to think there is so small a chance of our meeting soon. I comfort myself with the knowledge, however, that we certainly shall meet *some time*."³

In the following January Edward Maitland met Anna

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, pp. 30, 31. ² *Ibid.*, p. 31. ³ *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.

Kingsford for a short time one afternoon in London.¹ In the *Life of Anna Kingsford* he gives an interesting account of this their first meeting. She then told him that "justice as between men and women, human and animal, were her foremost aims. For all injustice was cruelty, and cruelty was, for her, the one unpardonable sin. It was their cruelty that more than anything else made her own kind hateful to her. For she was not a lover of humanity, if by that word be meant men and women; her love was all for principles, not for persons."² The meeting was sufficient to convince him of the "unusual character of the personality" with which he had come into contact, and, at parting, he found himself pledged to visit Anna Kingsford and her husband at the earliest opportunity. This, as will be seen, occurred in the following February, and the importance of the visit cannot be overrated, for it was from that time that the collaboration between Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland which has been so much to the world may be said to have begun.³

Edward Maitland was born on 27th October 1824 at Ipswich. He was the son of the Rev. Charles David Maitland, Perpetual Curate of St James' Chapel, Brighton. When he first met Anna Kingsford, his position was as follows: he, too, had been conscious from an early age of having "a mission in life";⁴ an idea that had remained with him, gathering force and consistency, until it was made clear to him that "not destruction merely, but construction, not the exposure of error, but the demonstration of truth, was comprised in it."⁵ He was bent on penetrating the secret of things at first hand, and by means of a thought absolutely free. He had been brought up in the strictest of evangelical sects, and had, even as a lad, begun to be revolted by the creed in which he was reared—especially the tenets of the total depravity of man and vicarious atonement, which he regarded as "a libel nothing short of blasphemous against both God and man": and he early came to feel that "no greater boon could be bestowed on the world than its emancipation from the bondage of belief so degrading and so destructive of any lofty ideal": and that only in such measure as he might be the means of

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 29, 32, 33.

² See *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 37.

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 36; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 13.

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 38; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 15-16.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

their abolition would his life be a success and a satisfaction to himself. He says: "It even seemed to me that my own credit was involved in the matter, and that in disproving such beliefs I should be vindicating my own character. For if God were evil, as those doctrines made Him, I could by no possibility be good, since I must have my derivation from Him. And I knew that, however weak and unwise I might be, I was not evil."¹ His life, too, like Anna Kingsford's, had been one of much isolation and meditation. He says: "I had felt myself a stranger even with my closest intimates. For I was always conscious of a difference which separated me from them, and of a side to which they could not have access. I had graduated at Cambridge with the design of taking orders; but only to find that I could not do so conscientiously, and to feel that to commit myself to any conditions incompatible with absolute freedom of thought and expression would be a treachery against both myself and my kind—for it was for no merely personal end that I wanted to discover the truth."² And so, after taking his degree, he joined the band of "Forty-niners" to the then newly discovered placers of California, and remained abroad—from America passing to Australia—for nearly ten years, during which time he "experienced well-nigh every vicissitude and extreme which might serve to heighten the consciousness, toughen the fibre, and try the soul of man."³

While in Australia he married, "only to be widowed after a year's wedlock."⁴ Of this marriage there was one child, a son, who survived him, but who has since died.

In 1857 he returned to England, and after an interval devoted himself to literature—writing for ideal reasons; but he did not leave his trials behind him, for "vicissitudes and struggles, and trials and ordeals," awaited him at home, and he was made to learn by experience that only "by the bruising of the outer, the inner is set free," and that "man is alive only so far as he has felt."⁵ His books of this period brought him into immediate fame. They were *The Pilgrim and the Shrine* and *Higher Law*, and the book to which I have referred, *By and By*.

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 37; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 13, 14.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 37; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 14.

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 38; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 15.

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 42; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 21.

⁵ *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 16-17, 21-22.

On visiting the Shropshire parsonage in February 1874, Edward Maitland received from Anna Kingsford and her husband a welcome "more than cordial."¹ He found that she had laid aside all other pursuits for science, and "her work-table was covered with the insignia of her new engrossment";² but, in order that he might not have any misconception on the subject, she again told him that it was not for men and women—who seemed to be her natural enemies—that she was taking up medicine and science, not to cure their ailments, but "for the animals and for knowledge generally." She said: "I want to rescue the animals from cruelty and injustice, which are for me the worst, if not the only sins. And I can't love both the animals and those who systematically ill-treat them."³ In connection with this, however, it must be borne in mind that (as Edward Maitland has pointed out), though she may not have loved men and women, "she ardently loved that which men and women are either in the making or in the marring, in that her enthusiasm was for Humanity": and "Man, carnivorous and sustaining himself by slaughter and torture, was not for her man at all in any true sense of the term. Neither intellectually nor physically could he be at his best while thus nourished."⁴

One great difficulty stood in the way of Anna Kingsford carrying out her determination to obtain a medical degree—at any rate, in this country. Immediately after she had passed her preliminary examination, the medical authorities had seen fit to close their schools against women students; and, owing to asthma, from which she was a great sufferer, she could not, for the greater part of the year, live in the country. It was essential then for her to be in a large city. The nearest country abroad where women were then admitted to medical degrees was France, and Paris was a city in which, when other places would be impossible for her, she would be able to live, and in Paris she would be able to prosecute her studies. Her husband "desired only that she be happy in her own way, and follow what career she preferred, as by the terms of their engagement, as well, also, as by her endowments and aspirations, he considered her entitled to do":⁵ but as was natural, and very rightly, he would not consent to her

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 36, 46; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 12.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 47. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 48. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

⁵ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 50; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 12, 13.

going alone and unprotected to Paris. He could not himself leave his work to accompany her, and neither of them knew of any person, relative or friend, who was available for the purpose; nor did they know of any family in Paris with whom she could make a home. This was a difficulty which none of them were then able to solve. Meanwhile, Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland "saw truth alike," and it proved to be the same with their respective aims in life. Edward Maitland says: "As I was bent on the construction of a system of thought at once scientific, philosophic, moral, and religious, and recognisable by the understanding as indubitably true, by reason of its being founded in first principles; she was bent on the construction of a rule of life equally obvious and binding, and recognisable by the sentiments as alone according with them, its basis being that sense of perfect justice which springs from perfect sympathy. By which it will be seen that while it was her aim to establish a perfect practice, which might or might not consist with a perfect doctrine, it was my aim to establish a perfect doctrine which would inevitably issue in a perfect practice, by at once defining it and supplying an all-compelling motive for its observance."¹

During this visit, which lasted nearly a fortnight, one subject especially occupied them: this was the subject of vivisection, of which he then heard for the first time. It was a discovery which filled him with "unspeakable horror and amazement," and he resolved to make the abolition of vivisection, and the system represented by it, thenceforth the leading aim of his life and work.²

As regards the question of diet: Edward Maitland had "never been fully content with the prevailing mode of sustaining our organisms." It had always struck him as "inconsistent with the perfection conceivable as possible, that man, the highest product of the visible world, should be so constituted as to be able to sustain himself only by doing violence, not only to his sensitive fellow-creatures, but to his own higher feeling."³ Consequently, he was favourably disposed to give practical heed to the arguments put before him on behalf of the vegetarian regimen; and the further consideration that

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 51, 52; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 36.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 52, 53; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 30, 31.

³ *The Soul, and How it Found Me*, p. 21.

only as an abstainer from flesh-food could he with entire consistency contend against vivisection, was a potent factor in his decision. He recognised the distinction between "death and torture as a broad one."¹ "But," he says, "the statistics I now for the first time perused, of the slaughter-house and cattle traffic, shewed beyond question that torture, and this prolonged and severe, is involved in the use of animals for food as well as for science."²

Thus, the first important result of this visit was that Edward Maitland became a vegetarian.

The change in his mode of life was soon productive of good results. It was, he says, accompanied by "increased accessibility to ideas," and consequent enhanced capacity for entering into relation with the region whence ideas have their derivation.³ He says: "Had we been in any degree instructed in spiritual or occult science, we should have known that the renunciation of flesh-food, though in itself a physical act, has ever been recognised by initiates as the prime essential in the unfoldment of the spiritual faculties; since only when man is purely nourished can he attain clearness and fullness of spiritual perception."⁴ As it was, neither of us had [then] even heard of occult science, or of the necessity of such a regimen to the perfectionment of faculty. She had adopted it on grounds physiological, chemical, hygienic, æsthetic, and moral; not on grounds mental or spiritual. I undertook to adopt it partly on the same grounds which had influenced her, and partly with a view to enhance and consolidate the sympathy subsisting between us."⁵

Referring to his "increased accessibility to ideas," he says: "It is mainly to the increased sensibility of my mental surfaces, through the elimination from my system of all unsuitable substances, that I ascribe the increased accessibility to ideas of which I have spoken. All my experience goes to show that it is not to any original or unavoidable defect of material or structure, but to the coarseness and unsuitability of the food on which we are in the habit of sustaining our organisms, that our general insensibility to the finer influences which pervade

¹ See *The Woman and the Age* (par. 16), by E. M.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 53; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 31, 32.

³ *The Soul, and How it Found Me*, pp. 21, 23; see also *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 39.

⁴ See also E. M.'s lecture on *Man Incarnate and Discarnate* (MS. pp. 4, 5).

⁵ *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 29, 30.

the universe—and by the operation of which alone man becomes redeemable from exclusive engrossment by the lower planes of his nature—is ascribable. It is, I am confident, because our sympathetic faculties are so dulled and narrowed through our cruel and unnatural mode of sustaining ourselves, that we have lost that sense of oneness both with the whole of which we are parts, and with our fellow-parts of the same whole, in the due recognition and culture of which religion and morality respectively consist. We are accustomed to over-materialise ourselves to such a degree as to lose all cognisance of the immaterial and essential part of us.”¹

Edward Maitland considered that the evils suffered by the world during the cycle known as the historical, are “due to no inherent defect, either of constitution or of circumstance, but to a temporary and remediable lapse from normal health through the misconduct of life, and, primarily, through disobedience to the laws of Purity . . . man must be made clean outwardly in respect of his flesh by the washing of water,” and “he must be made clean inwardly in respect of his organism . . . by the abjuration of a diet of blood and of all poisonous infusions whatsoever, and by the return to his natural sustenance—at once food and medicine—the grains and herbs, the juices of fruits, and vegetable oils; for so only will he deposit tissues possessed of perfect soundness, and have an organism capable of attaining its full development in respect of all the faculties of humanity, and build up his body to be a pure temple and abode of the soul.”²

A few weeks after Edward Maitland had returned home from his visit to Atcham, he received from Mr Kingsford a letter informing him that the time had come for his wife to go to Paris, and, as he could not possibly quit his duties to accompany her, asking him if he (Edward Maitland) would do so; for, in default of his compliance, she would be forced to renounce her proposed career, and the disappointment would be more than she could bear, so entirely had she set her heart on it. He added that the expedition would occupy only a few days, the purpose being the preliminary one of enrolment. Edward Maitland fell in with the suggestion, and, after a few days sojourn in Paris, they returned to England, she having become a regularly enrolled student of the University of Paris; and while in Paris, after having overcome “obstacles which

¹ *The Soul, and How it Found Me*, pp. 22, 23.

² *Ibid.*, p. 297.

would have daunted any one of weaker will or meaner purpose," she obtained a permit from the Minister of Public Education, accepting the preliminary examination already passed by her in London in lieu of the usual entrance examination at Paris. This left her free to study where she pleased until the commencement of the academic year in the following autumn, when she would again have to return to Paris.¹

Edward Maitland says: "On returning to England, she at once set to work on her subjects for the autumn term at Paris, dividing the time between her home and London. For, although the schools were closed against her sex, she could still obtain private tuition. The death of my mother, which took place in the summer of this year, set me free to leave Brighton and go into chambers in London, where I was in a position to be of service to my charge, and to follow the lines of study in which we were mutually interested." While in London, Edward Maitland spent much time at the British Museum studying and analysing "the various religious systems of antiquity." He says: "As I pursued my analysis of the various systems of religion, steadfastly following the while my reformed mode of diet, I found myself, to my inexpressible delight, coming into possession of a strangely entranced faculty of ideation, which manifested itself in a power of insight into problems which had hitherto baffled me. It was as if my mental surfaces had been cleansed and sensitised in such wise as to render them accessible to impressions and suggestions which formerly had been too subtle and refined to obtain recognition."²

When the time arrived for her to return to Paris for the autumn term, Edward Maitland accompanied her and resumed his office of escort as on the previous occasion. She then settled down to prepare for her first *examen* under the tuition of a professor who had been recommended to her; and Edward Maitland followed her course of studies with her, and enabled her by dint of logical processes to detect the philosophical fallacies enunciated by her professor, who, though a man of great talent, was a thorough-going materialist, and an adept in the elaboration of specious arguments.³

Notwithstanding serious inroads made on her time and strength by ill-health, "she worked to such excellent purpose as to pass her *examen* with the highest credit, and to rouse her

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 57, 58. ² *Ibid.*, p. 73. ³ *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 59.

professor's enthusiasm to the utmost pitch," and he procured for her a magisterial permit enabling her to pursue her studies at home until the following autumn. They then returned to her home at Atcham for Christmas, after which she went to London, and studied physiology at the school then recently opened in Henrietta Street for women students of medicine, attended classes in botany at Regent's Park School, and took private lessons in other subjects required.¹

In the autumn of 1875 she returned to Paris, this time accompanied by her husband and daughter, Edward Maitland remaining in London. They took up their residence, near to the medical schools, with a family of Irish ladies, under whose care she was left when her husband and daughter returned home for Christmas. An interesting account of her first experiences as an hospital student is to be found in the *Life of Anna Kingsford*.² While her success in her work was remarkable, one thing brought her into constant conflict with her tutor, and that was her refusal to allow him to vivisect or experiment on animals at her lessons. Her persistent refusal led at length to his withdrawal, compelling her to engage another.

Meanwhile, despite her hard work, she from time to time reported to Edward Maitland such of her hospital experiences as were likely to interest him. In a letter, written in 1876, she related the following:—

"In the hospital yesterday—at the surgical consultation of La Pitié—there was a man with a broken *péroné*, who fell to my share.

" 'Describe to me the accident which caused this,' said I.

" 'I slipped. My leg slid under me, and I fell.'

" 'How came you to slip?'

" 'The floor was swimming in blood, and I slipped on the blood.'

" 'Blood!' cried I. 'What blood?'

" 'Madame, I am a slaughter-man by trade. I had just been killing, and all the slaughter-house was covered with blood.'

"Oh, then, my heart was hardened. I looked in the man's face. It was of the lowest type, deep beetle-brows, a wide, thick, coarse mouth, a red skin—'savage' was stamped on every line of it.

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 61, 62.

² Vol. i. pp. 63-67, 73, 78, 79.

“The world revolts me. My business is not here. All the earth is full of violence and cruel habitations. Elsewhere I shall find peace, and there will I go to wait for you, and for the few pure and merciful souls yet remaining here. . . . What of life remains to me I will live in doing my utmost against every form of cruelty. . . . More and more every day it appears to my mind that I am not of this world. Visions float about me in the night that seem to warn me of some unknown change perhaps awaiting me. I do not know; but my state of mind of late has been singularly clear and expectant. I fancy that there *is* a future, and that I am meant to have some special work beyond this plane of existence, something for which I have been put to school here.”¹

Soon after this she passed her second *examen* “with high credit.” Her health, however, which was then in “an utterly bad state,” necessitated a month at the seaside, with “entire cessation of work,” and after a few more weeks, which were divided between her own home and her mother’s, the time came when it was needful for her to return to her work in Paris. She was again accompanied by her husband, who this time had arranged to remain with her for a prolonged period, his bishop having assented to his engaging a substitute during his absence. But shortly after their arrival she was taken so ill that it was “impossible to say when, if ever, she would be able to resume work.” They accordingly decided to return to England at the earliest opportunity, and “permission was sought and obtained for her to pursue her studies at home during the coming winter without detriment to her academic position, attendance at an English hospital being accepted as an equivalent for attendance for the same period at a French one. This was a special favour granted, in consideration of the circumstances, by the Minister of Public Education, in compliance with a formal application on her behalf from the authorities of the university. She accordingly returned home, and when sufficiently recovered to resume her studies, took up her abode with a relative at Chelsea, and obtained permission to attend the Children’s Hospital in Great Ormond Street, Bloomsbury.”² Chelsea, however, did not agree with her; and she, subsequently, in January 1877, after having gone home for Christmas, removed from Chelsea and became the guest of

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 89, 90.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 92, 93; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 42, 43.

Letitia Going, a vegetarian lady and a spiritualist, who lived in Jermyn Street; and here she had the additional advantage of being nearer to Edward Maitland than she had been when at Chelsea.¹

During the Christmas interval, which he had spent with Anna Kingsford and her husband at their home in Shropshire, Edward Maitland made the following note, describing the aspect at the time of a certain village which struck him as "singularly illustrative of our condition as a people." He says: "In the towns I had, of course, been accustomed to see the festival of the nativity of the Divine Life that had been born into the world celebrated by the public exhibition in the provision shops of the usual hecatombs of animal corpses stripped of their skins. But this fair village among the peaceful hills far surpassed in sacrificial enthusiasm any homage which a town could render to the gory Moloch of our national orthodoxies. For some days before Christmas the population had been engaged in the annual killing of their pigs, a process which for that whole period had involved the incessant piercing of the skies by the agonised screams of the innocents thus massacred in advance.

"The slaughter was finished by Christmas Eve, and the village sent out its carollers over the country round to sing hallelujahs about the 'Lord of Life,' and 'It was the joy of One,' and 'How beautiful upon the mountains'; and the next morning saw them flocking to the village church to do further homage to the Genius of the day by reciting services to the key-note of 'Peace on earth, and good will towards men!' A thin fleece of new-fallen snow covered the ground, as if sent expressly to signify that Nature, even if she had not condoned the violence done to her in the persons of her porcine offspring, was anxious at least for that sacred day to efface all evidence of the deed. But the attempt was unsuccessful. For in the gutters between the whitened foot-way and road the blood ran in streams, while every here and there a large ensanguined patch of snow indicated the place of a standing pool of blood. The decorations of the church, and the vigour of the devotions of the congregation, whose responses were fairly roared out, served to aggravate the incongruity of the whole, and to remind one that that rough little village was but an epitome and résumé of all Christendom, inasmuch as it

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 126, 138, 139.

was precisely the combination of lip-service and blood-service, which ever constitute for a priest-constructed orthodoxy the realisation of perfection. And I wondered whether the Laureate could have had such a scene in his mind when he made his Harold ask of one who had turned renegade—

“ ‘What dost thou here,
Trampling thy mother’s bosom into blood?’ ”¹

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 135–136; *England and Islam*, pp. 255–256.

Things have not changed in this respect since 1876. Christmas still has its Advent or season of preparation and looking forward, and this season is by flesh-eaters still observed with befitting discipline. In England—as probably in most, if not all other Christian countries—it is honoured by great cattle shows, which are held in different parts of the country, but which, though crowded with men and women—“connoisseurs” and “experts”—only a small minority of our great population can attend. The majority have for their information to be satisfied with lengthy press descriptions of these shows, which descriptions are given in language as light, mocking, callous, heartless, and cruel as may be considered suitable or agreeable to or befitting the tastes of the flesh-eating “faithful,” for whose instruction or delectation they are written. The following description (taken from the *Daily Express* of 5th December 1911) of one of these cattle shows may be taken as an illustration, for it fully bears out what I have said,—the day of the show being the day next after Advent Sunday in the year of Grace 1911:—

“The great Christmas show of fat cattle opened at Islington yesterday, and nearly six hundred animals, each the pride of its countryside, are making positively their last appearance before the public.

“They are all to be butchered to make a Christmas holiday, and each of the pens is a condemned cell.

“The sheep are already as good as mutton, and although the mammoth pigs sleep peacefully beneath winning rosettes, their pen bears that other dread sign, ‘Sold to Cuttem and Slicem, Ham Curers.’

“But this note of impending doom does not spoil the enjoyment of the *connoisseurs* from all the shires who come to feast their eyes on pens of fat lambs, and lean over the railings discussing for hours the points of a red-poll steer.

“Many of these experts wear flat, curly top hats and side whiskers, and are accompanied by daughters, who sniff superciliously at the weak points of a curly-coated Lincolnshire pig or the demerits of an Aberdeen-Angus heifer.

“For the real breath of the hills and dales, however, one must listen to the herdsmen and shepherds. These men, so obviously in their best Sunday clothes, who never tire of tending and combing their beasts, make the hall a babel of every known dialect. . . . Admission to the show costs only a shilling or so, and it is well worth the money. There are clusters of South Down sheep, whose backs are a veritable delight to pat. One’s fingers sink deep into thick, woolly backs that are like rare Turkish carpets.

“In another room are fat pigs, whose clean, white backs it is impossible to pass without slapping. Ferocious Highland cattle are secured by stout ropes, and may be prodded between the wide, stretching horns with perfect impunity. . . .”

This description of a cattle show is, a week later (the *Daily Express* of 12th December 1911), followed by an account of the “sales.” The writer says: “Because we eat to live, our cattle and sheep are fattened to die—to provide those of us who are not vegetarians with the flesh-pots for which we hanker.

“The Christmas cattle market was held at Islington yesterday, and thou-

Reference has been made to the increased accessibility to ideas which Edward Maitland, after his renunciation of flesh-foods, found himself possessed of. New faculties now began to manifest themselves, and in them both. For, in 1876, Edward Maitland and Anna Kingsford found themselves possessed of psychic faculties in such measure that "no longer did the veil which divides the world sensible from the world spiritual constitute an impassable barrier, but both were open to view, and the latter was as real and accessible as the former." Edward Maitland says: "It was about the middle of 1876 that this remarkable accession of faculty began to manifest itself in plenitude, I being the first to experience it, notwithstanding my previous total lack of any faculty of the kind, or of the belief in the possibility of my having it. . . . I found myself—without seeking for or expecting it—spiritually sensitive in respect of sight, hearing, and touch, and in open, palpable relations with a world which I had no difficulty in recognising as of celestial nature; so far did it transcend everything of which I had heard or read in the annals of the contemporary spiritualism; so entirely did it accord with my conceptions of the divine." Edward Maitland, so far as he was concerned, ascribed this accession of faculty to, in part, the purification that his physical system had undergone by means of his new dietary regimen.¹

In this connection, Edward Maitland relates the following interesting occurrence which happened early in 1877, and which, he says, "while in itself singular in the extreme, threw an unexpected light on an obscure part of the Bible and on the spiritual significance of certain animal forms." He and Anna Kingsford were in London, which place they had arranged to leave on the evening of 29th March, on a visit to her mother at Hastings. When she awoke on the morning of the day in question, she suddenly saw before her in waking vision a collection of dragons, scorpions, serpents, lobsters, and various creeping things, large and small, while a voice said to her, "Keep him [Edward Maitland] from touching these; if he touch the flesh of these, you must not suffer him to come

sands of beasts passed from the drovers' care into the hands of the inevitable butcher. . . . The slaughter-house seems cruel, but we must have our Christmas dinners, despite all sentiment. Regal, thick-necked steers, soft-coated calves, and fat sheep must go the way of all flesh, that they may re-appear on our Christmas tables as beef, and veal, and mutton."—S. H. H.

¹ *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 37, 38.

near to you." Edward Maitland says: "She told me of this vision in the course of the day, and drew for me some of the forms of the animals; for so vivid had been the sight, that she had every detail perfectly impressed on her mind. But through some interruption to our conversation she omitted to tell me of the prohibition. She had, moreover, no apprehension of any of the animals shewn coming in my way, or of my eating of them should they do so.

"In the afternoon, however, owing to the presence of a visitor who desired something different from the diet usual in the house, a lobster appeared on the table. At this she [Anna Kingsford] was somewhat dismayed, for it gave rise to the suggestion that her vision might be prophetic and have an unanticipated significance. Even now, she did not tell me of the positive prohibition, but imagined it was intended as a test; and that *if* I partook, she was not to go on her journey with me. Consequently, after a general remark from her, intended as a dissuasion against the eating of anything that had to be put to so cruel a death as is reputed of the lobster, I, regarding it as fish and 'cold-blooded,' and therefore, in the absence of a sufficiency of perfectly insensitive food, allowable, partook of it, but through some cause I could not define did no more than taste it. Shortly after this she rose, and quitted the room, saying she should not be able to go that evening.

"After venting her disappointment alone—for she had been eagerly looking forward to her holiday—she returned, and said that she saw now that she had been wrong in not having told me the whole vision; but that she had mistaken the meaning of the words uttered, and that, as she now perceived, they were not a test, but a positive prohibition. And we then sat down to consult our Genii¹ through the planchette² concerning the occurrence, deeming it likely that the vision had been of their sending.

¹ Celestial affinities, guides or ministers. They are sometimes called "angels." Inferior spirits are employed by the Genii to perform the mechanical act of writing. The Genii being of the celestial order do not themselves manifest on the physical plane, but employ the elementals for that purpose (*Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 167. See A. K.'s Illumination, *Concerning the Genius or Daimon*, C. W. S., part i., No. xiv.).

² For those who have never seen a planchette, the following description (taken from *The Century Dictionary*) may be of interest. A planchette is "a small heart-shaped or triangular board mounted on three supports, of which two, placed at the angles of the base, are easily moving casters, and

“ We both, as usual, placed our hands on the instrument ; but, after waiting for some time, there was no response. I then withdrew my hand in order to reduce the amount of the light in the room, but sat down again without doing so on finding that the writing had begun. On replacing my hand, it ceased. I withdrew it, and it went on again. And so again the third time. Thereupon I withdrew it altogether. It then wrote :

“ ‘ Let him go. We can do nothing with him now.’

“ ‘ For how long is this ? Can we go to-morrow ? ’ we asked.

“ To which it wrote :

“ ‘ If he purge himself to-night, you may go ; but he may ask nothing of us for seven days.’

“ ‘ What is the meaning of this prohibition ? ’

“ ‘ The spirits who hold intercourse with you belong to an order which can have no dealings with eaters of reptiles, whether of sea or land. For all things which move upon the belly are cursed for the sake of the evil one, whose seal is set on all serpents, dragons, and scorpions, such as we shewed you.’

“ In answer to further questioning, they said :

“ ‘ If he take a purge, you may go with him to-morrow.’

“ I complied with their injunction, and the next morning we asked some further questions respecting this strange affair. Among other queries, we inquired whether they endorsed the whole of the Levitical code, for we had recognised and found a passage corresponding to the above. To this they replied :

“ ‘ No, else you would have been destroyed already.’

“ ‘ Is it right to eat flesh ? ’ was then asked ; to which it was replied :

“ ‘ We do not say it is right ; and even for you it would be unlawful to eat flesh.’ ”¹

On another occasion, they were, in like manner, informed by their Genii that :

the third, placed at the apex, is a pencil-point. If the tips of the fingers of one person, or of two, are placed lightly upon it, the board will often, after a time, move without conscious effort on the part of the operator, and the pencil-point will trace lines, words, or even sentences. It was invented about 1855.”

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 165, 166, 167 ; *The Soul, and How it Found Me*, pp. 204-207.

“ Man’s perfect diet is grain, the juice of fruits, and the oil of nuts.”¹

When the time came for her return to Paris, she was accompanied by her husband, her daughter, and her daughter’s governess ; her husband remaining with them until they were settled. Some weeks later, in July, she then being very unwell, Edward Maitland, at her husband’s suggestion and her request, joined her until her husband could replace him, which he did in the following month, when Edward Maitland returned to London.

During the time that Edward Maitland was with her, they received, through the planchette, the following message :—

“ Teach the doctrine of the Universal Soul and the Immortality of all creatures. Knowledge of this is what the world most needs, and this is the key-note of your joint mission. On this you must build ; it is the key-stone of the arch. The perfect life is not attainable for man alone. The whole world must be redeemed under the new gospel you are to teach.”²

In September Anna Kingsford returned home for a short time. The following extract from a letter, dated 23rd September 1877, written by her to Edward Maitland, records another of her wonderful experiences : one which has important bearing on the subject of this book, and which she regarded as “ a new revelation of great import and of an astonishing nature ” : and which, Edward Maitland says, “ contained several things which, at the time, were beyond not only our own but the world’s knowledge, for their meaning had long been lost.”³ In her letter she says :

“ You must know that I passed yesterday afternoon in reading through the book *Fruit and Bread*, which had been sent me anonymously. The book struck me much, but I am bound to say that I did not attach any great importance to it, and never dreamt that it had come into my hands in any other than an ordinary chance fashion. It was not, therefore, exclusively in my thoughts when night came ; and I was by no means prepared for the vision which the (full) moonlight brought me after I had gone to rest. I might keep it till we meet, but as possibly it might by that time lose something of its vividness, or some of the words spoken might slip my

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 171 ; *The Soul, and How it Found Me*, p. 215.

² *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 134 ; *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 186.

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 246.

memory, I think it best to commit it at once to paper while it is fresh in my mind.

“ I saw in my sleep a great table spread upon a beautiful mountain, the distant peaks of which were covered with snow, and brilliant with a bright light.¹ Around the table reclined twelve persons, six male, six female, some of whom I recognised at once, the others afterwards. Those whom I recognised at once were Zeus, Hera, Pallas Athena, Phœbus Apollo, and Artemis.² I knew them by the symbols they wore. The table was covered with all kinds of fruit, of great size, including nuts, almonds, and olives, with flat cakes of bread, and cups of gold, into which, before drinking, each divinity poured two sorts of liquid, one of which was wine, the other water. As I was looking on, standing on a step a little below the top of the flight which led to the table, I was startled by seeing Hera suddenly fix her eyes on me, and say : ‘ What seest thou at the lower end of the table ? ’ And I looked, and answered : ‘ I see two vacant seats. ’ Then she spoke again and said : ‘ When you are able to eat of our food and to drink of our cup, you also shall sit and feast with us. ’ Scarcely had she uttered these words, when Athena, who sat facing me, added : ‘ When you are able to eat of our food and to drink of our cup, then you shall know as you are known. ’ And immediately Artemis, whom I knew by the moon upon her head, continued : ‘ When you are able to eat of our food and drink of our cup, all things shall become pure to you, and ye shall be made virgins. ’³

“ Then I said : ‘ O Immortals, what is your food and your drink, and how does your banquet differ from ours, seeing that we also eat no flesh, and blood has no place in our repasts ? ’

“ Then one of the Gods, whom at the time I did not know, but have since recognised as Hermes,⁴ rose from the table and,

¹ The mountain and snowy peaks in this vision denoted the pure heights of spiritual attainment, variously called in Scripture the “ Holy Hill of the Lord,” the “ Mount of God,” the “ Mount of Regeneration,” and other names, meaning the summit of one’s own spiritual nature (see note to A. K.’s dream, *The Difficult Path*, in *D. & D. S.*, p. 56 ; and see *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 254).

² Of these Gods and Goddesses, Zeus may be said to represent spirit and reason ; Hera, original life ; Pallas Athena, interior wisdom ; Phœbus Apollo, the spirit of wisdom ; Artemis, the intuitional or reflective principle of the soul.

³ The term “ virgin ” in its mystical sense signifies a soul pure from admixture of matter. The plural was used to include Edward Maitland.

⁴ Hermes represents the spirit of understanding, and the fig-tree, as “ the special symbol of Hermes,” signifies the faculty of inward understanding (*Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 247 ; *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 75 ; and see p. 211 *post*).

coming to me, put into my hands a branch of a fig-tree bearing upon it ripe fruit, and said : ‘ If you would be perfect, and able to know and to do all things, quit the heresy of Prometheus. Let fire warm and comfort you externally ; it is Heaven’s gift. But do not wrest it from its rightful purpose, as did that betrayer of your race, to fill the veins of humanity with its contagion, and to consume your interior being with its breath. All of you are men of clay, as was the image which Prometheus made. Ye are nourished with stolen fire, and it consumes you. Of all the evil uses of Heaven’s good gifts, none is so evil as the internal use of fire. For your hot foods and drinks have consumed and dried up the magnetic power of your nerves, sealed your senses, and cut short your lives. Now, you neither see nor hear ; for the fire in your organs consumes your senses. Ye are all blind and deaf, creatures of clay. We have sent you a book to read. Practice its precepts, and your senses shall be opened. . . . ’

“ ‘ Do you, then,’ I asked, ‘ desire the whole world to abandon the use of fire in preparing food and drink ? ’

“ Instead of answering my question, he said : ‘ We shew *you* the excellent way. . . . We have told you all that can be shewn you on the level on which you stand. But our perfect gifts, the fruits of the Tree of Life, are beyond your reach now. We cannot give them to you until you are purified and have come up higher. The conditions are GOD’S ; the will is with you.’

“ These last words seemed to be repeated from the sky overhead, and again from beneath my feet. And at the instant I fell, as if shot down like a meteor from a vast height ; and with the swiftness and shock of the fall I awoke.

“ You may guess how full my heart was ! . . . I suspect that . . . we shall really have to abandon the use of cooked foods, and to live like John the Baptist and the old desert saints, before we can get what the Gods promise. Have you courage sufficient for this ? When one thinks *what* it is one is buying at the price, the sacrifice seems a slight thing indeed. And in view of your consenting, I will ask you to get some packets of ‘ crushed wheat,’ instead of the tea we were going to take out—the plain crushed wheat, I mean. I felt curiously guilty this morning as I ate my egg and drank my hot coffee ! And I had always considered my food so simple and pure ! Now I regard myself as a mere groveller—a worm and an ‘ image of clay.’ My mind is full of the Gods and of Prome-

thus, and I can't think of anything else for five minutes together. . . ."

During the year 1877, she passed her first *Doctorat examen* with distinction.¹

Allied to the question of the slaughter of animals for food, is that of the slaughter of animals for sacrifice. There are some who believe—or profess to believe—that, many years ago, God commanded Moses to have animals slaughtered for religious sacrifices! They base this belief on certain passages—which they invariably interpret literally—that are to be found in the Bible; and this alone, for them, is final and conclusive, and settles the matter; and they argue that “as God commanded that animals were to be killed for sacrificial purposes, it cannot be wrong for man to kill them for other purposes, such as food, etc.” These Biblical advocates for animal slaughter, flesh-eating, and other cruelties, never pray to be delivered from “blood-guiltiness,” or try to understand what “blood-guiltiness” and “blood-thirstiness” mean;² nor do they lay any, the least, stress on the fact that only those Statutes are of the Lord (and therefore right), that “rejoice the heart”;³ nor do they believe that it has ever entered into the Divine Providence to “save both man and beast,”⁴ much less do they consider it to be the distinguishing mark of “a righteous man” that he should regard “the life of his beast”;⁵ and as to believing or feeling that “it is good not to eat flesh nor drink wine”⁶—such thoughts, though to be found expressed in language most explicit in the Bible, are far from them. It is sufficient for them that there are to be found in the self-same Bible some passages which, apparently, justify flesh-eating and other barbarous customs of which they approve: and this leads to the question whether they rightly interpret the Bible or the part thereof to which they appeal in justification of their wrong-doing.

In June 1878, Anna Kingsford received, in sleep, an instruction *Concerning the Interpretation of the Mystical Scriptures*,⁷ which has a very important bearing on the subject of Biblical interpretation in connection with animal sacrifice. A portion of this instruction she read in a book, in a library purporting to be that of Emanuel Swedenborg. The remainder

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, p. 264.

² Ps. li. 17; see also Ps. cxxxix. 21.

³ Ps. xix. 8.

⁴ Ps. xxxvi. 1, 7.

⁵ Prov. xii. 10.

⁶ Rom. xiv. 21.

⁷ See A. K.'s Illumination of this title, *C. W. S.*, part i., No. v.

of it she heard delivered as a lecture "by a man in priestly garb, in an amphitheatre of white stone, to a class of students (of whom she was one), who took notes of it." What she had read, she wrote down immediately on waking, and the notes that she had taken of what she had heard, she was also, on waking, able to reproduce from memory, her memory having been abnormally enhanced, for "the words presented themselves again to her as she wrote, and stood out luminously to view."¹ The gist of the Instruction was that the "Books of Moses the Prophet" are not historical but mystical, and ought, therefore, to receive not a literal but a mystic or allegorical consideration; and a considerable portion of it was used by Edward Maitland in his Lecture on *Vegetarianism and the Bible*,² which appears in another part of this book.

The following passage on the sacrifices said to have been offered up by Cain and Abel respectively is of interest:—

"It is not to be supposed that the two sacrifices offered to God by the sons of Adam were real sacrifices, any more than it is to be supposed that the Apple which caused the Doom of Mankind was a real apple. It ought to be known, indeed, for the right Understanding of the Mystical Books, that in their esoteric sense they deal, not with material Things, but with spiritual Realities; and that as Adam is not a Man, nor Eve a Woman, nor the Tree a Plant in its true signification, so also are not the Beasts named in the same Books real Beasts, but that the Mystic Intention of them, is implied. When, therefore, it is written that Abel took of the Firstlings of his Flock to offer unto the Lord, it is signified that he offered that which a Lamb implies, and which is the holiest and highest of Spiritual Gifts. Nor is Abel himself a real Person, but the Type and spiritual Presentation of the Race of the Prophets; of whom, also, Moses was a Member, together with the Patriarchs. . . .

"They are Idolaters who understand the Things of Sense where the Things of the Spirit are alone implied."³

At the beginning of June 1878, her second *Doctorat examen*, which she was anxious to pass with as much distinction as she had passed her first, was pending. The date originally fixed for this examination was 5th June, "but her professor, dis-

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 269.

² See pp. 214-224 *post*.

³ See further on the subject of bloody sacrifice *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, Lect. iv. pars. 6-15, and 17, where the connection between idolatry and bloody sacrifice—including flesh-eating—is shewn. See also p. 197 *post*.

trusting the examiners appointed for the occasion, partly because of the known hostility of some of them to women students, and partly because he had prepared her from books other than those written by the examiners themselves—a circumstance likely to be resented by them—had persuaded her to get the date of her examination postponed for a few days, when another set of examiners would officiate.”¹

Edward Maitland says : “ So eager was she to test her condition that [on 5th June] she went all the way to the Schools, when having no call to go, in order to listen to the examination then going on—the subjects being those of her next ordeal—and to compare the answers given with those that she herself was prepared to give, the examination being *vivâ voce*. Her delight on returning was unbounded. She could have answered every question put far better than any of the students, she declared, and would have distanced them all had she been one of the class.² . . . The day finally appointed [for her examination] was ushered in by a violent thunderstorm, which cleared off, but just in time to render her going possible ; for, while it lasted, the streets were flooded, and no vehicle was procurable. The storm, moreover, had produced the usual distressing effect upon her nervous system—for she was excessively sensitive to electric disturbances—so that I begged her to give up the intention of going in for her *examen* on that day. But she was bent on it. She had worked long and hard, and shrank from the strain of further delay ; and, moreover, was confident of being thoroughly up in her subjects, and she had never yet failed to pass well. It was not her mental but her physical state that led me to distrust her fitness. . . . So we set off for the Schools. The *examen* was to occupy two days. Her report to me of the first day augured ill for the chances of success. Of the three examiners, two had been all that could be desired ; but the third, a Dr N——, who had been substituted at the last moment, was known to her as one of a clique in the *Faculté* who violently objected to the admission of women to diplomas, and were determined to make the examinations impossible for them. His hostility to her was evinced from the moment that she presented herself, his manner, which to the male students had been kind and considerate, at once becoming stern and forbidding in the highest degree. And

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i, pp. 264, 265, 270.

² See also *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, p. 144.

when he found that she returned perfect answers in all the subjects properly comprised in the examination, he questioned her on others, referring to the most abstruse and recondite diseases, some of them of such rare occurrence that their very existence is denied by many doctors. And, finding no cause of complaint against her in respect of these, he endeavoured to break down her self-possession by committing the outrage of putting to her the most embarrassing questions which could possibly be put to a young woman in the presence of men, going far outside the usual range of subjects for the purpose. This exhibition of his enmity put a terrible strain on her nerves, but she bore it without flinching, knowing that he was technically within his right, and resolved not to afford him the pretext which he was seeking of refusing to pass her. It was only when it came to *l'épreuve pratique*, which involved manual dexterity, that the effect showed itself. She had controlled her mind, but she could not control her muscles. And the consequence was that her hands trembled over the piece of dissection appointed her, and the work was done somewhat less artistically than otherwise would have been the case, and than she had been wont to do it. This gave the professor the desired opportunity, and though the comparative failure was obviously due partly to the nervousness induced by himself, and partly to the clumsiness of the student told off to hold the subject for her, he refused to sign her note of approval.

“From her other two examiners she had obtained the warmest commendations. ‘Madame,’ said one of them, with a deferential bow, ‘you know your subjects perfectly.’ ‘Madame,’ said the other, ‘I have absolutely nothing to reproach you with.’ They felt deeply the injustice and hardship shown to one whom they recognised as exceptionally gifted and industrious, and the discredit done to their university and their order in thus treating a woman for being a woman after opening their doors to women. But he remained inexorable, declaring that under no circumstances would he and his party suffer a woman to pass. And so deeply did his colleagues feel the matter that they met expressly to discuss it, with the result that an offer was made to give her a fresh and merely formal examination in the following month with an unprejudiced professor in his place.

“The offer came too late. The disappointment and indignation felt by her were too much for a system always highly

strung and fragile, but now sorely overwrought. A condition set in of intense *commotion cérébrale*, under which she refused to return home, as she could not bear the sight, she said, of the books and study which had brought her to such an end ; and there was nothing for it but to tell the driver of our *fiacre* to go round the Bois. After driving for an hour or two, she said she would go home and put some things together, and go to the seaside. Paris was unendurable now ; she would go mad if she stayed. On reaching her apartment she threw herself on the sofa, where she remained for some time moaning and crying, and exclaiming in the most piteous tones, '*Je suis refusée—refusée—refusée,*' until, in a culminating paroxysm of anguish, she suddenly stood up at her full height, and with a piercing shriek fell insensible to the floor, her action being so sudden that, although I was by her side when it occurred, I was able only to break the full force of the fall. She remained insensible long after being raised, and recovered consciousness only to find herself paralysed from head to foot the whole length of the left side. And when, at length, a doctor was procured, the seizure was pronounced to be a *hémiplegie cérébrale gauche* of a very severe and serious character, from which a partial recovery at best could be anticipated, and this only after a long period of illness. As to her ever again being fit for mental work, that was scarcely to be thought of. The verdict, had I accepted it, was a death-blow to all our high hopes, and implied the ruin of our mission. But I did not for a moment accept it. I knew she had in her that of which medical science takes no account, and my faith in the Gods and in our mission far exceeded my faith in the doctors. For others their opinion might hold good ; but it did not apply to one of her order. They agreed with me that recovery would depend far more on nursing than on medicine, and that it must be sympathetic nursing. To aid me in rendering this, I proposed to summon her husband forthwith. But she forbade me to do so until she was sufficiently recovered to travel, and then he should come and help me to take her to the seaside. Meanwhile, she would rely solely on the nursing, and decline all medical aid. French diagnosis, she declared, might be good, but not so French therapeutics. Her experience of the hospital practice terrified her by its severe and experimental character ; and, besides, as a sensitive of sensitives, and an abstainer from flesh-food, her system falsified all the usual calculations of the effect of drugs.

And, as it was, the form taken by her malady was in defiance of all precedent. For, while the stroke was on the left side of the brain, the paralysis also was on that side, instead of following the course of the nerves and crossing over to the right. And, besides, the French doctors were all vivisectors, and as they could not take a fee from a medical student, they would have no interest in trying to cure her.”¹

When, shortly after, her husband joined her, they all left Paris and went (*via* Fécamp) to Dieppe for a change. He was able to stay with her until “near the end of July,” when he was obliged to return home, and she and Edward Maitland returned to Paris. It was a long time before she recovered from the shock to her system. In September, she was “suffering terribly through failure of the heart’s action”—the effect of her recent illness—but she was “struggling with her work” in order to pass the *examen* for which she had been so unjustly rejected, though it was doubtful whether she would be able to hold out so long.²

Writing, under date of 29th September, in his diary, Edward Maitland says :

“This morning she had a dreadful access of inability to breathe owing to the constriction of the muscles of the heart, and thought her last moment had come. In this extremity, she was startled by hearing a loud voice utter within her, in an imperative tone, the exclamation, ‘LIVE!’”³

In spite of her condition, during the month of September, she received from her Illuminators—whom she called “the Gods”—an instruction of great value, which, Edward Maitland says, out of consideration for her still remaining weakness of memory, “was projected into her mind, verse by verse, to be written down at once, no second verse being given her until she had written down the last received. The communication commenced shortly before she rose, and was continued at intervals during the whole time she was dressing.”⁴

In this instruction, which purported to come from Hermes, Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland were exhorted as follows :—

“Purify your bodies, and eat no dead thing that has looked with living eyes upon the light of Heaven.

“For the eye is the symbol of brotherhood among you.

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 266, 270-273.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 289.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 274, 289.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 282.

“ Sight is the mystical sense.

“ Let no man take the life of his brother to feed withal his own.

“ But slay only such as are evil ; in the name of the Lord.¹

“ They are miserably deceived who expect eternal life, and restrain not their hands from blood and death.”²

In October, she was much better, as the following entry in Edward Maitland’s diary shows :

“ 13th October.—Since 29th September when the Spirit commanded her to ‘ live,’ [she] has been marvellously better, having had no return of her heart trouble or difficulty in breathing. She has taken no drugs, and has lived as simply and moderately as possible—mainly on bread and fruit, avoiding hot foods and drinks. I, too, have done likewise, with manifest advantage to health, comfort, and lucidity.”³

Before the close of the year she “ passed with high credit and perfect ease the *examen* for which she had been so unjustly and cruelly *réfusée*,” and shortly afterwards, in 1879, “ an intense spell of work, extending over three months, was rewarded by her passage of a somewhat dreaded examination in chemistry with the highest notes of approbation.”⁴

In 1880, she entered on the last year of her student course, provided all went well. But her persistent refusal to allow her professors to vivisect at her lessons continued to subject her not only to constant altercations with them, but to a constant change of them.⁵

Having passed her *Doctorat examens* with the highest credit, and accomplished her course in the shortest possible period—saving only for the single failure above mentioned, the fault of which was not hers—there remained only the acceptance of the thesis, by which the granting of a diploma is preceded, for her to complete her student course, and be qualified to enter on the practice of her profession as an M.D. of the

¹ Animals have souls which, like those of men, are good and evil, and, like those of men, survive the death of the body, and reincarnate and progress or otherwise ; for transmigration may be downwards as well as upwards. The body is but “ the chamber of ordeal ” for the Soul, and for the time being, it represents the character of the Soul. Some animals are receptacles of evil spirits. Killing creatures—whether men or animals—that are *habitually noxious* is not wrong. Such creatures may be killed, as mercifully as possible, “ in the name of the Lord.”

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 283. A. K.’s *Illumination, An Exhortation of Hermes to his Neophytes*, C. W. S., Part ii., No. xii. p. 248.

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 292.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 303, 315.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 338, 339.

Faculté de Paris. Edward Maitland says : “ She resolved to make her thesis an exposition of the principles on behalf of which she sought a diploma, entitling it *De l’Alimentation Végétale chez l’Homme*. In it she demonstrated the non-carnivorous nature of man, as determined by his physical structure and moral constitution, and advocated a return to his natural diet as the remedy for the evils which afflict modern society. In a treatise thus conceived the wrongs and the sufferings of the animals inseparable from the use of them as food necessarily held a conspicuous place in the moral division of the argument ; and though there was no opening for a direct denunciation of scientific experimentation upon them, the whole tone of the paper pointed unmistakably in that direction. It was the usage for the candidates for a diploma to recite their theses in the Schools before an audience of professors and students, and to defend them in open disputation. And she was so full of her subject and confident of the impregnability of her position, as well as of her ability to do justice to it even in a foreign language, that she looked forward with ardour to an ordeal usually regarded with terror. Her disappointment, therefore, and consternation were great when, on presenting herself at the appointed time and place, the *chef* of her hospital—Professor Léon Le Fort—came forward and informed her that her thesis could not be received as it stood ; not because it was unscientific—its accuracy was unimpeachable in that respect—but because it was moral ! He himself, he declared, and some of his colleagues did not object to it on that score ; and, indeed, now that they had admitted women, they could not expect altogether to exclude sentiment, at least for the present : but there were some of their number, one in particular, whose position made it impossible to disregard them, and who were enraged at its tone, and the only course open was to postpone the reading until the obnoxious portions had been eliminated, when she would be called up again and passed, but without a public disputation. For, though admitting it to be scientifically sound, the *Faculté* could not allow teaching so opposed to all their traditions to be promulgated among the students. Meanwhile, he himself would make the necessary excisions, and she might be perfectly easy about the result. It would only involve a delay of a few weeks. . . . We were not long in ascertaining the name of the chief objector. He was one of the party most violently opposed

to the admission of women to degrees. And from the accounts which reached us of the discussions, and even dissensions, which arose among them over the thesis, it was evident that these inveterate patrons of the shambles and the torture-chamber fairly writhed under the thought that such a protest on behalf of mercy and purity of life could have emanated from one trained in their school. It was a veritable thrust from the spear of Ithuriel, and the hand that had dealt it was a woman's!"¹

The day finally appointed for the thesis was 22nd July 1880. Edward Maitland says: "On repairing to the Schools, we found her friendly *chef* and two other professors waiting to examine her on the subject of her thesis, and such others as might choose, in a small room and with closed doors, myself as next friend being the only other auditor. The examination took the form of a friendly conversation, in which it was evident the professors each and all took no small pleasure in drawing out a candidate whom they recognised as of exceptional endowments. Finding them thus *sympathique*, she was perfectly at her ease, and did full justice to her faculty of eloquent and lucid exposition. On the conclusion of the function her *chef*, who evidently took no small credit to himself for having composed the difference which menaced her diploma, warmly shook hands with me, and congratulated me on her success, saying, 'Madame is now one of us'; to which I mentally replied, 'Yes, but with a very considerable difference.' . . . The novelty and importance of the subject, her courage in selecting such a theme, the talent shewn in the treatment, and the disputation to which it had given rise, secured for the thesis a demand altogether exceptional in the case of such productions, to the speedy exhaustion of the first edition and issue of a second."² And the question received an impulsion which extended over the Continent generally, leading to the formation of vegetarian societies, several medical men warmly supporting the cause."³

In the following month she graduated in Paris, and thus ended her career as a medical student—a career during which

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 380, 381.

² The original thesis was published in Paris in the French language. It was subsequently translated into German, and issued with illustrative notes and other additions by Dr A. Aderholdt (see Preface to *The Perfect Way in Diet*, and see *Pall Mall Gazette*, February 1888; *Light*, 1888, p. 97).

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 382.

she never attended at any place or on any occasion where or on which vivisection took place, it having been an essential part of her plan to prove that such experimentation was not necessary for a degree. And this she effectually demonstrated by accomplishing her student course with rare expedition and distinction, despite her many and severe illnesses and her frequent change of professors, who, one after another, resigned the office on account of her refusal to allow them to experiment on live animals at her lessons.¹

Concerning the obtaining by her of her qualification to practise as an M.D. of the *Faculté de Médecine* of Paris, Edward Maitland says: "Of the cost in toil and suffering, physical and mental, at which that privilege was obtained," the *Life of Anna Kingsford* "gives at best but a faint indication. For, being limited to things occurring in space and time, history cannot take account of the dimension which is conditioned by intensity."² Only those who know what it is to be hypersensitive to their spiritual surroundings can imagine the keen agony to her of the associations to which she was in the University of Paris of necessity exposed. "That which sustained and carried her through her university course was the consciousness that her mission was a mission of redemption, and that only to those who have themselves been more or less 'perfected through suffering' is such a mission ever entrusted."³

One of the trio of examiners at whose hands she received her diploma, was Professor Charles Richet. Edward Maitland says: "He was so much struck by her, that he invited her to a vegetarian repast at his house, given expressly in her honour; and she was not without hope of enlisting him on her side in the vegetarian and anti-vivisection causes. For she read in him a possibility of higher things. But the rival influences prevailed. His soul was quenched, and he became one of the leading experimentalists of the day."⁴

On quitting Paris, they went for a short time to Boulogne, to recruit their exhausted energies; and thence they returned to England—she to her home at Atcham, and he to London. Their intention was to find a small house in the West End of

¹ *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 135, 136.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 380.

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 348; *Light*, 1888, p. 117.

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 269, and see vol. i. p. 382.

London suitable for continuing their humanitarian and other work; and, before the end of the year, they decided on No. 11 Chapel Street (now Aldford Street), Park Lane; and in the following November she took up her residence there.¹ She had not been there for long when she received, in sleep, an instruction *Concerning the "Work of Power"*—a work open to all potentially and eventually, but not actually and in the present. In this instruction she was told that the "Two Seats" were vacant at the Celestial Table,² if she would put on Christ, and she was adjured as follows:—

"Eat no dead thing. Drink no fermented drink. Make living elements of all the elements of your body. Mortify the members of earth. Take your food full of life, and let not the touch of death pass upon it. . . . Hephaistos [the Fire-Spirit] is a destroyer, and the breath of fire is a touch of death. The fire that passes on the elements of your food deprives them of their vital spirit, and gives you a corpse instead of living substance. And not only so, but the spirit of the fire enters into the elements of your body, and sets up in all its molecules a consuming and a burning, impelling to concupiscence and to the desire of the flesh. The spirit of the fire is a subtle spirit, a penetrative and diffusive spirit; and it enters into the substance of all matter upon which it acts. When, therefore, you take such substance into your organism, you take with it the spirit of the fire, and you assimilate it together with the matter of which it has become a part. I speak to you of excellent things. If you would become a Man of Power, you must be master of the Fire."³

The following incident shews how adverse the conditions of modern life in this country were to their spiritual work. Edward Maitland says: "Being in London one Christmas evening, and speaking to me under illumination, 'Mary'⁴ suddenly broke off and said: 'Do not ask me such deep questions just now, for I cannot see clearly, and it hurts me to look. The atmosphere is thick with the blood shed for the season's festivities.'⁵ The Astral Belt is everywhere dense with blood. My Genius says that if we were in some country where the conditions of life are purer, we could live in constant communication with the spiritual world. For the earth here

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 386, 388.

² See p. 25 *ante*.

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. pp. 425, 426; *C. W. S.*, pp. 98-102.

⁴ *I.e.*, Anna Kingsford.

⁵ See pp. 19, 20 *ante*.

whirls round as in a cloud of blood like red fire. He says distinctly and emphatically that *the salvation of the world is impossible while people nourish themselves on blood*. The whole globe is like one vast charnel-house. The magnetism is intercepted. The blood strengthens the bonds between the Astrals and the Earth. . . . This time, which ought to be the best for spiritual communion, is the worst, on account of the horrid mode of living. Pray wake me up. I cannot bear looking, for I see the blood and hear the cries of the poor slaughtered creatures.' Here her distress was so extreme that she wept bitterly, and some days passed before she fully recovered her composure." ¹

In 1881 Anna Kingsford had some further remarkable experiences. In March of that year she was the recipient of a vision *Concerning Three Veils which separate Man from God*.² It is too long for insertion here. The purport of it was to teach mankind the absolute necessity for "purity of life, purity of heart, and purity of doctrine." The three veils to be removed were "Blood, Idolatry, and the Curse of Eve," and in her vision it was given to her to withdraw them. She was told: "To you it is given to withdraw them; be faithful and courageous; the time has come." And the command given was: "Put away blood from among you!" It is for the purpose partly of shewing how faithfully and courageously Anna Kingsford withdrew the first of these three veils that this Preface has been written.

In the same month she received, also in sleep, an Illumination *Concerning the Greek Mysteries*,³ from which the following passages, being of very great interest, are taken:—

"In the celebration of the mysteries of Phoibos Apollo,⁴ it was forbidden to eat anything upon which terrestrial fire had passed. Wherefore all the food of his votaries was sun-baked, and his chief sacrifice consisted in fruits from high trees ripened by the sun's rays. With these mysteries of Apollo were associated those of Zeus and Hera, the King and Queen.

¹ *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 136, 137.

² This vision is recorded in full in *Clothed with the Sun*, Part i., No. i.; also in *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, Lect. vi., par. 42.

³ See *C.W.S.*, Part i., No. xviii.

⁴ The inmost and highest mysteries of the perfect humanity, which constitute the highest of all castes, and "entitle those who attain to them to sit on the golden seats" (*C.W.S.* p. 78). Castes are, properly, spiritual grades, and bear no relation to the outward condition of life (see p. 210 *post*).

. . . It was, therefore, an offence against Phoibos and Zeus for their votaries to eat anything on which fire had passed, or any fermented wine. Their wine was the pure juice of the grape drunken new, and their bread was unleavened and sun-baked.¹ . . .

“In the mysteries of Hermes, the second circle—the God who guards the Soul—it was forbidden to eat any creature which had life, or, rather, which had seeing eyes.² For Hermes is the Seer. His votaries partook only of vegetable food, which might be cooked with terrestrial fire, and of wine, which might be fermented.”³

And in May she received, also in sleep, an instruction concerning the degradation of religion through the materialisation of the spiritual doctrine of sacrifice. In her vision, her Genius led her into a large hall of temple-like structure, where she saw four bullocks lying slaughtered upon altars, and a number of persons standing round in the act of adoration. And above the altars, in the fumes arising from the spirits of the blood of the slain beasts, were misty colossal shapes, half formed, from the waist upwards, and resembling the Gods.⁴ And her Genius said: “These are Astrals, and thus will they do until the end of the world.”⁵

I have referred to their book, *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*. During the preparation of the lectures comprised in this book, they received certain instructions with reference to the character of their audience. They were told that they must not speak of the Greater Mysteries to any persons who for a period of forty days had tasted flesh or whose hands had shed blood, or whose tongues had tasted any.⁶ The Greater Mysteries were to be reserved until they had a circle of “pure livers.” At the same time, they were enjoined to eat fish for a time, to enable them to perform the hard intellectual work before them. They were told that fish contained iodine,

¹ See p. 25 *ante*.

² See p. 32 *ante*.

³ In addition to the mysteries of Phoibos Apollo, and Zeus and Hera, and Hermes, Anna Kingsford's *Illumination Concerning the Greek Mysteries*, deals with the mysteries of Her, whose initiates might eat fish; of Bacchos in whose mysteries it was permitted to the outer circle to eat of all flesh save of the unclean; and of Ares, in whose mysteries human flesh and the flesh of horses might be eaten.

⁴ One of them in particular attracted her attention. It was the head and bust of a woman of enormous proportions and wearing the insignia of Diana (*The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, Lect. iv., par. 14).

⁵ *C.W.S.*, p. 66.

⁶ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 441.

which was necessary for them both, especially for her: that "the prohibition about fish related to the highest mode of life," and that these things were matters of Caste or Degree, and they were not yet of the highest, so that it was not obligatory on them to abstain from fish. But, while eating fish, they were to consider themselves of "a lower caste." This permission, of course, did not extend to allow of flesh being eaten.¹

Speaking of their method of work in preparing the *Perfect Way* lectures, Edward Maitland says that it "consisted in the forcible projection of the mind's perceptive point inwards and upwards to its central and radiant point in search of the informing idea of any phenomenal fact, following meanwhile the mode of life which always has been found essential to such introvision, one indispensable condition being the renunciation of flesh as food."²

The *Perfect Way* lectures were designed to exhibit the *process* of the interior perfectionment of the individual, rather than to elaborate the various practical applications of the doctrine taught. But in these lectures vegetarianism is "insisted on as essential to the full apprehension and realisation of the ideal implied by the term 'Christ'—among other reasons for its sensitising influence on the higher planes of the consciousness";³ and flesh-eating is condemned as incompatible with the religion of Jesus Christ.

Bearing in mind the instructions given to them, when referring in one of his lectures to certain knowledge appertaining to the Greater Mysteries, Edward Maitland said: "Such knowledge is reserved for those who have fulfilled the conditions requisite for initiation therein. Of those conditions, the first is the complete renunciation of a diet of flesh, the reason being fourfold,—spiritual, moral, intellectual, and physical,—according to the fourfold constitution of man. This is imperative. Man cannot receive, the Gods will not impart, the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven on other terms. The conditions are God's; the will is with man."⁴

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 4, 5; and see *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 131, 132.

² *Light*, 1893, p. 103.

³ Letter dated 15th October 1890, by E. M. to M. B. See *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, Preface, pp. ii.-iii.

⁴ *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, Lect. iii., par. 60; and see *C.W.S.*, No. ii. pp. 5-8.

On the subject of vegetarianism, Anna Kingsford said: "In eating flesh, and thereby ingesting the blood principle—*flesh and blood being inseparable*"—man "sacrifices to the astral emanations of his own magnetic atmosphere, and so doing, ministers to the terrene and corruptible. This it is to 'eat of things offered to idols,' for blood is the food of the astral *eidola*, and the eater of blood is infested by them." ¹ And, "let us say boldly, and without fear of contradiction from those who really *know*, that the Interior life and the clear Heaven are not attainable by men who are partakers of blood: men whose mental atmosphere is thick with the fumes of daily sacrifices to idols. For so long as these shadows infest the Man, obscuring the expanse of the higher and divine Ether beyond, he remains unable to detach himself from the love for Matter and from the attractions of Sense, and can at best but dimly discern the Light of the Spiritual Sun."

"Abstinence from bloody oblations on all planes is therefore the gate of the Perfect Way, the test of illumination, the touchstone and criterion of sincere desire for the fulness of Beatific Vision." ²

In another lecture she said:

"Paradise can never be regained, Regeneration never completed, man never fully redeemed, until the body is brought under the law of Eden, and has cleansed itself thoroughly from the stain of blood. None will ever know the joys of Paradise who cannot live like Paradise-men; none will ever help to restore the Golden Age to the World who does not first restore it in himself. No man, being a shedder of blood, or an eater of flesh, ever touched the Central Secret of things, or laid hold of the Tree of Life. Hence it is written of the Holy City: 'Without are dogs.' For the foot of the carnivorous beast cannot tread the golden floors; the lips polluted with blood may not pronounce the Divine Name. Never was spoken a truer word than this; and if we should speak no other, we should say all that man need know. For if he will but live the life of Eden, he shall find all its joys and its mysteries within his grasp. 'He who will do the will of God, shall know of the doctrine.' But until 'father and mother' are forsaken,—that is, until the disciple is resolved to let no earthly affections or desires withhold him from entering

¹ *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, Lect. iv., par. 15.

² *Ibid.*, pars. 18-19.

the Perfect Way,—Christ will not be found nor Paradise regained.”¹

On another occasion, being in a condition of clairvoyance, Anna Kingsford said: “Many particulars are shewn to me about diet. . . . Food should be cold and uncooked, and no fermented drinks used. Cakes should be sun-baked in a kiln, that the particles may become polarised by the sun’s magnetism. I see a row of cakes being baked in this way in Egypt, but in this [English] climate such things are impossible to us, and we must be content to live and die.”²

Three interesting letters, entitled *Letters on Pure Diet*, written by Anna Kingsford, appeared in the July and October 1881 and January 1882 numbers of *The Food Reform Magazine*, then recently established. The second and third of these letters—on the subject of Jesus and flesh-eating—being of particular interest. They are reprinted in this book.

The year 1881, also, saw the publication of an English edition of the thesis which Anna Kingsford had written in Paris at the close of her student course. In this edition the parts which had been rejected by the *Faculté* were restored. It was published under the title of *The Perfect Way in Diet*.³ In the Preface, Anna Kingsford says:

“If any into whose hands this book may fall should be inclined to think me over-enthusiastic, or to stigmatise my views as ‘Utopian,’ I would ask him seriously to consider whether ‘Utopia’ be not indeed within the realisation of all who can imagine and love it, and whether, without enthusiasm, any great cause was ever yet won for our race. Man is the master of the world, and may make it what he will. Into his hands it is delivered with all its mighty possibilities for good or evil, for happiness or misery. Following the monitions and devices of the sub-human, he may make of it—what, indeed, for some gentle and tender souls it has already become—a very hell; working with God and Nature, he may reconvert it into Paradise.”

The book immediately attracted the attention of the scientific world, being considered a work of great value, and it became the pioneer of the modern movement towards a pure

¹ *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, Lect. vi., par. 24.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 5; and see *Story of A. K. and E. M.*, pp. 131, 132.

³ *Life of A. K.*, vol. i. p. 382; vol. ii. p. 27. A sixth edition of *The Perfect Way in Diet* was published in 1909.

and bloodless diet. I have been told, recently, on good authority, that in this country *The Perfect Way in Diet* has done more for the vegetarian cause than any other book has done—and this after an interval of twenty-nine years from its publication, and notwithstanding the many books that have been written on the subject since its publication in 1881.

An idea of the comprehensiveness of *The Perfect Way in Diet* may be gathered from the fact that it treats of (*inter alia*) anatomy and physiology, cookery, physical force, food values, national habits, chemistry, effects and dangers of flesh food, alcoholism, slaughter-houses, social considerations,¹ sufferings of cattle and over-breeding, treatment of disease, economical considerations, the leather question, the fur trade, the manure question, and sport. In this book, Anna Kingsford says: "The most excellent and proper aliments of which our race can make use consist of tree-fruits and seeds—and these uncooked—and not of the plants themselves, whether foliage or roots."² At the same time, she admits that "through a combination of natural and artificial causes, this best mode of subsistence has become impossible to the majority of persons in certain parts of the globe, and it seems, therefore, wise and consistent that they should increase the variety and range of their food by recourse to cookery."³ But, she says, "fire can be only used legitimately by man for the preparation of those vegetables, herbaceous plants, roots, and hard fruits, which he cannot properly masticate when raw, and for the digestion of which, in that condition, the anatomy and physiology of his system are not adapted."⁴ To such extent, fire is allowed to be used to make palatable and digestible non-natural foods, and man may live—he may be bound to live—wholly or partially on such foods. By the use of fire, man is given a choice between Nature and Art. But, Anna Kingsford points out, the choice between the garden and the slaughter-house—which the use of fire also gives—involves very different considerations. For, as she says, "the culture, harvesting, and preparation of all vegetable produce are alike in harmony with the interests of morality, of individual and of public health,

¹ See p. 61 *post*.

² *The Perfect Way in Diet*, p. 15.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, *The Perfect Way in Diet* does not, for the reasons therein mentioned, oppose the addition of certain aliments of animal origin, viz. milk, eggs, cream, butter, and cheese—as being inconsistent with the Pythagorean regimen therein advocated (see pp. 50-51).

of social and private economy, and of that love of beauty, virtue, and consistent philosophy which dominates the nature of all gentle and civilised humanity"; but "each one of these interests is wounded, and that violently, by the abuse of the art of cookery in the hands of the man who degrades himself by its means to the level of the beast of prey."¹

In 1882, speaking on the subject of vegetarianism at a temperance meeting at Church Lawford, Edward Maitland said :

"I find myself [as a vegetarian] so much the better in both body and mind that I am quite convinced that no one can be the best that he has it in him to be until he has become an abstainer not only as regards drink, but as regards flesh. . . . I don't, however, recommend you to eat only what are called vegetables, such as cabbage, carrots, and turnips. Men are not root or herb eaters, but fruit and grain eaters by nature : and it is on this diet that we thrive best when once we have become properly accustomed to it."

In the month of April 1882, Anna Kingsford gave a lecture *On Food* before the students of Girton College, Cambridge, which was greatly appreciated. It is reprinted in this book. During the same year, she and Edward Maitland received urgent appeals to go to Switzerland in the Anti-Vivisection cause. Accordingly (accompanied by her daughter), they left London for a time to carry on their crusade in Switzerland, arriving there early in August,² the greater part of which month they passed at Lausanne. They made their home at the Pension du Cèdre, "being tempted thither by its charming position in the open country and its vegetarian regimen." While at Lausanne, she delivered addresses on behalf of vegetarianism and against vivisection. The energy she displayed in the cause for which she fought was such as to elicit from one of the local magnates the remark that "it was fortunate for them that she was a vegetarian, for as a flesh-eater her fierceness would have made her dangerous."³

Geneva was their aim, but it was too early for Geneva, the inhabitants then being mostly in the mountains. So, from Lausanne they went to Montreux, where they stayed until 19th September, when they repaired to Geneva. On arriving there, however, the weather, which until then had been fine,

¹ *The Perfect Way in Diet*, p. 16.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 73, 75, 79, 84.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

broke up, and she found herself "struck down with a chill," which, settling on the lungs, produced so serious an illness as to lead those whom they consulted to urge on her an instant flight to a milder climate. She would never, they declared, get over her attack if she remained at that season in Switzerland. At the end of the month, therefore, they left Switzerland for Mentone, where they had been advised to go to, intending to return to Geneva as soon as circumstances permitted.¹ But Mentone proved to be a no better place for her; and, in *The Life of Anna Kingsford*, Edward Maitland gives a detailed account of how they journeyed from place to place seeking one suitable for her, and of her terrible sufferings, and of the troubles that beset them and difficulties they encountered wherever they went. Finally, on 23rd October, they found themselves again in Paris, she remaining resolved to resume her interrupted crusade in Switzerland when she should be sufficiently recovered; and, in the meantime, with a view to keeping up her medical and scientific knowledge, as her health permitted, she "resumed her visits to the hospitals."²

The publication, in 1882, of *The Perfect Way* lectures³ was followed by a correspondence, which continued for some months, in the then new weekly paper, *Light*—the official organ of the Spiritualists. Anna Kingsford's and Edward Maitland's contributions to the controversy consisted of three joint articles, entitled, *The Perfect Way and its Critics*, which are of very great interest.⁴ Part of the controversy, of course, had to do with the food question, and, in this connection, St Paul was by one of their critics cited against them (as they put it) as an authority on behalf of "the inevitable brutalities of the slaughter-house," and "the revolting and inhuman practice of corpse-eating." In reply, they pointed out that "the very fact that Paul found it necessary to interfere in this matter between two different schools of the Church, proves that the conviction and practice in regard to flesh-eating were far from uniform

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 79, 80, 84.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 95, 96.

³ They were published in 1882, under the title of *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*.

⁴ The articles appeared in *Light* of 23rd September 1882, p. 425; of 11th November 1882, pp. 508-510; and of 9th December 1882, pp. 551-553. They are included in Appendix III. of the New (Fourth) Edition of *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*. The greater part of the third article incorporated (almost verbatim) the second of Anna Kingsford's *Letters on Pure Diet*, published in *The Food Reform Magazine*, to which reference has been made (see p. 42 *ante*).

among professing Christians, and that no inconsiderable number of them refrained on principle from bloody meats." They said : " If we listen to tradition, and study such historical memoranda as we possess on the subject, we shall find that Paul himself was the innovator, and that the general habits and teaching of the Early Church were Nazarene or Essenian, and therefore vegetarian. Jesus the Nazarene must certainly have been an abstainer from flesh and strong drink, and even the statements in regard to His custom of eating fish are, as one of us has elsewhere demonstrated,¹ not literally, but mystically intended. James, the ' brother ' of Jesus, and one of his most familiar associates, is universally reputed to have been a vegetarian, and so also was an innumerable company of the early saints, both men and women. The stricter devotional Orders of the Catholic Church, like those of all other divine Mysteries, have always abstained from flesh ; and, Paul notwithstanding, this unbloody and innocent diet has from the beginning been regarded by all Adepts as constituting ' the excellent—or perfect—way.' Certain it is, that the prophecy of Isaias—' They shall not hurt nor slay in all My holy mountain '—will never be realised by those who persist in destroying and devouring like beasts of carnage. How shall we hasten the restoration of Paradise by continuing the manners of the Fall? If we truly and earnestly desire to regain the Golden Age, and to become citizens of Heaven, we must begin by adopting the new life, and by returning to natural and human modes of sustenance. The eating of blood, and the habit of slaughter, are *part of the Fall*, and came with it. We, of the new Life, desire to return to Eden. And, as a first step thither, we abandon that horrible and degrading custom which has so long assimilated our race to that of the lowest types of bestial existence ; we reject the offal which delights the wolf and the swine, and turn instead to the pure sun-created fruits and grains, unbloody gifts of fragrant trees and fields, *for which alone the anatomy of man is fitted*. We cannot err in following the indications—nay, the commands—of nature, for these are the surest words of God.

" [Our critic] seems to argue that the superiority of certain races is due to their habit of flesh-eating. As well might he

¹ The reference is to Anna Kingsford's two letters, referred to above, on *Pure Diet*, which appeared in *The Food Reform Magazine* of October 1881, p. 46 ; and January 1882, p. 100.

assert it to be due to their not less universal habit of dram-drinking. Both habits are equally abuses and drawbacks, and have doubtless withheld these very races from the higher and interior civilisation they have hitherto invariably and significantly failed to reach. For there can be no true and perfect civilisation without sympathy and solidarity between all the children of God's family, and without the recognition of the fact which must be the basis of that solidarity,—that the same Spirit breathes in all, that the same Destiny is over all, and that the same Immortality is the heritage of all, no matter on what round of the ladder each individual soul, at any given time, may stand. To kill, to devour, or to torture any sentient fellow-being for a selfish end, is a breach of the law of solidarity, and there is but a question of degree between the murder of an ox and that of a man (Isa. lxvi. 3). . . .

“Against the use of wine *we* have said nothing ; on this subject we leave [our critic] to make peace between Paul and the Nazarenes, to whose number Jesus, John the Baptist, and many a saint and hero of the Old Testament, belonged.”¹

Writing, in the same controversy, on the relation of religion to diet, Edward Maitland very aptly pointed out that “As the regulator of conduct, religion is necessarily the regulator of diet. For diet is a department of conduct, and this as respects quality as well as quantity. To deny the relation in question is to repudiate the practice of temperance, whether in eating or drinking, as a religious duty, and to admit cannibals, gluttons, and drunkards to the kingdom of Heaven. The conditions of admission to that kingdom are dependent upon attitude of mind and state of heart. The question between us is whether those conditions are fulfilled by one who, either personally or by proxy, batters in the skull or cuts the throat of a gentle, innocent, highly sensitive fellow-creature, in order to devour its flesh, when the earth around him supplies in abundance wholesome and legitimate food. Nor is the cruelty to the animals the worst part of the evil involved in such a practice. Men themselves are unutterably degraded by it and kept back. It is not the wolf or tiger, but the lamb, which is represented in the Sacred Writings, as the type of him who finally overcomes evil and attains to perfection and bliss. And there is abundant reason to believe that only from food

¹ *Light*, 1882, p. 509 ; *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*, App. III. pp. 34⁸-35⁰.

at once pure in itself, and righteously come by, can the spirit within (the ' God of the man,' as I have termed it) extract the elements needful for the *edification* of the individual to the full stature of his due perfection."¹

They remained in Paris until the middle of March 1883, when they returned to Switzerland to resume their interrupted crusade. Writing, about this time, to *The Herald of Health*, Anna Kingsford said: "I think that possibly you may like to reproduce an article which has recently appeared in a French newspaper, and of which, therefore, I enclose a translation. I have seen several of the advertisements, '*Bains de Sang*' (Baths of Blood), to which the article refers, and I know a Parisian lady whose doctor told her that she would probably die if she did not consent to go to the slaughter-house in the morning and drink blood. He said she had tubercular symptoms, and that nothing else could save her. She refused to comply, and recovered.

"This 'blood mania' is, in fact, the last new medical craze, and it may interest your readers to see what is thus the practical outcome of vivisection and carnivorous tastes, encouraged as they are here in this atheistic city of Paris."²

Edward Maitland says: "The article contained a graphic description of the scene at the abbatoirs in the Rue de Flanders, the files of elegant equipages of the upper classes drawn up before them, and their dainty occupants awaiting in the buildings the slaughtering of the 'mild-eyed oxen,' and then quaffing bowls of the fresh-shed, steaming blood; while others supplement or vary the process by having baths of blood at home."³

¹ *Light*, 1882, p. 551. Edward Maitland's letter is signed, "Cantab."

² *Life of A. K.* vol. ii. p. 112.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 112, 113.

In the *Daily Express* of 16th July 1908, an account of "The Blood Cure," as it was then recently practised on the advice of "a quack doctor at Kirchbrak," was related as follows:—

"BERLIN, *Wednesday, 15th July.*

"The extraordinary credulity which still prevails among a large section of the population was well illustrated to-day by a prosecution at Brunswick, which resulted in a man named Charles Albrecht being sentenced to three years penal servitude for criminal quackery.

"Albrecht practised as a quack doctor at Kirchbrak, and to his many clients he recommended the blood of executed murderers as a remedy for all kinds of ailments.

"The demand for this gruesome medicine was enormous, and in order to cope with it, Albrecht obtained a quantity of pig's blood, which he bottled and sold as the blood of beheaded murderers at 12s. a bottle. His profits

Their Swiss campaign opened distressfully, she having to remain for several days at Berne owing to ill-health. In the course of this expedition she "held meetings, public and private, and delivered lectures and addresses at Berne, Lausanne, Montreux, and Geneva," at which places letters of introduction, which they held, procured for them cordial receptions from the principal residents. Edward Maitland says: "Her subjects were vegetarianism and vivisection, and the enthusiasm excited by her combination of gifts, her courage, her zeal, her eloquence, her self-possession, her resourcefulness, her mastery of her subjects, and the charm of her personal appearance, made her progress a veritable triumph." And, he says: "Her visit proved a great and lasting stimulus to the cause of food reform in Switzerland."¹

On 20th May they returned to England. Two days later they went to Norwich, where she had undertaken to lecture on behalf of vegetarianism, and "her reception was most enthusiastic."²

In August they went together to Atcham, "to prepare for a lecturing tour" which they had undertaken on behalf of the Vegetarian Society. The expedition occupied them from 21st September till the middle of October 1883, when they returned to Atcham, having held public conferences at Chester, Carlisle, Longtown, Silloth, Ambleside, Stirling, Dundee, Dunfermline, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and Dumfries.³

Edward Maitland says: "The most notable features of this tour were, first, the indescribable enthusiasm everywhere evinced for Anna Kingsford on account of the eloquence and luminousness of her expositions and the charm of her personality; and, secondly, the intensity of her physical sufferings, and the manner in which her spirit rose superior to them and carried her triumphantly through. She had left home ill, the

were very large, and his patients, who numbered hundreds, blindly obeying his directions, drank the pig's blood, believing it to be the blood of criminals who had died on the scaffold. The same remedy was recommended for heart disease, consumption, gout, skin diseases, and practically every other form of sickness."

It will be noticed that the only crime supposed to have been committed—and for which punishment was meted out—was the mere imposture by Albrecht of selling some pig's blood for the blood of executed murderers, and so obtaining money by a false pretence or fraud: and the moral condition of the dupes of the quack doctor—who numbered hundreds—who were prepared to drink the blood of executed murderers in order to cure their physical ailments—and this in a Christian country—is described merely as a good illustration of "extraordinary credulity!"

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 117-119.

² *Ibid.*, p. 120.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

climatic conditions of the place having proved in the highest degree deleterious to her, and each day's journey had completely prostrated her, sometimes inducing total loss of consciousness while in the train, and always culminating in agonising neuralgic headache on arrival, rendering her to all appearance utterly incapable for the appointed task of the evening. Her one remedy was the immersion of the lower limbs in water as hot as she could bear it ; and thus would she occupy herself until the last moment before starting for the lecture-hall. Arrived there, she was a new person, and for the hour, or hour and a half, of her address would stand firm, confident, and self-possessed, and pour forth unfalteringly that which she had to say, with a natural spontaneous eloquence which kept her audience spell-bound, to be greeted at the close with an outburst of applause, electrical for its vehemence, and seeming as if with difficulty repressed until then.

“ The tributes rendered to her gift were many and striking. Even persons of slender culture and ordinarily unimpressible would declare, whatever the subject might be, they would go any distance to hear her. Speaking of her one day, a notable publicist and philanthropist, himself an admirable speaker, declared of himself and his compeers that they always felt when listening to her as if they were beings of an inferior order hearkening to the utterances of some superior being who had come down to teach them. She herself and her teaching seemed alike to be to her hearers as a new revelation of human possibilities.”¹

After a few days' rest at Atcham, they visited Birmingham and Bath on the same behalf, and with similar results.²

It was probably during this lecture tour that, when speaking to a vegetarian society at Birmingham, Edward Maitland said: “ Among the many excellent grounds, economic, hygienic, æsthetic, and moral, on which we abstainers from a diet of flesh are entitled to congratulate ourselves, there is one which, in my view, not only surpasses all others, but which calls at this time³ for special recognition. This is the con-

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 128, 129.

² *Ibid.*, p. 129.

³ In 1882 special endeavour had been made to deprive the animals even of the scanty allowance of justice theretofore supposed to be accorded to them, and to leave them wholly to the caprices of the vivisectors, by claiming for physiologists the right not only to slay, but to torture animals to the utmost for ends in which the animal victims themselves had no concern. (See Dr W. B. Carpenter's article in the *Nineteenth Century* for February 1882.)

sciousness we enjoy that, in virtue of our innocuous mode of living, we constitute in our own persons, as do no others of mankind, living temples for the divine principle of Justice, and on all occasions where Justice is involved, can stand forth as champions of the oppressed and redressers of wrong, without liability to reproach on the score of inconsistency. . . .

“ Unless they [the animals] do something to merit harsh treatment, let us not accord them harsh treatment. Using without abusing : not wilfully inflicting on them any incomensurable injury or suffering ; training them, as our children, by means of kindly discipline, to lead useful lives, and so both ministering to their happiness in the present and fitting them for higher forms in the future : slaying, in obedience to the law of self-preservation, such only as are noxious and dangerous, or, for pity's sake, those which are hopelessly suffering. Such is the Perfect Way with Animals. But it is not a new way, strange as it may appear to a world which has for ages revelled in blood. It was the way of the Golden Age of the past, when innocence was the product of ignorance. It will be the way of the Golden Age of the future, when innocence will be the product of experience. For it is ever the way indicated by the divine Spirit itself of Humanity as expressed in the words : ‘ He hath shewed thee, O Man, what is good ; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God ? ’¹—words in which we have at once the Creed of the Vegetarian and the whole duty of Man.”

In May of the following year (1884) they visited Exeter “ to take part in a public demonstration in the vegetarian cause, where Anna Kingsford was the principal speaker : in June they were in Paris on behalf of the anti-vivisection cause :² and in December they went on a lecturing tour to Leeds, Hull, Birmingham, and Cheltenham, her subjects being, as before, vegetarianism and vivisection. “ She had everywhere the same success and recognition as on her previous tour, but also, as then, a vast amount of physical suffering ” :³ and towards the close of the year she undertook to write a weekly letter to the *Lady's Pictorial* on subjects connected with Hygiene. This involved a very heavy correspondence with individuals, and it brought to her a considerable private practice. By this

¹ Mic. vi. 8.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 179.

³ E. M. MS. of *Life of A. K.*, p. 1154.

means, also, she was able to do a great deal to advance the cause of humanity that she had so much at heart.¹

The year 1884 was a memorable one for vegetarians. During that year there was held, in London, an International Health Exhibition, and the Vegetarian Society—which had its headquarters in Manchester²—obtained space for and opened a dining-room in the Exhibition for the purpose of demonstrating in practical fashion the truth of its teaching, and circulating literature advocating pure and humane diet; and a series of public lectures was given on the subject. In consequence of a decision come to at the close of the Exhibition, the Society, on 12th January 1885, held a great meeting at Exeter Hall, in London, at which addresses were given by prominent vegetarians who dealt with various aspects of the food question. This meeting attracted considerable attention, and many leading articles were written upon it. The chair was taken by Edwin Collier (the then Treasurer of the Society), and the speakers included W. E. A. Axon, the Rev. Professor J. E. B. Mayor, Dr Anna Kingsford, Edward Maitland, T. R. Allinson, William Harrison, Thos. Baker, the Rev. M. de Colleville, the Rev. W. J. Monk, Lieut. Richardson, W. S. Manning, T. W. Platten, and others. Anna Kingsford spoke on “The Physiology of Vegetarianism”; and Edward Maitland on “The Higher Aspects of Vegetarianism.”

On 15th May 1885 Anna Kingsford wrote to her friend Lady Caithness as follows: “I enclose you a form of petition sent to me for signature. . . . I have already obtained nearly seventy names to it, and I send a form to you, begging you to sign it, and to get all the friends you can to sign also. As you see, it is a petition to Pope Leo XIII., calling on him to instruct the Catholic Church on the subject of humanity to animals,—a long-neglected matter, which I understand his Holiness has promised to take up if the Christian world shews itself anxious to receive the expression of his opinion. . . . Vivisection is not specifically mentioned, the basis of the request being as indefinite and general as possible. But I am sure you will agree with me that the expression of the Pontiff’s views in favour of the kind treatment of animals is enormously

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 230, 277, 278.

² This Society dates from 1847. It had its origin at Ramsgate; its first President was James Simpson. It has numbered among its Presidents, Professor F. W. Newman and Professor Mayor.

needed in Catholic countries." The petition, ultimately, proved to be a hapless one. "Hapless because, although having some hundreds of thousands of signatures, it was refused presentation on the ground that the effect of a papal utterance on the subject would be to burden the conscience of the faithful with a new sin to confess, and one of which a precise definition was impracticable."¹

Some two years later, when she was in Rome, she saw for herself how cruelly the animals were treated there, and how indifferent to their sufferings all people were. In a letter, dated 28th March 1887, to *Light*, she said:—

"The great need of the popular form of the Christian religion is precisely a belief in the solidarity of all living things. It is in this that Buddhism surpasses Christianity—in this divine recognition of the universal right to charity. Who can doubt it who visits Rome—the city of the Pontiff—where now I am, and witnesses the black-hearted cruelty of these 'Christians' to the animals which toil and slave for them? Ill as I am, I was forced, the day after my arrival, to get out of the carriage in which I was driving to chastise a wicked child who was torturing a poor little dog tied by a string to a pillar—kicking it and stamping on it. No one save myself interfered. To-day I saw a great, thick-shod peasant kick his mule in the mouth out of pure wantonness. Argue with these ruffians, or with their priests, and they will tell you 'Christians have no duties to the beasts that perish.' Their Pope has told them so. So that everywhere in Catholic Christendom the poor, patient, dumb creatures endure every species of torment without a single word being uttered on their behalf by the teachers of religion. It is horrible—damnable. And the true reason of it all is because the beasts are popularly believed to be soulless. I say, paraphrasing a *mot* of Voltaire, 'If it were true that they had no souls, it would be necessary to invent souls for them.' Earth has become a hell for want of this doctrine [that animals have souls that survive the death of the body]. Witness vivisection, and the Church's toleration of it. Oh, if any living beings on earth have a claim to Heaven, surely the animals have the greatest claim of all! Whose sufferings so bitter as theirs, whose wrongs so deep, whose need of compensation so appalling? As a mystic and as an occultist, I *know* they are not destroyed by death; but if I *could* doubt

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 201, 202, 290, 291.

it—solemnly I say it—I should doubt also the justice of God. How could I tell He would be just to man if so bitterly unjust to the dear animals? ”¹

Writing in her diary of her Roman experiences, she said : “ I went [to Rome] thinking that I should love Rome : I found that I hated it. Hated the peasants most of all, and the priests. The whole place and its influences left a bitter taste with me. I shall never wish to see Rome again, should I live a hundred years. A great horror and contempt of the degraded cult, called Christianity, which from Rome has gone forth to poison the whole earth, seized me. Worse even than Protestantism in this, that it has taught the people to be cruel to their beasts. . . . No art, no marble or painted or columned beauty, can compensate for the daily sight and hearing of the devilries of Italian peasants. And the priests ! Pah ! They resemble black flies buzzing about the putrid corpse of a dead religion. . . . I have seen a man strike his horse furiously with his fist upon its nostrils because the poor creature snatched a wisp of grass from a torn sack.”²

In the autumn of 1885 Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland went on a nearly six weeks’ lecture tour, during which she delivered fifteen public addresses.³

They visited Gloucester, Malvern, Cheltenham, Hereford, Bristol, Clifton, Weston-super-Mare, Clevedon, and Tunbridge Wells. Edward Maitland says : “ At all these places she addressed large audiences, public and private, with her wonted power and acceptance, betraying no signs of the ill-health from which she was suffering, her enthusiasm for the causes advocated always sufficing to sustain her through the effort, however arduous, and lifting her to a plane at which she was superior to all limitations.”⁴

In 1886 Anna Kingsford—then being in London—was again in a very bad state of health. “ When the time came to quit London for home, she was prostrate and suffering beyond all previous experience.” Edward Maitland accompanied her home to Atcham ; but, he says, “ it soon became evident that the only hope of immunity from intense and constant suffering . . . lay in flight to some less unfavourable conditions of

¹ *Light*, 1887, pp. 161-162. See further as to the souls, and as to immortality of animals, Anna Kingsford’s letter, dated 8th May 1887, *Light*, 1887, p. 219.

² *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 298.

³ E. M.’s letter, dated 16th November 1885, to Mrs A.

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 222.

climate. The wrench for us all was a severe one, for we were never so happy as at the Vicarage, and it was an ideal place for study and work."¹ She determined to go to Paris; to which place she and Edward Maitland went, *via* Ostend and other places, and they arrived there sometime in October.² While in Ostend they visited Madame Blavatsky, who then was staying there.³

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 251.

² *Ibid.*, p. 260.

³ At the time of their visit—which lasted three days only (namely, from 5th to 8th October)—Madame Wachtmeister and Madame Blavatsky were living together. Some years after the death of Anna Kingsford, a book entitled *Reminiscences of H. P. Blavatsky and "The Secret Doctrine,"* written by Madame Wachtmeister, was published. In this book Madame Wachtmeister magnified the above-mentioned visit of three days into a visit of a fortnight, and her account of the visit was otherwise inaccurate—so inaccurate that, Edward Maitland says, "She misstated everything except the fact of the visit" (letter, dated 2nd March 1895, of E. M. to the Rev. J. G. Ouseley). It is necessary to bear this in mind, because it proves how little reliance can be placed on statements made by Madame Wachtmeister about Anna Kingsford in connection with this visit. Edward Maitland subsequently learnt that, after the above-mentioned visit, Madame Wachtmeister had been accustomed to depreciate Anna Kingsford "especially by alleging that in respect of diet she did not practise what she preached, and was no consistent opponent of cruelty to animals." It was not only in loose conversation that she said these things, but in writing; and of this, Edward Maitland received absolute and conclusive proof. Writing to a friend, Madame Wachtmeister said: "Anna Kingsford was not a vegetarian, so you see she could not deprecate the torturing of animals both before and at the slaughtering-houses, for she was inconsistent both in teaching and policy." In another letter she said: "You seem to be as surprised to hear that Mrs Kingsford was no vegetarian as I was myself when she and Mr Maitland begged of me to provide both fish, poultry, and birds during the time that they were the guests of Madame Blavatsky and myself at Ostend. The first evening there was only vegetable food such as I eat myself, but during the fortnight they stayed with us, I, of course, provided the food Mrs Kingsford told me she was accustomed to eat. . . ."

These statements, in so far as they make out Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland to have been flesh-eaters, at the time referred to, are, of course, absolutely untrue. The letters containing them, subsequently, came into the possession of Edward Maitland. Referring to Madame Wachtmeister's misstatements, Edward Maitland says: "How far the calumny spread, and what the injury done by it to our reputation and work, I have no means of judging. . . . Madame Blavatsky . . . made no manner of charge against us on the score alleged by her associate Madame Wachtmeister" (see *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 256-259; and letter, dated 2nd March 1895, of E. M. to the Rev. J. G. Ouseley).

I should not have thought it worth while after all these years to repeat or even refer to the "inventions" of Madame Wachtmeister, were it not for the fact that, quite recently, it has again been given out—this time in a well-known and widely read food-reform paper (*The Herald of Health*, of July 1911, p. 131)—that Anna Kingsford "took fowl." In further and conclusive proof of the inaccuracy of all such statements: when writing, on 4th March 1895, to the Rev. J. G. Ouseley of a similar statement that had been made by a certain well-known food-reformer (whom I will call "Mrs X") and which had first come to the knowledge of Edward Maitland in 1894—the statement made

On 17th November, being then in the very weak state of health that I have described, Anna Kingsford was caught in a heavy rain while returning home after going to the Pasteur Institute with a view to witnessing Pasteur's procedure and obtaining information to strengthen her hands with the public against his system. The visit had been a fruitless one, owing to her having gone at a wrong hour ; and, on her return home, she was "struck down by a severe attack of pneumonia, which for a time threatened to carry her off. But after an incredible amount of suffering—so extraordinary was her vitality—she rallied." This was the beginning of a "long and terrible illness," from which she never really recovered. It marked the beginning of the end. And it was not until 15th February of the following year (1887) that she was well enough to leave Paris, when they left for San Raphael, accompanied by her husband, who had joined them for a few days.¹ From San Raphael they went to other places, including Rome. I have referred to the impression made upon her by the habitual cruelty of the people to the animals that she witnessed while she was at Rome. On 15th July they returned to London—that then being the only place suitable for her—and took up their abode at 15 Wynnstay Gardens, which they had taken furnished, and which, so far as she was concerned, proved to be "a home to die in," her husband spending as much time with her as he could, having regard to his clerical duties.² This was the first time in her life that she really knew the pleasure of having a comfortable home of her own in which she could live ; and, at first, it did something to reanimate her with fresh energy and hope, and she continued her writing with by Mrs X having been that Anna Kingsford was "no vegetarian"—and referring to the conversation that he (Edward Maitland) had had with Mrs X on the subject of her misstatement, Edward Maitland says:—

"On demanding [from Mrs X] her authority for the statement, she said that she had seen her [Anna Kingsford] eat fish or bird at Mrs Going's in the spring of 1877. To this I replied that Mrs Going's was a vegetarian house, and she did not have such food on her table, and that was Anna Kingsford's reason for staying there. To this [Mrs X] returned that some stranger had come who required such food, and it had been got especially for her ; and that Anna Kingsford had partaken of it. I assured [Mrs X] that she must be mistaken, certainly as to *bird*. As to fish, I could not be so positive, because we did not then put fish in the same category with the warm-blooded animals : and it was so early in our spiritual work that we had not yet received positive instructions in the matter. But that even so I was confident that she [Mrs X] was mistaken. And as she had no knowledge whatever about Anna Kingsford's habits subsequent to that period, she was quite unjustified in denying her to be a vegetarian."—S. H. H.

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. pp. 274, 275, 277, 292.

² *Ibid.*, p. 299.

unimpaired vigour. Though her medical knowledge told her that, physiologically, she had no right to look for a recovery, she eagerly adopted every means which promised to conduce to a cure, including the taking of "the most nutritious diet compatible with her principles, though not such as satisfied her doctor, whom she plainly told that she preferred to die, if die she must, as a vegetarian, than to live as a flesh-eater, so greatly did she loathe the idea as well as disapprove the practice."¹ But as the weeks passed, it became only too evident that she was getting weaker and weaker. She said it would be no kindness for people to wish to keep her alive if life was to be the *rack* it had theretofore been for her.² During the time she was lying ill, she wrote a letter to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, "pleading with tenderness and power the cause of the seal and other helpless creatures who are slaughtered each year for the sake of their fur."³

In September she had to give up her press-work, by discontinuing her weekly contributions to the *Lady's Pictorial*. Even then her doctors saw no reason why she should not recover a fair share of health and live for some years "if she would consent to follow the diet prescribed by them—beef and burgundy." But Edward Maitland says: "Such an abandonment of her principles was out of the question, even if she had believed in its efficacy"⁴—which she did not. On the contrary, she considered herself as "a striking example of the beneficent effects of the Pythagorean system of diet," to which she owed her life, her health, and the vital force that she had enjoyed. In *The Perfect Way in Diet*, she said: "While occupied in a laborious six years' study of my profession at the *École de Médecine* of Paris, I overcame many obstacles and trials, physical and moral, rendered specially hard by the artificial disabilities of my sex, and by a variety of personal circumstances. Indeed, the difficulties in my case were such as would, I believe, have proved insurmountable to most persons even of robust health and physique. I, moreover, am not only burdened with an hereditary tendency to phthisis, but have been actually treated for a somewhat severe manifestation of the disease, and am, besides, of an extremely sensitive

¹ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 300. Letter of E. M., dated 4th March 1895, to the Rev. J. G. Ouseley.

² E. M.'s letter, dated 10th August 1887, to Mrs E. M. James.

³ *Pall Mall Gazette*, February 1880; see *Light*, 3rd March 1888, p. 97.

⁴ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 328.

and nervous temperament. That under all these adverse conditions I have been enabled to attain satisfactorily the end of my student's course, I owe probably in great part to the simple, pure, and unexciting diet which for a period of ten years¹ I have uninterruptedly maintained."² In a public address, she declared: "I cured myself of tubercular consumption by living on vegetable food. A doctor told me I had not six months to live. What was I to do? I was to eat *raw meat* and drink port wine. Well, I went into the country, and ate porridge and fruit, and appear to-day on this platform!"³ An obituary notice⁴ of her says: "According to her own assertion, she would have succumbed to this disease [consumption] twenty years ago but for her strict adherence to vegetarian diet." But her life was not to be spared longer, and, finally, on 22nd February 1888, in her forty-second year, this "good and faithful servant" of God was released from her "rack," and passed away to continue her work from elsewhere.

The great and high mission that Anna Kingsford came to fulfil, she fulfilled. The hard and sorrowful work that was given to her to do, she did. The agony of heart that she was called upon to suffer, she suffered. The heavy and painful burthen that was put upon her shoulders to bear, she bore—for, to her, it was none other than that "sweet yoke of Christ" which all saints embrace—and she bore it to the end: and, even then she had no thought of relaxation, for "one of her latest utterances was that she could carry on the work better from the other side, where she would be free of her physical limitations."⁵ Hers was a *divine mission*, and in fulfilling it she gave—and gave willingly—her health, her strength, her convenience, her comfort, her happiness, yea, her very *life*—all that people hold most dear—and she gave as those and those only who stand close to God can give. Her knowledge of "the cruelties perpetrated in the world, especially those enacted in the name of science, robbed life of all joyfulness for her, and made the earth a hell from which she was eager to escape."⁶

Edward Maitland survived her for a little more than nine years. But for his help and sympathy—but for his life of

¹ *The Perfect Way in Diet*, in which this passage occurs, was published in 1881.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 90, 91.

³ Address on "The Physiology of Vegetarianism," p. 113 *post*.

⁴ *Pall Mall Gazette*, February 1888; see *Light*, 3rd March 1888, p. 97.

⁵ E. M.'s letter, dated 22nd February 1888, to Mrs E. M. James.

⁶ *Life of A. K.*, vol. ii. p. 347; *Light*, 1888, p. 116.

self-sacrifice and self-abnegation—she could not have done her work: and but for him the tale of her life would not have been told. The world owes a great debt to this dear and loving soul. His remaining years were spent in editing her books, *Dreams and Dream Stories*, and *Clothed with the Sun*; and in bringing out a new (third) edition of their joint work, *The Perfect Way, or the Finding of Christ*; and in writing *The Story of the New Gospel of Interpretation*; *The Bible's Own Account of Itself*, and *The Life of Anna Kingsford*; and in writing various letters, articles, and pamphlets—many of them in the vegetarian cause—and in lecturing.

Writing in 1892, in reply to a letter from a friend about some of the Humanitarians of the day, Edward Maitland says: "While sympathising in their ends, I do not sympathise in their means, for I see in their extravagances the worst enemies of the cause they seek to serve. And I, accordingly, look upon the whole order represented by T——, K——, and Co. as *symptoms* of the prevailing disease, rather than as its physicians and healers. If, however, you have influence with any of them, I think the most effective line to take, as in regard to diet, is *not* the sake of the animals, but that of the humans; as by shewing them that the root of all progress must be within man himself; and so long as he feeds like the carnivora, he cannot be expected to be human. It is a *spiritual* regeneration that alone can better the world, one that reforms men themselves, and not institutions merely. And these folks have no idea except of the *outer*, not being themselves evolved in their spiritual part. If we can put the right spirit in man, all the rest will order itself in accordance. That was the secret and method of Jesus; and it is the line on which we are working. Of course we must not neglect the outer, but the main thing is the inner. The two act and react on each other. The world would be no better off were all the reformers of the outer only to come into power at once. For the *man* would remain the same."¹

On 14th May 1895, at a meeting of the London Vegetarian Society, Edward Maitland, in opening a discussion on the subject of "Food, Death, and Civilisation," said that "at first sight the connection between these things was not clear. But without the first, the second was inevitable. It was equally true that any quantity of food would not prevent

¹ Letter, dated 12th April 1892, to Mrs L.

death or promote civilisation. The question was : What was the salient cause of our social difficulties, dangers, and defects ; and what the radical cure ? Our manner of living was at the bottom of all, and the remedy was to be found in reverting to the natural manner of sustaining life. Our carnivorous habits sinned against the laws of nature, physical and moral : and the evil of our social condition was the consequence of a violation of those laws, which were not to be outraged with impunity, but always exacted the penalty. The prevailing evils of our social system were drunkenness, disease, and crime : and this was a consequence of the congestion of great towns and cities, causing a struggle for existence. The cause of this he attributed to our carnivorous habits driving the people into the towns to make room for the animals to feed. By resuming the natural diet (vegetable food), the populations of our towns would be spread over the land to cultivate and turn it into one vast fruit and vegetable garden, with the result of providing food and work for all, and rendering possible the education of all.”¹

Having fought “the good fight,” Edward Maitland passed away on 2nd October 1897, at the close of his seventy-third year.

From 1874, when he first met Anna Kingsford, until his death, his voice and his pen were ever active in the cause of humanity, and he ever gave of his best. His heart taught him the inhumanity, and therein the wrong and wickedness of flesh-eating. He was faithful to his intuitions : and “the generation of the faithful shall be blessed.”

I shall ever remember Edward Maitland as one of the greatest, wisest, most lovable, and best of men whom it has been my privilege to know : and, applying the words to Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland respectively, I say, with Anna Kingsford :

“Blessed is the Soul whom the Just commemorate before God ; for whom the Poor and the Orphan and the dumb Creature weep.”²

In memória aetérna erit justus :
ab auditióne mala non timébit.

SAML. HOPGOOD HART.

CROYDON, 1912.

¹ *The Vegetarian Messenger*, July, 1895

² *Hymn of Love*, in *C.W.S.*, Part ii., No. xiv. p. 273.

SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS¹

Is it morally lawful for cultivated and refined persons to impose upon a whole class of the population a disgusting, brutalising, and unwholesome occupation, which is scientifically and experimentally demonstrable to be not merely entirely needless, but absolutely inimical to the best interests of the human race ?

Butchers are the Pariahs of the western world ; the very name itself of their trade has become a synonym for barbarity, and is used as a term of reproach in speaking of persons notorious for brutality, coarseness, or love of bloodshed. The common exclamation, " What a butcher is So-and-so ! " in reference to such men, betrays the horror and reprobation with which are instinctively regarded the followers of a trade created and patronised chiefly by the " refined " classes !

In the report of a " diseased meat " case given in the *Leeds Mercury* of 6th March 1880, the ensuing passage occurs :—

" Mr J. Ellis, President of the Leeds Butchers' Association, stated that there was no disease about the lungs of the animal at all. Blood had probably been forced into them by some person jumping on the animal's body after it had been felled.

" Mr Bruce : Is it a common practice *when a beast is dying* for a person to jump upon it to force the blood out of it ?

" Witness : Yes."

In the course of the celebrated Tichborne case a certain metropolitan butcher was called to testify to the claimant's identity. This man averred that *employés* in slaughter-houses habitually make use of clogs to avoid soaking their feet in the pools of blood which continually inundate the pavements of these places. Really, when one thinks of these unfortunate and brutalised men, thus condemned by modern " civilisation "—Heaven save the mark !—to pass their days in the midst of

¹ From *The Perfect Way in Diet*, by Anna Kingsford (New Edition, 1897, pp. 61-64). See Biographical Preface, p. 42 *ante*.

spectacles and practices so foul and loathsome, taking part daily in wholesale massacres, and living only to take away life, it is impossible not to conclude that such men are deprived of all chance of becoming themselves civilised, and are consequently disinherited of their human rights and defrauded of their human dignity. And not only the slaughterers themselves, but all those who are directly or indirectly associated with this abominable traffic—cattle-drivers and dealers, meat-salesmen, their apprentices and clerks—all these live in familiar, if not exclusive, contact with practices and sights of the vilest and most hideous kind ; all these are condemned to the degradation or suppression of the most characteristic features of Humanity.

With people in general, the very look and touch of raw flesh excite a disgust which only a special education can overcome. So that in the butcher and cook persons are condemned to work which their employers deem altogether repulsive. It is absurd to suppose that if kreophagy were really natural to mankind, the sentiments in regard to butchers and their trade, to which allusion has been made, would find such spontaneous and universal expression among us. The true carnivora and omnivora have no horror of dead bodies ; the sight of blood, the smell of raw flesh, inspires them with no manner of disgust. If all of us, men and women alike, were compelled to dispense with the offices of a paid slaughterer and to immolate our victims with our own hands, the *penchant* for flesh would not long survive in polite society. It would be indeed hard to find a man or woman of the upper or middle classes who would willingly consent to undertake the butcher's duties, and go to the cattle-yard armed with pole-axe or knife to fell an ox or to slit the throat of a sheep or lamb, or even of a rabbit, for the morrow's repast. On the other hand, there is no one, however delicately bred or refined, who would not readily take a basket and gather apples in an orchard or peaches in a garden, or who, if need should arise, would object to make a cake or an omelette.

It would, alas ! require many long pages to cite the innumerable cruelties and sufferings which the gluttony and luxury of flesh-eating man impose on the innocent herb-feeders—sufferings which, whatever may be said to the contrary, are *absolutely inevitable* and inseparable from modern European habits of diet. Sufferings by sea and land, in transit

from different ports, by rail and by road, sufferings in the live-stock markets, in the pens of the slaughter-houses while waiting their turn for death, sufferings by thirst, starvation, sickness, overcrowding, cold, heat, mutilation, blows, terror, apprehension, exhaustion, neglect, to say nothing of the wanton barbarity to which they are too often subjected, such, under the present hateful and unnatural system, is the woeful lot of the patient, gentle, laborious creatures who should be ploughing our fields, and yielding us, not their flesh and blood, but milk and wool and the fruits of their willing toil.¹

¹ Here follow harrowing details, given by various eye-witnesses, of cruelties and sufferings connected with and inseparable from the cattle-traffic and the slaughter-house.

An Act consolidating and amending the law as to cruelty to animals has recently been passed. By section 1 of the Protection of Animals Act 1911, provision is made for the punishment of persons who shall be convicted of certain acts of cruelty, therein specified, to domestic or captive animals, as therein defined, but the same section contains a proviso in favour of (*inter alia*) "*the destruction, or preparation for destruction, of any animal as food for mankind*"; and in favour of coursing and hunting captive animals, and in favour of legalised vivisection. The effect of this Act is to enlarge the class of legally protected animals, but, unless a more liberal and humane construction is put upon it than was put upon the former Act—the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1849—which also was passed with the object of protecting certain animals against cruelty and ill-treatment, it will be but a poor protection: for, the judges, having decided that the former Act was directed against only *unnecessary abuse*, that is—abuse which flesh-eaters would consider to be unnecessary—held, that an act such as branding the lambs on nose with a hot iron for the purpose of their identification, was not cruel: and, while the very painful operation of dishorning cattle by sawing off their horns close to their heads for the purpose of slightly increasing their value, and for convenience in feeding and packing, was held by an English judge to be unnecessary and cruel, and therefore unjustifiable; judges in Scotland and Ireland declined to follow such holding, and decided that dishorning cattle was not an offence! It was urged, on behalf of the practice of dishorning cattle, that it made them graze better and fatten more quickly. When, in the first instance, this case came before the justices, they found that the farmer who had dishorned the cattle had "*acted under the belief that the operation was for the benefit of the animals themselves as well as for his own benefit as grazer.*" It was held, under the old Act, that a painful operation performed on an animal, if the operation was customary, and if it was performed for the purpose of *benefiting the owner by increasing the value of the animal*, was not legally cruel, even though the operation was in fact unnecessary and useless (*e.g.* the operation of spaying sows). Such was the construction put by flesh-eating judges on an Act passed for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals! It will be observed that all these cruelties were done for and on behalf of the flesh-eaters as such. For how long is this state of things to continue? So degraded has this nation of England become under a regime of flesh, that such wantonly cruel and heartless acts as the following can be openly perpetrated without remonstrance or fear of punishment, and without adverse comment in a daily paper giving publicity to them. The *Daily Express*, of 2nd November 1911, without a word of condemnation or disapprobation, says:—"A seal was seen in the Thames yesterday [All Saints Day] and chased into the Higham Canal, which joins the river at Gravesend. It was pelted with stones and finally shot."—S.H.H.

LETTERS ON PURE DIET¹

I.

It is with the most earnest satisfaction, and presage of good things to come, that all Food Reformers scattered over the United Kingdom will welcome this first appearance of a Metropolitan Journal devoted to the propagation of our faith and practice. The system we advocate is pre-eminently a scientific system, and for that very reason, it requires special organisation and special exposition to make known its bases and its value. The poor are too ignorant to comprehend its *rationale*, the rich are too indolent or too luxurious to care to trouble themselves about the subject ; it is chiefly among the middle class that our teaching is likely to find minds capable of understanding and hearts of being touched. For our system, whether we call it Dietetic Reform, Vegetarianism, or Pythagoreanism, is not *all* scientific. It appeals to the intuitional as well as to the intellectual faculties ; and it is hard to say in which direction the appeal is stronger.

On the one hand we are able to command the advocacy of Comparative Anatomy and Physiology, Chemistry, Hygiene, and Economy Social and Political ; on the other, our cause is pleaded by all the arts which beautify life and civilise

¹ These *Letters on Pure Diet*, written by Anna Kingsford, first appeared in *The Food Reform Magazine* in the months of July and October 1881, and January 1882, respectively. They were reprinted in *The Ideal in Diet*, which was published in 1898, as vol. ix. of the Vegetarian Jubilee Library. The first of these *Letters* was, in part, incorporated by Anna Kingsford in her *Lecture on Food* (p. 77 *post*), and it is reprinted here as revised or added to in such lecture. The second *Letter* was incorporated (almost verbatim) by Anna Kingsford and Edward Maitland in their third article in the controversy, "*The Perfect Way*" and *its Critics*, in *Light*, in 1882, which followed the publication of their book, *The Perfect Way* (see *Light*, 9th December 1882, p. 551, and Biographical Preface, p. 45 *ante*). The second *Letter* is reprinted here as revised or added to in the above-mentioned article in *Light* ; and such article has been also reprinted in Appendix III. of the new (Fourth) Edition of *The Perfect Way*.—S. H. H.

humanity, and—better and worthier still than these—by those just, compassionate, and gentle instincts of man, in virtue of which alone he *is* man, differing from and surpassing all lower creatures.

The Perfectionist is necessarily an abstainer from flesh. No man who aims at making his life an harmonious whole, pure, complete, and harmless to others, can endure to gratify an appetite at the cost of the daily suffering and bloodshed of his inferiors in degree, and of the moral degradation of his own kind. I know not which strikes me most forcibly in the ethics of this question—the *injustice*, the *cruelty*, or the *nastiness* of flesh-eating. The injustice is to the butchers, the cruelty is to the animals, the nastiness concerns the consumer. With regard to this last in particular, I greatly wonder that persons of refinement—aye, even of decency—do not feel insulted on being offered, as a matter of course, portions of corpses as food! Such comestibles might possibly be tolerated during sieges, or times of other privation of proper viands in exceptional circumstances, but in the midst of a civilised community able to command a profusion of sound and delicious foods, it ought to be deemed an affront to set dead flesh before a guest.

What disfigurement, too, this horrible practice of corpse-eating causes in otherwise civilised cities, replete with beautiful monuments, cathedrals, fountains, avenues, and all kinds of decorative art; where, side by side with pictures, flowers, jewels, statues and embroideries, one meets at intervals of every few yards the loathsome, foul, and indecent spectacle of slaughtered bullocks, sheep, pigs, and other animals hanging in rows, exposed to public view, the blood often trickling down from their mutilated trunks, and coagulating on the pavement!

To me it is simply amazing that human society should tolerate these things, and still more amazing that the person who objects to put carrion into his mouth should be seriously expected to adopt the position of an apologist, and required to make good his case! Surely the case makes itself sufficiently “good” on the face of it; and assuredly, also, the burden of excuse lies, not with the pure food-eater, but with the eater of flesh. *He* it is who is the innovator, *he* it is who has departed from the law of nature and from the customs of his ancestors! Shew me then, O man of prey, for what reason you slit the throat of a living creature and devour its tissues and organs,

when you may have nourishment of better value, in purer and stronger condition, without recourse to bloodshed! Shew me why you are not revolted and shocked by the contemplation of all the filthy practices and processes involved in this habit of carnage; how you reconcile the idea of the slaughter-house with ideas of progress, beauty, and gentle manners; and when you have made out your case to your satisfaction, it will be time enough for me to begin making out mine!

We all know the story of the butcher who coaxed his little son to repeat the Church Catechism on Sunday by promising that if he said it nicely he should be allowed to kill a lamb before breakfast on Monday morning. Everybody, on hearing this story, expresses horror and disgust at the notion of so dreadful a bribe being held out to a child in reward for the performance of a religious exercise. But why? In reason's name, why? If the slaughter of lambs be a virtuous and humanising business, why should not the child be initiated into his father's craft as early and as innocently as into any other? If the boy had been promised the treat of baking a loaf or planing a piece of wood by way of reward for his good conduct, the story would have shocked nobody. But, admit that slaughtering is a horrible business in itself, and the instinctive disgust becomes at once explicable. That which is base for the man is, of course, doubly vile for the innocent child.

As I write, I chance to light on a passage from a modern romance, and cannot forbear quoting from it, with slight alteration, a few portions, so well it puts one aspect of the moral side of our question.

“Cookery the divine, can turn a horrible fact into a poetic idealism, can twine the butcher's knife with lilies, and hide a carcase under roses. Men write stanzas of ‘gush’ on ‘maternity,’ and tear the little bleating calf from its mother to bleed to death in a long slow agony; send the spring-tide lamb to the slaughter; have scores of birds and beasts slain for one dinner, that they may enjoy the numberless dishes which fashion exacts; and then—all the time talking softly about *rissôle* and *mayonnaise*, *consommé* and *entremet*, *croquette* and *côtelette*, the dear gourmets thank God that they are not as the parded beasts of prey! . . . If there be a spectacle on earth to rejoice the angels, it is not man's treatment of the animals he says God has given to him! I wonder if ever He ask how men have dealt with His gift, what they will answer! If all

their slaughtered millions should answer instead of them, if all the countless and unpitied dead, all the goaded, maddened beasts from forest and desert, and all the innocent, playful little home-bred creatures that have been racked by the knives and torn by the poisons and convulsed by the torments of modern science, should answer instead—what then? If, with one mighty voice of a woe no longer inarticulate, of an accusation no longer disregarded, these oxen with their blood-shot, agonised eyes, driven to death in the slaughter-house; these sheep with their timid, woe-begone faces, scourged into the place of their doom, bruised, terrified, and tortured, should answer instead—what then? Then, if it be done unto men as they have done unto these, they will seek for mercy and find none in all the width of the universe, they will moan and none shall release, they will pray, and none shall hear.”

Well, two classes of men are chiefly to blame for all this demoralisation and suffering: the clergy, and the physicians. Both have erred and continue to err for lack of education and discernment on the one hand; and on the other, for sake of the love of popularity and power. But these questions are deep ones, and will involve a more careful and particular study than, in the limits of the present article, I am able to give them. They will form good subjects for examination at a future time, when I trust to be able to speak at some length of the true bearing both of sacred scripture and of therapeutic science on the question of flesh-eating, and to make it clear that the misapprehension which exists so widely with regard to the teaching of these two authorities, is due, not to the authorities themselves, but to misconception and misinterpretation on the part of their expositors.

II.

We may assume that the public interested in the Food Question—as in every other national question—is divisible into three sections, namely, the section led by ecclesiastical opinion, that led by medical opinion, and lastly, the independent or free thinking section which either despises or ignores the opinions of both clergy and “doctors.”

It may seem at first sight a strange thing that the advocate of pure diet should have any difficulties to contend with on religious grounds; but those who are experienced in the cam-

paign of Food Reform, know well that the average Christian, of whatever denomination, commonly regards the doctrine of abstinence from flesh as an arrant heresy. He quotes Paul on the subject, hurls Peter's vision at one's head, and triumphantly cites what he assumes to have been the practice of the Founder himself of Christianity, evidence, which for him, would clinch the argument, even if Moses and the Hebrew code of clean and unclean beasts had never been heard of. What, in the face of such arguments, is to be the reply of our advocate ?

Let us deal first with the head and front of the difficulty ; its minor points may be set in order afterwards.

Most modern Christians believe that Jesus ate not only fish, but flesh, and this impression constitutes for them clear licence and sanction to do likewise, although a careful examination of the Sacred Writings and a scrupulous comparison of the various statements made in the Gospels would go far to convince them that the probabilities of the case are strongly in favour of a wholly different view.

In the second chapter of Matthew it is stated that Jesus was a "Nazarene." The fact that the writer refers to prophecy for his authority plainly shows that he means not a Nazarene in the sense of a mere inhabitant of Nazareth, but a "Nazarite," for the reference made can only be to the declaration of Jacob (Genesis, chap. xlix. verse 26), in which the word *nâzîr* occurs for the first time in the Bible, and in the Protestant version is translated "*separate*"; to the directions given by an angel to the mother of Samson ; and to the vow of Hannah in regard to Samuel. According to ecclesiastical tradition, a Nazarene, or Nazarite, appears to have been one who wore his hair long, clothed himself in a single outer garment without seam, abstained from fermented drinks,¹ and, in the higher degrees of the order, as among the Essenes, from flesh-meats also, after the manner of John the Baptist. The belief that Jesus was one of this order is not only supported by Gospel statement, but by legendary art, based on early conviction

¹ The wine used by Jesus at the Last Supper is stated by some authorities to have been *unfermented* grape juice. Those, therefore, who believe that Jesus partook of wine in the *literal* sense, need not assume that Jesus transgressed the rule of his order. Anna Kingsford was of opinion that the connection of Jesus with bread and wine is equally mystic in its character as is that of Jesus with fish and fish-eating, and "needs no explanation for those who are acquainted with the facts and doctrines of ancient mythology and the relation of the latter to the religion of which they are the lineal ancestors" (*Light*, 1882, p. 552).

and doctrine, as is conclusively shewn by all the Christian representations of the Master, depicting Him invariably in the Nazarite garb, with flowing hair and beard. That He was an adherent of John's doctrine appears further probable from the fact that He sought and underwent baptism at the hands of the latter, and the very word "*Essene*" is derived from a root signifying "*Bather*." To be "bathed" was, therefore, to profess Essenism.

There is no evidence, written or traditional, that Jesus ever partook of flesh. The phrase, "the Son of Man is come eating and drinking," is plainly shewn by the context (in the revised edition) to refer to the eating of *bread*; and it implies that Jesus did not push abstinence to asceticism, as did John. The Paschal Lamb difficulty (in connection with the Last Supper) arises out of a simple misunderstanding, easily rectifiable. The Last Supper is shown in the gospel of John, who himself was a prominent figure on the occasion,¹ to have taken place on the evening of the thirteenth day of the month of Nisan, that is, as is many times distinctly affirmed, *before* the day of the Paschal meal, which was the fourteenth of Nisan. On this latter day (Friday) the Crucifixion itself took place, for we are told in all four Gospels that this event occurred on the preparation day of the Sabbath, which Sabbath, being also the Convocation day, was "an high day." The date of the Crucifixion is unmistakably fixed by John in the verse: "They led Jesus, therefore, into the palace (or pretorium); and it was early; and they themselves entered not into the palace, that they might not be defiled, *but might eat the Passover*." That the Crucifixion took place the day after that of the Last Supper is clearly stated by all four Evangelists, and this fact affords plain evidence that the mention of the "eating of the Passover" in relation to the Supper is an erroneous interpolation, for all of them agree that it was held on the thirteenth of Nisan (Thursday), on which day the Passover *could not have been eaten*.

But that Jesus ate fish is, if the Gospel records are to be accepted in their literal sense—an *assumption I emphatically contest*—pretty well established. Let me point out the strong indications which exist why the fish-eating and fish-catching

¹ This observation is not less pertinent if we suppose the Fourth Gospel to have been written, not by John, but *according* to John, for in either case it would record his version of the event in question.

attributed to Jesus and His disciples have, not a literal, but a parabolic and mystic meaning, precisely as have also the many references to the "cup" and to wine-drinking in the same narratives. All these allusions are related to astronomical symbology, and identify the Hero of the Christian Evangels with His ancient prototypes. It is admitted by most critics of the Sacred Scriptures that they are largely based on and governed by reference to that science, which, in earlier times, and in Eastern lands—whence both the Hebrew and Christian oracles are derived—dominated and directed all expressions, whether tabular or written, of psychic truths. The science was founded on the study of the Celestial Planisphere, and its earliest and most universal text-book was the Zodiac. The phenomenon known as the Precession of the Equinoxes causes a different sign in the Zodiac to appear at the vernal equinox about every two thousand years, and to the character of this vernal sign, prominent expression was given by the initiated, in the theological cultus of the period. Thus, history has shewn us successively the Bull (Apis) and the Lamb (Aries) as the dominant emblems of Egyptian and Jewish worship; and this latter sign has survived in Christian symbolism because Aries is always the first Zodiacal hieroglyph, and thus the permanent emblem of the one eternal year or great Sun-cycle. But the sign which actually ushered in the Christian dispensation, and which, therefore, we should expect to find reflected in the sacred legends of the period, was *Pisces*, or the Fish. Hence the Messiah, who appeared under the auspices of this sign, is portrayed as being followed by Fishers; as distributing Fishes ("the two small fishes" of the Zodiac) to His disciples; as preparing Fish for the food of His Apostles; and as Himself partaking of Fish after His resurrection. Besides, the fish is the maritime emblem, and Jesus is said to have been born of Maria and the Holy Ghost, or of Water and the Spirit. The prophet Esdras (Esdras, book ii., chap. 13) sees Christ in a vision coming up out of the sea; and the ceremony of "passing through the sea and the cloud" is still connected with the initiation into Christian doctrine. For these reasons, the Kingdom of Heaven is likened to a Net, and the Apostles are told they should be "fishers of men." Clement of Alexandria writes to his people early in the third century: "Let our signets be a Dove (the Holy Spirit), or a Fish (symbol of the water), or the heavenward-sailing Ship, or the Lyre (of

the Sea-nymph), or the Anchor." All these symbols are found in the Celestial Planisphere. In the Roman catacombs—the home of primitive Christian art—the most remarkable and the most general symbol employed to express the name of Christ was that of the Fish, which affords, significantly, a combination of everything desirable in a tessera, or mystic sign. The Greek word for fish—ΙΧΘΥΣ—contains the initials of the words—Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ Υἱὸς Σωτὴρ (Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour). Sometimes the word Ἰχθυὺς was written at length in place of the graven symbol. Augustine also applies this emblem to Jesus, and says that "He is a Fish which lives in the midst of waters." Paulinus, speaking of the miracle of the five loaves and two fishes (the mystic number of planets), alludes to Jesus as "the Fish of the living waters." Prosper refers to Him as "the Fish dressed at his death." And Tertullian calls the Christians "fishes bred in the water, and saved by one great Fish." Jerome, commending a disciple who sought baptism, tells him that, "like the Son of the Fish, he desires to be cast into the water." As thus the Messiah of the Gospels is associated with the sea and with redemption through and by water, so, with perfect reason, the successors of Peter, His chief apostle and vicar, claim as their distinctive title the name of the "Fisherman," and the ring with which each successive Pontiff is invested, in token of his office and authority, is known as the "Fisherman's Ring." It has been observed also that the mitre, characteristic of ecclesiastical authority in the Christian Church, represents a fish's head, and expresses, therefore, the relation of the wearer to the Founder of the religion inaugurated under that sign. Fish were connected in primitive Christian times with all theological ceremonies; the Saints in the sacred mysteries were called "*pisciculi*" (little fishes), and to this day the water vase at the entrance of Catholic Churches bears the name of "*piscina*." The custom of eating fish on Friday, in commemoration of the chief event in the history of Him whose Mother is identical with the genius of that day, is still common in the larger section of Christians.

We might insist at greater length on the peculiarly symbolical character of the whole twenty-first chapter of John's Gospel containing the account of the final fish-miracle, which chapter is appended as an epilogue to the Gospel itself, whose formally concluding verse closes the preceding chapter. More than one

critic has pointed out the strong probability that the episode referred to, with its curiously emphasised numerals,—seven, two hundred, a hundred and fifty and three—and the unlikely character of its literal interpretation (see the Rev. Malcolm White on the symbolical numbers of Scripture), is altogether mystical and, perhaps, prophetic in meaning. But enough has been said to indicate the reasons for attaching a sense, not historical but symbolical, to the various statements contained in the four Gospels on the subject of Christ's connection with fish and fishery, and the reason of the substitution of the fish for the lamb, which represented the former dispensation.¹

III.

Before entering on the subject of the present letter, I wish to observe concerning it and its predecessor of the last number, that the sole object of the criticisms and interpretations I am now placing before the readers of this Magazine, is to suggest to conscientious Christians a ground of reconciliation between the tenets of their faith and the practice of vegetarianism, so that they may not fancy themselves forced to conclude that religion sanctions and even inculcates that which their own secret sense of morality condemns. It may be that in the course of my exposition I may offend some, who, despite personal conviction and rule of life, yet prefer to abide by the popular exoteric sense attributed to the text of the Old and New Testaments. I beg such to have patience with me for the sake of others, who, like myself, are bent on *systematising* their thought, and to whom it is a serious difficulty to be unable to regard the personages whom sacred tradition presents to us as types of perfection, as failing in respect of one of the

¹ In a letter dated 11th April 1893, to the Rev. J. G. Ouseley, Edward Maitland, referring to the miracle of the loaves and fishes, says:—"About Jesus eating fish—the Gospels are so mystical that the word 'fish' may well be taken as symbolising the doctrine of Love or mysteries of Aphrodite the Sea-Queen, to whom the fish was sacred; while the loaves would imply the fellow mysteries of Demeter the Earth-Mother. For it was no part of a Christ's mission to provide the materials for a huge physical picnic. The multitude was famished for spiritual sustenance, and the loaves and fishes supplied by him would be of that kind." In other words: as the "loaves" represent "the Lesser Mysteries whose grain is of the Earth"; the "fishes"—which are given after the loaves—imply the Greater Mysteries, the fish being born in the "waters," which are, symbolically, of the Soul and its kingdom. The fish, therefore, represents the interior mysteries of the soul (see *The Perfect Way*, Lecture viii., par. 28; and Lecture ix., par. 10).

chief articles in the moral code by which they regulate their own lives.

In my last letter I pointed out some of the many reasons we have for supposing that the fish-eating and marine occupation attributed to Jesus and his Apostles are, as admittedly are many Bible histories, allegorical and mystical in character. And this appears the more probable, when, in support of the facts already adduced, we remember that in Hebrew scripture many passages occur connecting Messiahship and the office of the Prophet of Mercy with the Sea and Fishery; while, on the other hand, the Avenger and the function of the Prophet of Wrath are symbolised under the figures of the Hunter and the Arrow. Thus, in Jeremiah xvi. 16, "Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them; and after I will send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them." And in Ezekiel xlvii., "There shall be a very great multitude of fish, because the waters shall come thither, for they shall be healed, and everything shall live whither the river cometh. And it shall come to pass that the fishers shall stand over the waters, from Engedi even unto Eneglaim there shall be spreading forth of nets, their fish shall be according to their kinds, as the fish of the great sea, exceeding many."¹ For the net of the Fisher gathers, draws, and encloses, as does the doctrine of the Messiah of Peace, taking men's souls, not by violence, but by the attraction and subtleties of love. But the arrow of the Hunter strikes, wounds, and destroys, as does the vengeance of the Lord by the hand of those whom He appoints to be Ministers of Wrath. The first are the Sons of the Water, or of the Virgin, whose robe in all legendary art is characteristically depicted as blue; the latter are the Sons of the Fire, bearing the flaming sword of justice, and purifying the Earth as fire purifies, not by cleansing but by consuming. The perfect balance and combination of these two colours, blue and red, produces the royal purple, as the perfect harmony of love and justice characterises the Divine King.

The Messiah of the Gospels is thus associated with the sea, and redemption through and by water, as are His prototypes,

¹ A note on this text in the Douay Version of the Bible, says, "These waters are not to be understood literally, but mystically, of the baptism of Christ, and of his doctrine and grace; the trees that grow on the banks are Christian virtues; the fishes are Christians, that spiritually live in and by these holy waters; the fishermen are the apostles, and apostolic preachers."

Noah, Moses, and Jonah, all of whom were saviours, and messengers of mercy.

It remains to speak of the sense in which, from the vegetarian Christian's point of view, may be understood certain allusions to flesh-eating in the parables recorded by the Evangelists. The most notable of these allusions occurs in the story of the Prodigal Son, on whose return home "the fatted calf" is slain. We may, I think, regard this statement and others of a similar character,—including the account of Peter's vision,¹—as belonging to a class of illustrations—frequent in both Old and New Testaments—which, though based upon common and popular practices and customs, cannot be taken as intended either to sanction or to perpetuate them. For if such illustrations are to be held commendatory of flesh-eating, we should, on the same ground, be forced to admit that Jesus approved the institution of slavery; since, not only in His own teaching and in that of His apostles, nothing appears against it; but in Luke xvii. 9, we find a verse which can hardly be regarded as representing our modern views of what should be the conduct of a Christian master towards his servant. It may be noted also, that the word translated "servant" in this verse, and generally so translated throughout the New Testament, is not *μισθωτης*—one who serves for hire,—as in the parable of the Prodigal Son, and in Mark i. 20; or even *οικέτης* as in Peter's admonitory address, but *δούλος*,—a slave, a bondman. We do not need to be reminded that for many years serious opposition to the Anti-Slavery movement was

¹ The fact that Peter, while he understood the vision as a command to "kill and eat," *refused* to obey the command—a command, be it remembered, thrice uttered,—notwithstanding his hunger and desire to eat, proves, conclusively, that he, like his Master, was, *on principle*, a non-eater of such foods as come within the description of the animals which, in his vision, he saw let down in the sheet, viz. :—"All manner of four-footed beasts, and creeping things of the earth, and fowls of the heaven": a description that embraces and includes the very foods which are abjured by non-flesh eaters. Peter declined to do what he was not in the habit of doing, and what was revolting to his moral nature, and it is not without significance that at the time when he so declined to "kill and eat" he was "upon the house-top" of his higher consciousness. He was in the place of communion with God. How, in the face of this, Peter's vision can be regarded as an argument *in favour* of flesh-eating, I fail to understand. If it should be argued that Peter's vision at least represents God as being in favour of or not against flesh-eating, the answer is:—as Peter's vision, admittedly, was *not* intended as a command to Peter to kill and eat any animal, but to teach him not to call any man common or unclean, it cannot be used to shew that God has ever commanded or that He approves of flesh-eating.—S. H. H.

offered by "religious" persons, on the ground that the inspired writers of both Old and New Testaments not only abstain from condemning the institution of slavery, but even provide codes of laws, penal and otherwise, for regulating the mutual relations of masters and bondmen. Precisely the same observations apply to questions concerning the social position of women, which, in spite of biblical and apostolical restraint, tends every year to grow worthier and nobler. In our times no Christian community exists that would not be ashamed to accept the laws formulated in the Old Testament with regard to marriage, plurality of "wives," the punishment of infidelity in the woman, the relations between parent and child, the conduct of war, the treatment of prisoners, and the like; to none of which, however, do we hear that Jesus took any serious exception. For even in the story of the woman "taken in adultery," the law which adjudged her to death by stoning is not condemned, but only its administration by the hands of those present on the occasion. In the same manner modern thought and experience have greatly modified the powers and authority of princes, which at the time of the Apostles were despotic and tyrannous. Yet the principle of this tyranny is nowhere condemned. Instances still more startling may be found in the prophecy of Hosea, who, as a "sign," is twice commanded to commit what Christians would consider a gross offence against morality (Hosea i. 2, and iii. 2); in Kings xxii. 22, 23, where we find the "Lord" giving a direct sanction to falsehood; in the blessing pronounced on the treacherous and cruel Jael: in the Divine instigation attributed to the act of the murderer Ehud (Judges iii. 15), and in analogous cases, too numerous even for mention.

Truth to tell, the "letter" of the scriptures is not that which Christians should regard as itself the veritable "word," for not only is the "letter" in most instances unimportant, but it even "killeth"; that is to say, that, if exclusively venerated, it destroys the reason and the moral conscience. The "spirit" alone it is which "giveth life," and it is precisely this "spirit" of Christ, which is also the spirit of freedom and justice, that has led men step by step to liberate their fellows from hereditary chains and slavery; to curtail the despotism of monarchs; to observe international courtesies in time of war; to spare the families of the vanquished from outrage and murder; to emancipate women from servitude and enforced seclusion,—

a work yet far from completion ;—and, last and latest, to recognise the rights of dumb beings and the duties their human brethren owe them. The living Christ in man it is who has done and is doing work like this ; the Christ-spirit which reforms institutions by first reforming men.

A LECTURE ON FOOD¹

It requires rather a course of lectures than a lecture to treat adequately, and in all its bearings, the subject upon which you have invited me to address you. For it is one which, being appropriately plant-like in nature, has many root-fibres, which penetrate into various strata of knowledge and experience, and the shadow it casts extends over a vast area of thought, related as well to the future as to the past.

I might, for instance, invite your attention to the consideration of human dietetics in the light of history. I might point to the opening of the Kabbalistic Book of Genesis, the origin of which is undoubtedly Indo-Egyptian, as evidence of the teaching of the sacred mysteries in regard to the nature of the food proper to man in an unfallen state ; or I might cite to you the famous passages in which Ovid describes the Golden or Arcadian Age, when, " contented with the food which nature freely gave, men were happy in the fruit of trees, and herbs of earth, nor stained their lips with blood." And I might point out to you further, what also Ovid well shews in the speech he puts into the mouth of the Samian sage ; how, with the odious practice of flesh-eating, came likewise that of bloody sacrifice and aggressive war,—a dismal triad, whose mutual relations are nowhere so forcibly and graphically portrayed as in the *Iliad* of Homer. But that I do not desire to weary you with quotations and references, I might remind you of the teachings of that purest and noblest school of Greek philosophy to which Pythagoras gave his name, and which, through the influence of his disciples of a later age, Porphyry and Iamblichus, became the parent of Neo-platonism ; I might cite the letters of Seneca to Lucilius ; Plutarch's celebrated *Essay on Flesh-*

¹ This lecture was given by Anna Kingsford on the 24th April 1882, before the Students of Girton College, Cambridge ; " And Inscribed to them with Sincere Regard." It was printed as a pamphlet, a second edition of which was issued in 1884, by the Vegetarian Society (Manchester).

Eating, and certain passages from the *Republic* of Plato, the chief exponent in which dialogue is Socrates ; I might speak of Tertullian's treatise on abstinence from animal meats, in which he criticises Paul's observations on the subject ; and of works having a similar import from the pens of Clement of Alexandria and Chrysostom the Golden-mouthed. I might recall to your minds the innumerable army of prophets, heroes, saints, hermits, and fathers of both Orient and Occident, whose practice, whether as Magi, Therapeuts, Brahmans, Buddhists, Nazarites, Essenes, Ebionites, or Gnostics, was identical with that of the modern school of Akreophagists. Or, quitting antiquity, I might speak to you of Gassendi, Ray, Cheyne, Antonio Cocchi, Rousseau, Wesley, Nicholson, Lambe, Swedenborg, Gleizes, Graham, Lamartine, Struve, Shelley the king of poets, and many another illustrious or well-remembered name.

But as my time is brief and my theme long, I must content myself with only a scant indication of the witness borne to the doctrines of our School by the great and gifted of bygone and present times, and pass on to touch on a few points of more practical and immediate interest.

I shall say first a few words in relation to the anatomical, physiological, and chemical aspects of human dietetics ; next I shall speak of the economical, sanitary, and æsthetic bearings of the question ; lastly, I shall give a few suggestions which may help you to formulate a more complete and satisfactory code of social and personal ethics than that commonly enunciated from modern pulpits and platforms.

Whether we adopt the theory of the Evolutionists or that of the Creationists—and I may as well say at the outset that I hold the former, as containing the only intelligible and scientific explanation of natural order and phenomena—we must equally admit the Linnæan classification of animals, by which man is placed in the same series as the Ape family. All the characteristics of the human creature are equally those of the higher Primates, and in particular of the orang-outang, the gorilla, and the chimpanzee. Their cranium, their cerebral convolutions, their teeth and dental morphology, their jaw action and glandular appendages, their stomach, liver, and alimentary canal, their hands adapted for fruit-gathering and tree-climbing—all these, refined and elaborated, are distinctly human in character, and differ in every particular from the

carnivorous attributes of predacious beasts on the one hand, and on the other, from those of the ruminant herbivora. Now the Ape family, man included, are all naturally frugivorous. The food of the anthropoids is derived from tree and grain produce, and though some of the tribe are great egg-suckers and insect-hunters, these pursuits are incidental only, and are clearly due, especially as regards the latter, to the curiosity and love of mischief which characterise alike the ape and the savage man. In no zoological collection that I ever yet heard of is the ape or the monkey supplied with any flesh food, or even with animal products. The rations served daily to these creatures in the Jardin des Plantes at Paris, and in the gardens of the Zoological Society of London, consist of rice, potatoes, apples, bread, and salad. Pouchet, Owen, Cuvier, Linné, Lawrence, Bell, Gassendi, and Flourens all agree in attributing a frugivorous nature to man. Flourens says: "Man is neither carnivorous nor herbivorous. He has neither the teeth of the cud-chewers, nor their multiple stomachs, nor their intestines. If we consider these organs in man, we must conclude him to be by nature frugivorous, as is the ape."

Now, the digestive apparatus of the family to which man belongs, may, broadly speaking, be divided into three separate receptacles and laboratories, to each of which a distinct function is appropriated. These three departments are the stomach, the intestines, and the liver, and to each corresponds a special chemical division of alimentary substances, known to modern science respectively as nitrogenous, fatty, and starchy foods. The first-named group, the nitrogenous foods, are fourfold in constitution, containing carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen, with traces of sulphur and phosphorus. Nitrogenised compounds are obtainable from both vegetable and animal sources, and their forms are known as albumen, fibrine, caseine, gelatine, and chondrine. In vegetables they are procurable chiefly from seeds; in animals, from muscular tissue. The first three substances, albumen, fibrine, and caseine, appear primarily in the vegetable kingdom, and are known to chemists as *proteinaceous* substances. By this term it is meant that by the action of heat and an alkali these three forms of nitrogenised matter furnish a new substance called *protéine*, produced in the process by transformation only, and this fact serves to distinguish them from gelatine and chondrine, pro-

ducts of animal origin, which, although nitrogenised, are not capable of yielding proteine. Albumen, fibrine, and caseine, identical in both organic kingdoms as regards nature and properties, differ slightly from one another. *Albumen* contains a considerable proportion of sulphur and phosphorus, and exists in both the soluble and the coagulated state, the latter condition being due to the application of heat above the ordinary temperature. It forms the substance known as "white of egg," which when raw is fluid, and becomes solid by being subjected to a process of cooking. It is contained in all the cereals, in all seeds, and in the juices of most herbaceous vegetables. *Fibrine* differs from albumen by its characteristic tenaciousness, and by the fact that it coagulates without heat. More sulphur is present in fibrine than in albumen. In the animal system fibrine is the material which forms the basis of muscular tissue and the thickening substance of the blood. In vegetables it constitutes the basis of gluten—the firm portion of seeds and grains. *Caseine* neither coagulates spontaneously, as does fibrine, nor by heat, as does albumen. It contains sulphur, but no phosphorus. It is obtainable from milk, and therefore from all milky compounds, and from all peas, beans, and other leguminous seeds.

Not long ago the view taken by scientific men of the uses of proteinaceous food was a very different one from that which recent observation and inquiry seem to have satisfactorily established as correct. In accordance with Liebig's hypothesis, nitrogenous (or proteine-giving) material used to be regarded as the only and exclusive source of muscular and nervous *power*. It was held that nitrogenous matter, after becoming incorporated with muscular tissue and passing through that condition, disintegrated in the system into two constituent parts, one of which was eliminated from the body as waste material, and the other retained for the production of heat and energy. Thus, it was thought, all food must become *organised tissue* before it can contribute to force production; and the tissues of the body being consumed in the manifestation of functional activity, and exhausted by metamorphosis into force, nitrogenous matter must be constantly ingested to replace the double loss and expenditure involved. Although *partially* true, this hypothesis erred in attributing to nitrogenised food the work of supply of power as well as of repair of tissue. In fact, the force evolved by muscular

action does not, as Liebig supposed, proceed from destruction of muscular tissue ; his assumption to this effect having been abundantly disproved by the analysis of the effete matters thrown off from the system during muscular exertion, and by careful research undertaken by numerous investigators, and based both on experiment and on arithmetical calculation. The truth appears to be that the property of proteinaceous foods is pre-eminently to serve as material for the development and for the renovation of the various tissues and secretions of the economy. As waste is perpetually occurring alike in muscular, nervous, and glandular tissue, and as a vast quantity of secreted juices is constantly expended in the work of the vital processes, it is of great importance that nitrogenous aliment sufficient to compensate these losses, and to repair the substantial elements of the economy, should be ingested daily.

All the various groups of nitrogenous food are digested in the stomach by means of the gastric juice, a secretion having an acid reaction, and of which the active elements are a soluble ferment called pepsine—whereby albuminous foods are converted into peptones—and an acid, closely resembling in nature and characteristics the mineral product known as hydrochloric or muriatic acid. The effects of the gastric juice on the three chief groups of nitrogenous food, viz., albumen, fibrine, and caseine, differ slightly in detail, but under its influence *all* are liquefied, dissolved, transformed, and rendered fit for assimilation. This digestive process is greatly aided by animal heat, and by the mechanical action set up during the operation in the muscular walls of the organ itself, which, like every other organ of the living body, is intelligent in its functions and takes an active part in the offices of life. From the stomach, the liquefied food, or chyme, is passed on into the next digestive department, where, if necessary, it is further elaborated, and in which the process of absorption commences.

The nitrogenised foods in ordinary use in this country are more commonly derived from the animal than from the vegetable kingdom. They comprise milk and cheese, eggs, lean flesh-meats, poultry, game, and fish ; beans, haricots, peas, lentils, all the cereals, nuts, and some herbs. Of these various materials, the proportion of nitrogen yielded by flesh, poultry, game, and fish is much less than that yielded by an

equal percentage of cheese and vegetable matter. Beef and mutton, for instance, give an average of 18 per cent. of nitrogen; pork and ham, 8 per cent. ; white fish, 17 per cent. ; while cheeses range in nitrogenous value from 25 to 44 per cent., and the bean tribe from 25 to 30 per cent. There is thus, *a priori*, a greater advantage in nitrogenous value to be derived from a given amount of vegetable and milk food than from the same amount of flesh meat. But there is another consideration, important to the *human* being who desires not only that his food should be nutritious but that it should be *pure*. Comestibles of every kind, and nitrogenised foods in particular, contain, besides nutritive matter, elements improper to assimilation, and destined to be rejected by the economy as waste or "ash." These elements are divisible into two categories: substances innutritious by their nature but not impure or vitiated in constitution, such as cellulose, and the woody fibre of plants and all *vegetable* products; and substances both innutritious and vitiated, such as are contained in the juices of flesh meats.

The finest and healthiest animal tissue is always permeated by blood, for it is impossible, unless by processes which would utterly ruin it as food, to separate blood from the solid material everywhere pervaded by the circulating vessels. Flesh and blood are therefore virtually inseparable, and their component elements are continually interchanging. Now, as the blood is the vehicle of the sewage of the body, as well as the medium of reconstitution, it contains always two kinds of materials, of which part represents nutrition and part impurity and decomposition. In eating animal flesh, we consume, therefore, as well as the healthy and nutritive matter momentarily fixed in the tissue, certain substances in course of expulsion, decaying products returning into the blood, and destined for elimination from the body of the animal by the various channels appropriated to waste residue. These matters, in process of "retrograde metamorphosis," are known to chemists by such names as creatine, creatinine, xanthine, protagon, tyrosine, sarcosine, inosic, formic, and butyric acids, and so forth.

I do not now speak of the innumerable perils and disgusting associations connected with the eating of *diseased* flesh. These will be touched on when we come to the sanitary considerations of our subject. I desire in this place to point out what impurities and degenerate products are *inevitably*

consumed by every kreophagist, be he never so fastidious, careful, or delicately served.

As the stomach is physiologically related to the digestion of nitrogenous compounds, so are the intestine and the liver to that of fatty and starchy foods. These foods differ from nitrogenous aliments in their constitution, which, instead of being fourfold, comprise three elements only—carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen. The fatty substances are called by chemists, hydro-carbons; and the starches and sugars, carbo-hydrates. The first group contains carbon, hydrogen, and a *small* amount of oxygen; the second comprises carbon, with hydrogen and oxygen in the exact proportion of two volumes of hydrogen to one of oxygen, H_2O —the formula of water. To the hydro-carbons belong all the vegetable oils, yielded by seeds, nuts, stems, etc., and all the animal fats—butter, lard, suet, and dripping. To the carbo-hydrates belong substances obtainable—with one single exception—only from the vegetable kingdom—starch, sugar, gum, fruit-jelly, and cellulose.

Modern experimentation in physics, aided by the application of chemical analysis, has demonstrated that as nitrogenous food corresponds to the development and renovation of living material, so carbonaceous food, of both groups above named, corresponds to the production in the living organism of heat, and consequently of force,—heat and force being mutually convertible. And although, from a chemical point of view, it is necessary to distinguish between the hydro-carbons and the carbo-hydrates—the proportion of oxygen being uniformly larger in the latter than in the former—the physiological uses and character of the two groups may be said to be identical. Both pass through the stomach without change, both are digested in the small intestine, both appear to be finally assimilated under the same form, and both are charged with the function of heat and force production.

Fatty substances—hydro-carbons—consist chemically of a principle possessing acid properties, called fatty acid, in combination with a *radical*. A “radical” in chemical language is a composite body forming a molecular group capable of acting as a simple body in combination, and transferable from one combination to another in exchange for one or more atoms of hydrogen or its representatives. Fats, under which head, of course, oils are included, are decomposed by alkalies, and by certain ferments contained in the juices of the small

intestine. These juices are three in number,—the intestinal, secreted by the small glands of the intestine itself; the pancreatic, secreted by the pancreas; and the bile, secreted by the liver. The last-named secretion, however, appears to take no active part in digestion; and although physiologists have long disputed its function, the general tendency now is to regard it as destined to play the part rather of scullion than of cook in the culinary department in which it officiates. That is to say, that while the process of digestion is going on in the intestine, the bile does not arrive on the scene at all; but when the work of the other juices is pretty nearly finished—when the endothelium or superficial cells which line the intestine and take part in the act of absorption, have begun to peel off and decorticate—then the bile flows in, sweeps away these deteriorated cells, cleans down the whole laboratory, renews its surface, and puts everything in order for new work. Thus it prevents putrid fermentation of the intestinal contents, and repairs the mucous lining of the alimentary canal. But to the intestinal glandular secretion, and especially to the pancreatic juice, is committed the operation of the digestive process. The main part of this process, the emulsification of all the fats and oils, is performed almost exclusively by the pancreatic juice, an alkaline secretion which flows into the intestine immediately on the arrival of the food, and of which the active principle is a mixture of three particular ferments. The fat is thus broken up, and parted into very minute globules, such as are contained in milk, and in this condition it is sucked up and absorbed by the little cellular projecting tubes which line the intestine. Upon starch and other amyloid matters, comprised under the term carbo-hydrates, and belonging therefore to the second group of non-nitrogenised solid foods, the action of the intestinal juices is equally strong. Although these are destined to undergo their final transformation elsewhere, it is in the intestine that they become converted into sugar, which, passing by virtue of its diffusibility into the circulating current of the blood-vessels, is thus conveyed by the portal system into the liver. It is not precisely determined by what physiological process this saccharine matter eventually becomes absorbable by the organism, but that the process, whatever its details, takes place in the liver, and that it is ultimately in the form of fatty matter that all sugary material is utilised in the human

body, appear, according to modern writers, to be indubitable facts.

Of hydro-carbons or fats, the most valuable, but unfortunately the least known and used in this country, are derived from vegetable sources. These are much more digestible and suitable food than the animal fats, partly on account of the assured purity and freedom from disease of their origin, and partly on account of their more sound and wholesome nature, less liable to decomposition and alteration than fats obtained from beasts. The best-known vegetable oil is that of the olive, procured from the fruit by pressure. In France this oil is largely replaced by *huile d'olive*, expressed from poppy seeds, and which, being tasteless, is most valuable for cooking purposes. The seeds of the sunflower yield 40 per cent. of oil, and oils of very fine quality are also procurable in large quantities from linseed, cotton-seed, mustard-seed, rape-seed, sesamum, the seeds of the common cucumber, and other grains. Seed-oils are largely used in the East, where the national religious customs preclude the use of animal fats. Palm oil is, like olive oil, a fruit product, and is obtained from the pericarp of a palm-tree growing in tropical Africa. All nuts, of whatever kind, contain oil in large quantities, and some, as the almond and cocoa nut, are extensively used in commerce for the sake of their richness in this respect. *Solid* vegetable oils, or butter, are procurable from several species of Indian and African plants. The seeds of the Indian "butter-tree" contain a substance which in the fresh state resembles animal butter, but which hardens gradually, and becomes suet-like in consistence. "This butter," says Mungo Park, in his *Travels in Africa*, "besides the advantage of keeping sweet the whole year round without salt, is whiter, firmer, and to my taste, of a richer flavour than the best butter made from cow's milk." Dr Pavy tells us that the growth and preparation of this commodity seem to be among the first objects of African industry, and to constitute a main article of the national commerce.

The carbo-hydrates, with one single exception only, come to us from the vegetable kingdom. The exception is lactine, or sugar of milk. True, a substance analogous to starch is found in the liver, and under certain diseased conditions in flesh tissue, but for alimentary purposes these sources are not available. Sugar is of three kinds: milk-sugar (just named),

cane-sugar—the crystallised variety in common use, extracted from stems and roots—and grape-sugar, procurable from every kind of fruit. Honey is also a vegetable product, being collected from flowers by the insects whose food it is. It appears that in the living human organism sugar is more readily assimilable than most substances; and if the deductions of physiologists are trustworthy, it plays so necessary a part in vital processes, that, as Dr Edward Smith observes, “it may be doubted whether the loss of any one element of food would be so keenly felt as that of sugar. It enters universally into the dietaries of every class of mankind in every place.” In fact, physiology has demonstrated that *grape* sugar, under which form *cane* sugar and all saccharine compounds are assimilated, performs in the living body certain indispensable functions beyond that of heat and force production. It excites and assists the digestive processes, furnishes abundant chyle, and probably stimulates the secretion of the salivary glands, always more copious and necessary in fruit- and grain-eating animals than in predaceous mammals. Dr Playfair, in his dietaries, while allotting to nitrogenous matter a proportion of four ounces only, and to fatty substances two ounces, considers carbo-hydrates—starch and sugar—necessary to the extent of seventeen or eighteen ounces daily.

Starchy substances are usually described as farinaceous foods. The articles of this nature chiefly in use among us are sago, tapioca, cassava, arrowroot, potato, semolina, rice, vermicelli, macaroni, and all the meals and beans generally. It must be borne in mind that these foods, especially the corn- and bean-meals, represent also the prime sources of nitrogenous food. Dry common wheat contains on an average 77 per cent. of hydrates of carbon, and from 15 to 20 per cent. of nitrogenous material. Barley-meal, rye-meal, quinoa-meal, buck-wheat, maize, and oatmeal give an average of about 70 per cent. of carbo-hydrates and 12 of nitrogen, the rest being made up of oily matter and salts.

The type of all human foods—bread—comes to us from the vegetable world, and the fact that this aliment is popularly regarded as the “staff of life,” and the poetical equivalent of all possible forms of nutritive matter, is in perfect accord with the estimate of science; for as fruit, or grain—which botanically are identical—is the most highly vitalised, solarised, pure, and essential product of organic life, so the food which is

composed of grain is the most precious to the human economy. In the wheat-grain are contained all the elements necessary for the fulfilment of the twofold function of alimentation of which I have already spoken. The cells of the central part of the grain contain starch, whereby are produced force and heat; the cells underlying the husk contain nitrogenous substance, whereby tissues are built up; and in the outer sheathings are found the phosphates and other mineral materials which enter into the constitution of the animal economy. The wheat-grain is thus a microcosmic epitome of the various classes of food with which physiological chemistry has made us acquainted.

Thus it is obvious that from the vegetable kingdom are derived the best and purest forms of human alimentation. This kingdom not only supplies us abundantly with the agents of heat and labour, the animal sources of which are totally inadequate to meet our needs, but it yields us also food of a nitrogenous character, infinitely healthier, more cleanly, and richer in value than the flesh of any beast or fowl. For these reasons among many others, it seems evident that in the operations of normal evolution, plant-life must everywhere precede animal-life; and that the carnivorous groups of the latter are to be regarded rather as the result of a degradation from, or retrogression in, the process of natural development—due to incidental disasters—than as the outcome of its orderly march.

I have not time, in view of the many important subjects which press for consideration, to enter upon the question of the relation of food to national resources. It is a question of profound interest and import to the political economist, the farmer, the landlord, the peasant-tenant, and the philanthropic reformer, and needs a treatise to expound its manifold bearings. But, leaving this momentous subject untouched, the question of food economy is interesting from a social and domestic, as well as from a national point of view. A great part of the burden of poverty, which in most of our large centres presses so severely on the labouring classes, would be removed were a cheaper system of diet introduced into their homes. It has just been shewn that many inexpensive kinds of vegetable food contain a percentage of nutritive material, both nitrogenous and carbonaceous, greatly exceeding that which can be obtained from costly joints of flesh-meat, the

waste of which in cooking averages from a third to half the original weight. An outlay of a shilling in oatmeal, peas, lentils, or beans will purchase as much nutriment as five shillings expended on butcher's meat. An idea of the immense economy which might be effected by a more judicious use and distribution of food-stuffs than that at present in vogue, may be gathered from Mr Hoyle's computation, that if the six million families of the United Kingdom were to reduce their consumption of butcher's meat by a pound's weight only a week, it would give a saving of ten or more million pounds sterling per annum.

If there be a moral lesson to be got out of statistics relating to domestic expenditure, it is one which pre-eminently concerns our national school boards. Let the authorities who hold in their hands the guidance of the rising generation, and therefore the immediate future of the country, take up the question of food-supply and domestic economy in a practical form, and teach the boys and girls committed to their care how to make the most out of the wages they will earn when they grow to be men and women. Let the children of the people be taught the values of food-stuffs, and the elements of organic chemistry—a kind of learning which would be of far more practical service to them than much of that which the "standards" now require, and the results of which would, in the best sense, be productive of civilisation and prosperity. And let attention, moreover, be given to the instruction of the girls in the science and resources of housekeeping, with special reference to the neglected art of vegetable cookery, and of making savoury and appetising dishes out of inexpensive materials. As a rule, the poor, and even the middle classes, in England have no idea of cookery as applied to any other material than animal meats. Boiled potatoes and cabbage, or potatoes "baked under the joint," express the limit of the popular notions with regard to vegetable comestibles. And in proportion to the restriction of their resources in this respect the people's health and purses suffer.

There is far greater perspicacity and economy shewn with regard to the choice of foods among the peasant classes on the Continent. In Switzerland, Germany, Norway, Italy, Spain, Holland, Belgium, and France, flesh-meat is rarely seen on the tables of agricultural labourers, and the omelette, the home-made cheese, the maccaroni stew, the *olla podrida*, the *pot-au-*

feu, take the place of the indigestible joint of pork, the steak pie, or the uncleanly tripe, which in this country consume the family earnings and preclude expenditure upon real necessities. For need of the proper instruction, which might be given in the national schools, but of which, alas! the instructors themselves stand in need, the poor are universally impressed with the belief that the prime source of all nourishment worth the name is to be found in butcher's meat, and to obtain this desideratum they will sacrifice in one day a sum which, spent with knowledge, would suffice for a week's comfort.

It is not by taking yearly more of our home lands from tillage and labour and laying them waste for rearing cattle that we shall increase either national prosperity or the material welfare of families. Such means as these carry with them three inevitable and direct evil tendencies, of which the first is to increase the chances of cattle epidemics by overstocking, and by the artificial feeding and rearing of farm-beasts for the market,—both fruitful sources of peril, especially as regards the production of entozoa, or worm affections, the varieties of which among stall-fed animals are very great. The second evil tendency is to throw out of work a large number of agricultural labourers, and to depopulate the country by diminution of the quantity of available food produced, thus fostering distress and bringing about enforced emigration. And the third evil consists in the multiplication of slaughter-houses, meat-markets, depots for offal and hides, tanneries, and many offensive and unhealthy trades connected with the butcher's avocation in and near large cities, thereby detracting enormously from the beauties and pleasures of civilised life, and increasing proportionately its discomforts, and the risks of infectious fevers, zymotic contagion, and diseases arising from the decomposition of animal matter.

We thus come to the consideration of a few facts related to the sanitary aspect of kreophagy.

Dr Creighton, addressing the Medical Congress of 1881 on the subject of "Diseases communicated to Man by the Meat and Milk Supply," said :—

"One ground of our alarm on this subject is that tubercle—or, as it is called, pearl disease—is quite common in the species of animals to which we trust so implicitly—one might almost say, so blindly—for a large part of our food. . . . The disease

is inherited and chronic, and may be present for years in the body of an animal and give rise to no symptoms. The distinctive formations of the disease are sometimes found in animals that have been slaughtered in (apparently) perfect condition. But the disease in its worst form . . . is mostly met with in milch cows. . . . The cow-houses in or near large towns are said to contain the largest proportion of diseased animals; the close confinement throughout the whole year, the artificial food, the want of fresh air and of sunlight, all tending to bring out the disease. The cows are milked as long as it is profitable to milk them, and they are then sold out of the herd, probably to the butcher. . . . Without adopting alarmist estimates . . . there need be no hesitation in concluding that the milk of cows in a more or less advanced state of tubercular disease is constantly being consumed both by infants and by adults. . . . As for the flesh, there are the lymphatic glands and viscera, and inferior parts of the carcass, such as the diaphragm, or 'skirt,' which are especially liable to have the actual tubercular nodules adhering to them, or more or less intimately blended with them. These inferior parts of the animal are sold at a cheap rate to the poor, and there is neither popular prejudice nor legislative enactment to hinder the tubercular meat from being sold. . . . Two days ago I sent a trustworthy person to certain slaughter-houses in London, with instructions to bring me specimens of pearl nodules from as many animals as he could find. He brought specimens from four old cows which were slaughtered in his presence. The lungs were riddled with purulent cavities; the meat would be sold at about fourpence a pound to be made into sausages and saveloys. There is, then, no doubt at all that the species of domestic animals which is so much in our confidence that we drink of one of its secretions, and eat of its flesh, and even of its viscera, is a species that is widely tainted with tubercular disease. That alone is fact enough to cause uneasiness. . . . On the 22nd of July 1881, I took the opportunity of attending a meeting of the National Veterinary Congress, and heard from a veterinary surgeon of Peterborough a narrative which brought out the value of our present evidence. A cow, which he knew professionally to be in an advanced state of tuberculosis, was sold out of a large farm for £5; the purchaser kept the cow for the exclusive supply of his family with milk and butter. Since then, the man's wife and one of

his children had died of rapid consumption, and the man himself was now also dying of the same disease."

In the course of the discussion which followed Dr Creighton's paper, Dr A. Carpenter observed that it had been shown by "evidence given in a court of law that ninety per cent. of the animals which were slaughtered for the Metropolitan Meat Market were more or less infected with tubercle. It was shown too that this was almost universally the case in cows which had become barren. . . . Meat and milk from diseased beasts could not be healthy; and so long as animals were kept in close, ill-ventilated sheds, disease would abound among them. The time must come," he thought, "when they would be kept in the manner which nature designed them to be, viz. in the open fields of the country only."

This last remark of Dr A. Carpenter is certainly sagacious, but it necessarily assumes a vast reduction in the quantity of flesh-meat and milk consumed. For the "open" pastures of this country would not support enough cattle in the "natural" condition of which he speaks to meet a fifth part of the present demand for animal food.

In the same section of the Congress, Mr F. Vacher presented an address on "The Influence of Various Articles of Food in spreading Parasitic, Zymotic, Tubercular, and other Diseases." Corroborating Dr Creighton, he said:—

"The foods which alone can spread their own diseases to the subjects by whom they are ingested are necessarily meat and milk, or their derivatives. There is abundant evidence in support of the view that foot-and-mouth disease may be spread to the human subject by means of milk, also tubercle: and as regards meat, there is evidence that a specific disease may be communicated to man by the ingestion of meat tainted with splenic fever or anthracoid disease, and erysipelas (a common symptom in many animal diseases) may spread to man by means of flesh. . . . Other diseases can be spread by means of meat infected by entozoa."¹

¹ "*Scarlet Fever and Butcher's Meat.*—The rapidly accumulating evidence as to the influence of food in spreading infectious disease has recently received a remarkable addition at the hands of Dr Robertson, who, in his last annual report on the health of the Penrith Rural District, includes an account of several cases of scarlet fever, which he is strongly inclined to believe were communicated through butcher's meat. In a butcher's family there was an exceedingly mild case of scarlet fever, so mild that no medical man was called in,—the disease, in fact, not being recognised; but the free desquamation of the skin, and the former history of slight fever with sore throat,

Mr Ernest Hart, in a long and careful paper, fortified by copious statistics, proved that typhoid fever, scarlatina, and diphtheria had been all largely propagated by the use of milk.

"There is nothing," he said, "in the analogy of epidemics to limit the list to these three maladies, and already we are seeing indications of other cognate diseases being spread by the same agency. The number of epidemics of typhoid fever recorded in the abstract as due to milk is fifty; of scarlatina, fifteen; and of diphtheria, seven. The total number of cases during the epidemics traced to the use of infected milk may be reckoned in round numbers as 3500 of typhoid fever, 800 of scarlet fever, and 500 of diphtheria. When it is remembered that barely ten years ago we were utterly ignorant that milk was a carrier of infection, and that all these observations have been taken within one short decade, it will be seen how vitally important is the safe-guarding of our milk supplies from contamination. That so common an article of food as milk should be so readily capable of absorbing infection is a question of the

leaves no doubt as to the nature of the illness. The occurrence of such a case in a small house, and where no precautions were taken, renders it an easy matter to spread the disease in the manner Dr Robertson suggests. The number of cases in the neighbourhood continued to increase, notwithstanding all the precautions that were used, in addition to the closure of the schools. The meat is the only means by which Dr Robertson can imagine the disease was carried in several of the cases; in others, the wanton carelessness of the public, after being fully warned of the danger of having public meetings and private gatherings, was a fruitful cause of its spread. In another village, a large number of cases of scarlet fever occurred, and the health officer has strong reason for suspecting the butcher's meat as a medium by which the infection was spread. The circumstances here were almost identical with those of the first outbreak. The first case was at a butcher's house; it was a slight one, not recognisable by the parents at first; free desquamation took place, and the child was allowed to run all over the premises."—From the *British Medical Journal*, 15th April 1882.

"*Outbreak of Typhoid in an Infirmary.*—Within the past few days Leicester Infirmary has been the scene of an outbreak of typhoid fever, by which no fewer than ten of the dressers, nurses, and servants have been prostrated, and two others have died. Dr Buck, the Medical Officer of Health, has instituted an investigation, from which it appears that all the victims had drunk raw milk. As the house-drains appeared to be in good condition, an inquiry was instituted. It was then found that the person who supplied the milk had been affected by similar symptoms, and that the owner of the farm from which it came had also suffered. The farm premises were next inspected. It was ascertained that the well was situated near an overflowing and leaky cesspool, and that it stood near the end of the house-drain. An analysis of three samples was made, and it was shown that the water used for domestic purposes, and with which the milk-cans were washed, was quite unfit for use, being polluted with sewage. It was therefore inferred that the outbreak had arisen from the use of contaminated milk. The patients were, at the last report, progressing favourably."

greatest moment. The houses invaded during these epidemics were found to be commonly of the better class, and in healthy situations. The poor, who take very little milk, and that only in tea or coffee, generally escaped."

Entozoic diseases, due to the presence in various parts of the body of small parasites—some varieties of which are microscopic—are largely communicable to man, and the consequence of eating the flesh of animals so affected is often fatal, especially in the case of the common pork malady known as *trichinosis*. The large tape-worm, or *tænia*, which in the intestinal cavity of man often acquires a length of many feet, is derived from the bullock, the calf, and the pig; fluke, or liver-worm, is common in the sheep. Usually, in thickly populated districts, the livers of all sheep supplying the markets are riddled with these small worms.

In connection with this part of my subject, I should like to offer a few remarks in regard to the new method of "inoculation" as a preservative against certain forms of cattle and sheep disease. As you are aware, this method, to which Pasteur has attached his name, consists of the introduction into the blood of healthy animals of the attenuated or "cultivated" virus of anthrax, a malignant disease which for some time past has occasionally attacked districts devoted to the rearing of herds and flocks. Now, Pasteurism is the means by which modern science seeks to combat Nature's determination to put down redundant numbers, and to maintain a just equilibrium. Man, for purposes at once unnatural and immoral, has artificially multiplied to an enormous extent certain species of animals, and has given up to their support vast areas of otherwise serviceable land. Whenever any particular kind of animal, not excepting man himself, increases beyond a certain ratio over a limited area, Nature provides means to check the increase, and to restore the balance of species. The flesh-eating propensities of all classes of mankind have, during the last few decades, been steadily growing, and to minister to these propensities domesticated eatable animals have been bred all over the western half of the world in incredible numbers. Cause has brought about effect; overcrowding, artificial living, the impossibility of maintaining invariable sanitary conditions, and other inconveniences connected with breeding, have produced their inevitable nemesis. Pasteur proposes to get the better of Nature by anticipating

her hand, and by infecting the yet unsmitten cattle and sheep with a mild form of disease, which shall prevent them from succumbing to its deadlier type. This means simply that so long as the animals are under the influence of the disease, whether mild or malignant, they will not be liable to contract a fresh bout of it. If a person has small-pox in his economy, he will not be liable to any fresh contagion from extraneous sources. But there comes a time, perhaps in seven years or less, perhaps in ten or more—in some persons much sooner—when the influence of the disease will have wholly passed out of the economy, and then the body again becomes liable to contagion. So it is with anthrax in cattle. Pasteur and his followers know this, and they recommend therefore re-inoculations at certain intervals. All of which means that in order to keep our flocks and herds from diminishing, and to be able to meet the unnatural demand for abundance of flesh, and to eat oxen and sheep without stint, we must keep them in a constant state of splenic infection. For be sure that so long as they are “protected,” as it is called, so long the deadly *bacillus anthracis* is somewhere about in the tissues and humours of the inoculated animal. Were it not, the “protection” would cease. The system is based on the principle of setting a thief in the house to keep other thieves out. But when once the house-keeping thief departs and leaves the house clean of his presence, the gang outside are liable to break in. Nor is the *bacillus anthracis*, even when fully in possession of the economy, able to keep out other diseases. On the contrary, an official report recently made to the Hungarian Department of Public Health on Pasteur’s inoculation declares that “deaths from other complaints, such as catarrh, pneumonia, pericarditis, etc., occurred *exclusively* amongst the inoculated. It follows from this that a fatal issue from other severe diseases is accelerated by protective inoculation.” Of this fact also Pasteur and his school are aware, for they now recommend, as Mr Fleming informs us in the *Nineteenth Century*, the application of the “protective” method to *all* infectious forms of disease! All the zymotic diseases are believed to be inoculable by means of their special bacilli, and it is gravely argued, nay, even urged with all the pompous air of scientific authority, that henceforth the blood of both man and beast should be infected by every one of these germs, and thus be maintained in a continual state of ferment

and impurity. "Disease is king," cry the scientists; "long live Disease!" Truly, we may despair of successfully eradicating by means of hygiene and sanitation the myriad forms of living dirt, while "prophylactic medicine," as it is sarcastically termed, industriously multiplies, preserves, circulates, transmits, and sows the fatal germs broadcast over all the earth.

There is, besides, another grave consideration connected with Pasteurism, and one which is specially related to our subject. We have seen how transmissible from cattle to man by means of milk and meat are tubercular disease, foot-and-mouth disease, and other complaints. Why not then splenic disease in similar fashion? Anthrax is communicable to wool-sorters and tanners by mere contact with infected hides; what warrant have we that the secretion and flesh of creatures suffering under the influence of attenuated virus will prove harmless eating and drinking? Such ingesta may not perhaps set up true anthrax, but might develop unpleasant blood-symptoms, and predispose to such diseases as erysipelas, septicæmia, cutaneous eruptions, inflammatory tendencies, or general ill-defined morbid conditions. On this subject the Hungarian Report says:—

"When we consider that the inoculative material contains anthrax microzymes in colossal quantities, although of diminished virulence, and that the microzymes multiply to a gigantic extent in the organism of the inoculated animals, we see that the general employment of protective inoculations would spread these germs in inconceivable quantities through the whole country. Deaths will occur at all times, even among the inoculated animals, and the possibility is not excluded that the microzymes which would be liberated from the dead bodies when they became scattered, might regain their original virulence, and thus, despite all trouble and cost, attack both men and animals. This is all the more to be feared, as the carelessness with which people even now treat the bodies of animals which have died from anthrax would then be increased by belief in the omnipotence of protective inoculation."

So far, I have briefly placed before you a few arguments drawn from comparative anatomy, chemistry, physiology, domestic economy, and hygiene. All these considerations belong to the utilitarian aspects of the subject, and affect us rather as physical than as spiritual beings. But the cause of

akreophagy may be pleaded yet more strongly from a higher and distinctly *human* point of view, intimately related to the arts which beautify life and civilise our race, and, better and worthier still than these, to those just, compassionate, and gentle instincts of man, in virtue of which alone he *is* man, differing from and surpassing all other creatures.¹ . . .

Ouida, the novelist, who has contributed to the *Gentleman's Magazine* a very good article against vivisection, writes thus in regard to the practice of flesh-eating.

[Here the lecturer read the passage quoted by her in the first of her *Letters on Pure Diet* in *The Food Reform Magazine*.²]

To those of us who have lifted the veil which polite society in general finds it convenient to draw between the fashionable dining-room and the slaughter-house, it is no longer possible to sit down with placid mind and complacent face to a table loaded with carcasses, and to bend piously forward while the stereotyped "grace" is murmured, and the Lord is thanked for the mercies graciously bestowed on the carnivorous company! "The *mercies!*" Heaven save the mark! But the Vegetarian host and his guests have no cause for shame. Their lentils, their rice, their fruits, their savoury dishes have been bought at no cost of suffering, terror, despair, or degradation to man or beast. The gardener, the agriculturist, the reaper, the fruit-gatherer are all of them in the enjoyment of healthy, invigorating, and ennobling pursuits. No odours of blood or death pollute the air they daily breathe, nor do hideous spectacles of pain and carnage occupy their sight from morn to night, and quench for them all the manifold loveliness and sweetness of life. The aroma of fields, of vineyards, of orchards, accompanies the beautiful repast of the man whose meal is such as Nature prompts; but over the banquet of the eater of dead flesh hangs the filthy smell of the shambles.

We are told that great things in the interests of progress, enlightenment, and other sacred names, are being done for the present generation by means of compulsory education and the facilities everywhere provided for instruction in science and literature. We are told that among all classes of the people knowledge is to be increased, intellect cultivated, and

¹ Here follows a passage, beginning with the words "The Perfectionist" and ending with the words "once explicable," similar to that in the first of Anna Kingsford's *Letters on Pure Diet* in *The Food Reform Magazine* (see pp. 65-66, *ante*).

² See pp. 66-67, *ante*.

civilisation spread. But if, as seems too probable, the chariot of popular education is to be made a vehicle for the propaganda of flesh-eating and vivisection, it will prove but a car of Juggernaut, whose wheels will assuredly crush the heart out of the people. A system of education merely intellectual tends not to civilise, but to bewilder and to harden. It is idle to speak of "civilising" the children of the new generation by such means as those provided by the Paul Bert's of the day, and by others of the modern school of materialistic biology. Education, if it is to be really humanising, refining, and elevating in its results, must be moral and spiritual as well as intellectual. And such an education as this will never be given by men who inculcate on human beings the diet of the tiger, and who teach science by the method of the Spanish Inquisition. Flesh-eating and vivisection are in principle closely related, and both are defended by their advocates on common premises, of which the catch-cries are Utility and the Law of Nature.

As regards the consumption of flesh, it has been shown that being unsuited to the structure and organs of man, comparatively innutritious, largely impure and unsafe, and extremely costly, it certainly cannot be recommended on utilitarian grounds. And in respect to vivisection, though it would be passing strange if a practice carried on throughout Europe for the past two thousand years had effected nothing, its scanty uses have been dearly bought indeed at the cost of the agony involved, and of the rare waste of time, of talent, industry, and intellect over a method mostly vague and futile in its results, other infinitely more exact and valuable means of research being meanwhile neglected. And if such low utilities be veritably of paramount import in the evolution of the race, why have not the vivisectors the courage of their opinions, and why should they not claim—what their arguments legitimately cover—the right to vivisect human creatures? Why, while admitting the principle of vicarious sacrifice, should they shrink from its logical outcome? Is it because of the foolish popular notion that man only has a "soul," while other animals have not? All the more reason then, surely, for sparing these in their one brief life the infliction of suffering which Nature does not impose. Man, with eternity before him, may well afford, for the good of his kind, a few hours or even days of suffering. It is, however, the strange fact that the most atrocious of

laboratory tortures are inflicted by men who profess to believe the nature and destiny of the brute and of man identical, and who hold that for both, death is the irrevocable finale of being. From the point of view of this doctrine—a doctrine rapidly gaining power, numbers, and importance in Europe—it is not less difficult to conceive why the brain of the ape should be deemed a fitting object for experiment, and that of the human infant or savage should be spared; why the innocent and serviceable horse or dog should be given over to the tormentors, and the criminal, lunatic, idiot, or pauper should be respected.

As to the second contention, that Nature's law is the law of prey, and that therefore man has *a priori* a natural right to rend and torment, it should be answered that the term "Nature" implies neither individuality nor responsibility, but simply *condition*. All that Nature does is to permit the manifestation of acquired qualities *in individuals*. In such sense we must understand the phrase "habit is Nature." This fact does not justify responsible humanity in the manifestation of cruelties which put to shame the worst of the carnivora. It is by dint of following what Mr Matthew Arnold calls "the stream of tendency which makes for righteousness" that man has risen out of the baser elements of his nature to the recognition of the standard known as the "golden rule." And it is precisely in proportion as he has set himself, on every plane of his activity, to

"Move upward, working out the beast,
And let the wolf and tiger die"

within him, that he has become higher, nobler,—in a word, more manly. The modern advocates of flesh-eating and vivisection, on the contrary, would reverse the sentiment of the lines just quoted, and would have us

"Move down, returning to the beast,
And letting heart and conscience die,"

making thereby the practice of the lowest in the scale of Nature the rule of the highest, and abasing the moral standard of mankind to the level of the habits of the most dangerous or noxious orders of brutes.

Our opponents are fond of calling arguments such as these "sentimental," and seem to imagine that the word completely

disposes of their value. But that this should be the case serves but to reveal more clearly their own position. For it shows either that they are ignorant of what the word "sentiment" means—ignorant that honour is a sentiment, that courage, truthfulness, love, sympathy, friendship, and every moral quality, the possession of which constitutes the superiority of civilised man over the savage and the brute, are sentiments; or else that they deliberately intend to obliterate these qualities from the curriculum of future generations of mankind, and to exclude them from their definition of humanity. The pretence of modern civilisation is to aim only at the acquirement of intellectual knowledge and physical gratification, with but scant, if any, regard to moral limits. In the creed of the nineteenth century man is man, not because he has it in him to love justice and to refrain from doing wrong, but because, being a pre-eminently clever beast, he is the strongest and most successful of all beasts.

But the disciple of Buddha and of Pythagoras, the preacher of the Pure Life and of the Perfect Way, cries to humanity, "Be men, not in mere physical form only—for form is worth nothing—but in spirit, by virtue of those qualities which exalt you above tigers, swine, or jackals! Under all your pseudo-civilisation lies a foul and festering sore, a moral blemish, staining your lives, and making social amenities unlovely. For the sake of ministering to your depraved and unnatural appetites, there exists a whole class of men, deprived of human rights, whose daily work is to kill, and who pass all their years in shedding blood and in superintending violent death. Away, then, with the slaughter-houses! Make to yourselves a nobler ideal of life and of human destiny!"

To appreciate and comprehend fully the spirit of Vegetarianism, to explain the enthusiasm with which it inspires its professors, a man must be at heart a poet. By this word "poet" I indicate that order of mind which sees intuitively; which seeks Beauty and Perfection as the end of all study and organisation; which formulates a clear Ideal, and makes it everywhere the criterion and guide, as did the Hebrews the Pillar of Flame in the wilderness. Only one of such mind, capable of knowing the Ideal, and of sacrificing all lower attractions to the love of the highest, is able fully to understand the enthusiasm of the Pythagorean, the Buddhist, the abstainer from flesh; the gratification of being innocent of blood-

guiltiness,—of knowing that no corpses strew the way to Paradise; and that when voice or pen is employed against cruelty, against oppression, against any one of the many forms of injustice rife among men under the reign of Physical Force, no mortal adversary, no inward conscience can reproach the reformer himself with the daily sacrifice of innocent victims to the false gods of bodily appetite.

Long since, one who has been called the king of poets, Shelley—the sweetest, because the tenderest of singers—in a poem¹ which most of us know as the sustained and earnest protest of a just soul against all modes of tyranny, wrote these words, so pregnant with power and wise love that they seem almost the utterance of a prophetic spirit, foreseeing in a vision the far-off light of the Perfect Day that shall be when the Kingdom of God shall come :

“ My brethren, we are free ! The fruits are glowing
 Beneath the stars, and the night winds are flowing
 O'er the ripe corn, the birds and beasts are dreaming—
 Never again may blood of bird or beast
 Stain with its venomous stream a human feast,
 To the pure skies in accusation steaming.
 Avenging poisons shall have ceased
 To feed disease and fear and madness ;
 The dwellers of the earth and air
 Shall throng around our steps in gladness,
 Seeking their food or refuge there.
 Our toil from thought all glorious forms shall cull,
 To make this Earth, our home, more beautiful ;
 And Science, and her sister Poesy,
 Shall clothe in light the fields and cities of the free ! ”

¹ *The Revolt of Islam*, Canto V. (LI. 5).

THE BEST FOOD FOR MAN ¹

I HAVE said that the French peasantry live much more in accordance with the dictates of Nature than do the English, and that consequently they are, as a rule, far more prosperous and well off. It is a very rare thing indeed for a French peasant to be destitute in his old age, because, although his wages are not nearly so high as in this country, they are much more economically spent, and thrift is looked upon as a cardinal virtue. Hence there is no necessity in France for the unhappy Poor-law system which is the bane of this country, and industrious and frugal householders are not compelled to pay exorbitant taxes for the support of persons who have laid by nothing for themselves. Many of the French peasants have told me how they live. Flesh-meat is so rare on their tables, that, as a rule, it is only eaten two or three times a year, but they take plenty of cheese, coarse bread, vegetable soups and savoury omelettes. On diet like this, with cider to drink, they manage to bring up families of robust, healthy children, to make their homes comfortable, and to lay by savings, sufficient to provide for the old folks when past work. Nor is this the case only in France. It is general all over the greater part of the civilised world. The diet of the Swiss, of the Belgian, the Prussian, the Bavarian, Saxon, Russian, Spanish, Italian, Pomeranian, Norwegian, and Swedish agricultural labourers is almost entirely devoid of flesh-meat. And, as a rule, other things being equal, their vital force and constitution are superior to those of their English brethren, their unstimulating and wholesome food enabling them to work with ease to an advanced age. And here I should like to call attention to a matter of much importance in gauging the extent and quality of vital strength. It should be borne in mind that the proper test of strength is its capacity for endurance. Mere feats of

¹ This article was written by Anna Kingsford, and was published (in two parts) in the *Theosophist* of February and of March 1884.

strength are valueless as tests of vital power. The question at issue is not—"How much can a man do in a day?" but "How much can he do in a lifetime?" It is sometimes said by superficial people,—“Beef and beer will enable you to get through a better day's work than oatmeal or pease pudding.” This may be true, generally speaking, because flesh-meat and fermented drinks are both stimulants of the nerves, and under their influence the machinery of the body runs at a faster and more violent rate. But the beef-eater and beer-drinker will probably break down at fifty-five or sixty years of age, because his vitality has been exhausted by forced work in excess of its natural and normal capacity, while the abstainer from these exciting aliments will be a hale man with work in him yet at eighty. It is the old story of the hare and the tortoise.

So then there are three distinct claims established for economy, on the part of the diet without flesh-food: First, it is the most economical as regards the relation between the Land and the People, viz. : cultivated land yielding corn, roots, and vegetables will support a population at least three or four times larger than the same extent of soil laid down in pasture; and this for a two-fold reason, because land under cultivation affords work and wages to a large number of hands,—which must otherwise get employment across the seas,—and because also its produce trebles or quadruples that of land devoted to cattle-grazing.

Secondly, a non-flesh diet is the most economical as regards housekeeping. A shilling's worth of oatmeal with fruit and good vegetables will yield as much nourishment and satisfy the appetite better than five shillings' worth of flesh; and if we assume that, on the average, the population of the United Kingdom were to reduce their consumption of animal food by only one pound a week per head, it would give a saving of ten or twelve million pounds sterling a year. A vegetable dietary, to which we may add cheese, milk, butter, and eggs, costs three times less than a mixed dietary of flesh and vegetables.

Thirdly, the reformed diet is more economical as regards human life and strength. Even if you are fortunate enough to escape suffering and disease from some of the horrible disorders to which we have seen flesh-eaters, especially among the poorer classes, are liable, you will probably have to pay with premature infirmity and shortened life the penalty exacted for indulgence

in unnatural food. If you burn your candle at both ends you must not expect the material to last so long as it otherwise would.

I may add to these three important economies a fourth, which is worth your serious consideration.

The costliest and the commonest vice in the United Kingdom, especially among the poorer classes, is the vice of drink. And it is the invariable accompaniment of flesh-eating. Strong meats and strong drinks always go together. There is in flesh-food a principle, variously named by medical authorities, which causes a certain irritable condition of the interior coats of the stomach and intestines, and provokes a desire for stimulating drink. This fact is so well known in institutions for the cure of dipsomania, or drunkenness, that in most bad cases abstinence from flesh-foods is enjoined, and in one establishment, unusually successful in its treatment (Dansville, U.S.), no patient entering the hospital is allowed, on any account, during the whole of his residence there, to eat flesh-meat. In fact, we have only to walk down a street in the poorer quarters of a town to see how public-houses or gin palaces abound; and it has many times been pointed out by able observers that the proximity of slaughter-houses, placed, as they invariably are, in the low quarters of a town, incites the inhabitants around to drink to an unusual extent. The frequency of crime as the immediate or proximate result of drinking habits seems to indicate that could we but reach the mainspring of this national curse and arrest its action, we should go far towards arresting altogether the more serious crimes of the country. Anyone who will collect for a week or more the instances appearing at the Police Courts, of what are known as crimes of violence, wife and baby murder, savage assaults and suicide, will see that almost all of them are due to drink. This is an admitted fact; but it is not so generally admitted that the way to the gin palace is through the butcher's shop. Vegetarians never drink to excess. Not all are abstainers on principle from alcohol, many take an occasional glass of wine or beer, but none drink to excess, because their food, being succulent and unstimulating, does not give rise to thirst. What an economy would the adoption of such a diet prove in houses where half the week's earnings now go to buy liquor! Sometime ago a working-man at Manchester made an effective temperance address in the public street. In his

hands he held a loaf of bread and a knife. The loaf represented the wages of the working-man. First he cut off a moderate slice. "This," said he, "is what you give to the city government." He then cut off a more generous slice,—“And this,” he went on, “is what you give to the general government.” Then, with a vigorous flourish of his carving knife, he cut off three-quarters of the whole loaf. “This,” he said, “you give to the brewer and to the public-house.” “And this,” he concluded, showing the thin slice which remained, “you keep to support yourselves, your families, and to pay the rent.”

Now, perhaps some of you, who are not used to vegetarian ways, may be wondering what non-flesh-eaters have for dinner. Well, they have a much larger variety of dishes than eaters of beef, mutton, and pork. But the diet of the vegetarian is a scientific diet, and either knowledge or experience must teach him the nutritive values of food-stuffs, before he can make a wholesome and frugal use of them. All foods contain certain elements necessary to the building up of the material and the renewal of the force of the body, but these elements are contained in very different proportions in various foods. Scientific men have divided the nutritive properties of food into two categories which include respectively: Tissue-forming substances, and Force or Heat-forming substances. They call the first Nitrogenous, and the second, Carbonaceous. Now, both these necessary kinds of food are abundant in the vegetable kingdom, and, proportionately to the weight, there is a great deal more of them to be got out of farinaceous and leguminous matter than out of dead flesh. An adult man in good health, says Dr Lyon Playfair, requires every day four ounces of nitrogenous or flesh-forming substance, and ten or eleven of carbonaceous or heat- and force-giving substance. He can get these elements of nutrition out of bread, oatmeal, pease, cheese, and vegetables at a cost more than less by half that of the butcher's meat necessary to furnish the same amount of nourishment. It is chemically and physiologically demonstrated that no property whatever, beyond that of stimulation, exists in flesh-meat that is not to be found in vegetable food, and that, therefore, it is a terrible error to suppose flesh-meat to be more strengthening than other aliments. It is, in fact, the reverse which is the case, for the quantity of nutriment contained in corn-meal is, for every hundred parts, more than double, sometimes treble—that contained in the same quantity

of butcher's meat. The most nutritious and strengthening of all foods are the grains,—the fruit of the cereals,—wheat, oats, barley, rye, rice, maize, and such mealy vegetables as beans, haricots, pease, lentils and their kind. All sorts of fruit are rich in carbo-hydrates, or sugary food, which, according to many medical authorities, is the most necessary of all to the human system. Dr Playfair puts down the daily proportion of sugary food necessary to an adult man at eighteen ounces—that is more than four times the amount of nitrogenous food requisite. This indispensable item cannot be got out of flesh-meat *at all*, but it is plentiful in table vegetables, such as potatoes, beetroot, tomato, cauliflower, turnips, carrots, parsnips, and so on. The Vegetarian Society has issued a series of excellent little Cookery books, varying in price from half a crown to a penny, giving *recipes* for any number of good cheap meals, without fish, flesh, or fowl. You cannot do better than study these, if you wish to live economically and purely, and to bring healthy children into the world.

Most of the diseases which fill our hospitals are self-induced, having their cause in debauched habits, sometimes aggravated by hereditary malady. Children are born blind, or rickety, or scrofulous, or tuberculous, or idiotic on account of the feeding and drinking habits of their parents. They are bred up under circumstances of incessant vice and misery, and they suck gin with their mother's milk. Hardly weaned, they are given pork and offal for food; their bones give way, their flesh ulcerates, the mothers and the parish doctor together make matters worse by the administration of drugs, and at length the wretched little sufferers, masses of disease and uncleanness, are brought to the hospital. Or, already vitiated in childhood, the average man or woman of the poorer class, ignorant of the laws of health and of the construction of the human body, continues in the way in which his or her early years were bent, and accumulates disease by constant recourse to that which originally caused it, until, at forty or fifty years of age, the pauper ward or the hospital bed receives the unhappy patient, incurably afflicted with some organic complaint. It is simply frightful to the educated mind to hear the confessions of some of these poor bed-ridden creatures. When a student in the hospitals, I was often unable to credit their accounts of the quantities and kinds of strong drinks they had swallowed on a daily average while in work. The question of diet,—what

we ought to eat and drink—is the question which underlies everything else and affords the key to the cause of all the accumulation of suffering and moral evil which we meet in poor districts, and especially in cities. Hygiene and morals go hand in hand and are inseparable, just as body and mind make one person, so intimately welded together, that neither good nor harm can be done to the one without affecting the other. This consideration brings me to the most important of all the aspects of flesh-eating, viz., its immoral tendency. We have seen one of its indirectly immoral results in the fondness it sets up for strong drink, but I am now about to speak of the degrading and barbarous nature of the habit itself, as it affects the national customs, manners, and tone of thought.

It needs no very great penetration to see what harm the proximity of slaughter-houses and the loathsome surroundings of the trade must do in the poorer quarters of towns,—the only parts in which these places are to be found. The rich and refined classes shut these things out of sight and hearing, but they are forced upon the poor, and their results are potent for evil. How is it possible to teach poor children the duties of humane treatment of dumb creatures and of tenderness to beasts of burden when their infancy and youth are spent in familiarity with the scenes which surround the slaughter-house, and while they are taught to look upon these institutions and on all they involve as lawful, right, and necessary to man? It is heart-rending to be in the vicinity of the shambles of a large town when its victims are being driven in. Bewildered oxen, footsore, galled, and bruised, sheep with frightened faces, scared at the baying of dogs and the sticks and goads so freely wielded by the roughs who drive them,—little brown-eyed calves, for whose loss the patient mother cows are lowing in the homestead;—all the sad, terrible procession of sacrifice that enters every city at dawn to feed the human multitude that calls itself civilised,—these are the sights upon which the early-rising children of the poor are educated. And a little later in the morning may be heard from within the slaughter-house the cries of the dying, and the thud of the pole-axe upon the brow of some innocent miserable beast, and the gutters begin to run with blood; and presently the gates of the slaughter-yard open, and out comes a cart or two laden with pailfuls of blood and brains and fresh skins, reeking with the horrible odour of violent death. Are spectacles and sounds

like these fit for the eyes and ears of little children, or indeed for any human creature, young or old? It is useless to urge that the Bible justifies the slaughter of animals for food. The Bible seems to sanction a great many practices which modern civilisation and philosophy have unanimously condemned, and which have been made penal offences in all Western codes of law. Such, for instance, are the practices of polygamy and of slavery, which are not only sanctioned in the Bible, but are in some cases positively enjoined. Even murder itself appears to be vindicated in some parts of the Old Testament, as are also many revengeful and cruel acts. No civilised general in these days would dream of conducting warfare as Joshua, as Deborah, as Samuel, or as David conducted it—such deeds as theirs would be justly held to sully the brightest valour; no minister of religion in our times could endure to redden his hands daily with the blood of scores of lambs, doves, and oxen; no average man, woman, or child could be induced to assist in stoning to death an unfortunate “fallen woman,” or a lad who had disobeyed his parents or used strong language. Yet these are some of the practices commended and inculcated in the Bible, and justifiable on the same grounds as the practice of flesh-eating.

But the Hebrew Bible is not the only sacred Book in the World. Other “holy Scriptures,” known as the Vedas, the Puranas, the Tripitaka, and the Dhammapada, which form the Canon of the religions professed by the largest part of mankind, enjoin abstinence from flesh-food upon all religious persons and extend the command, “Thou shalt not kill,” to all creatures, human and animal, which are not noxious and dangerous to the interests of peace and order. In regard to this subject, the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the annual meeting of the Church Missionary Society on 1st May of the present year (1883), said:—

“There are beautiful fruits belonging to the ancient civilisations of the East which we shall work into our Gospel, and our children, ages and generations hence, will wonder how we found the Gospel quite complete without them. Take such a noble thought as the Buddhist thought of the perfect sacredness of Life, how everything that lives, down to the mere animated dust, is a sacred thing. The Buddhist sees the difference between life and everything else that God has made, and it gives to him a tenderness and a sweetness, and a power

of union with the creation, which, when we have apprehended it, will enable us to see better and deeper and nobler meanings in St Paul's eighth chapter to the Romans."

These are good words of the Archbishop, and worthy of our serious thoughtfulness. It is not the letter, but the spirit of the Bible which is our true guide. The letter is subject to error, it belongs to the things of time, and has become the stumbling-block of the critics; but the spirit is the true Word of God; it is catholic, vital, and progressive. It is always *with us*, leading us into all truth, as we are able to bear it; but the letter is behind us and behind the age, it is dead, and killeth all who make an idol of it.

It has always seemed to me a strange and horrible anomaly that every one of the great Festivals of the present Christian Church is marked by some wholesale sacrifice of living creatures to our depraved appetites. Christmas, Shrove-tide, Easter, Michaelmas, all are made the occasions of special slaughter. And the season of "peace and good will" is, above all others, selected by common consent as that of universal bloodshed and violence! So soon as "the time draws near the birth of Christ," the streets of city and hamlet everywhere run with blood, and the knife and the pole-axe make havoc among the patient-eyed beasts of the stall, in whose presence, tradition says, the Holy Child made his advent on earth. What a basis is this for Christian civilisation! What associations are these with which to familiarise the minds of our children! How many among the tens of thousands of worshippers in church and chapel throughout the land on Christmas Day give so much as one minute's thought of regret to the incalculable suffering and cruelty caused to our "poor relations," the domestic animals, in order to celebrate the reign of One who is called the "Prince of Peace"? How many think with any shame or sorrow of the human ministers to all this gluttony and selfishness:—of the butchers and slaughter-men passing their lives in scenes of loathsome bloodshed and among unwholesome fumes of death,—of the demoralisation and deterioration of body and mind, of which the perpetration of so much cruelty and savagery must be the inevitable cause?

We trust,—we who live in the Future rather than in the Past or Present,—that the dawn of a better day is about to rise upon our world. Year by year the Spirit of Christ grows mightier and its meaning clearer, as one by one the mists of

superstition and misconception melt and drop away from the Holy Name, and we learn that the history of Man is the history of perpetual struggle after the Ideal, of perpetual aspiration after the "more excellent way." This Ideal, this Way, which is also the Truth and the Life, constitute the Christ in man, the ever-living, ever-risen Lord,—to follow whom is to follow "all things lovely, just, pure, and of good report."

It will be seen that the view I take of this question, "What is the Best Food for Man?" involves considerations far transcending the mere physical or economical plane. There is a Best Food for Man which implies a Best mode of Living, a Way into which all paths converge, leading to one celestial goal. This is the Way of Paradise, which is, equally, the Way of the Cross, because it is the will of God, and, therefore, the law of the universe, that no perfection is possible in anything but by means of self-denial and self-conquest. The ordinary flesh-eater, if he be a man of any perception, is always fain to acknowledge, on being pressed, that there is something in the usual mode of feeding which clashes with his finer sense of what ought to be. He would rather not talk about the slaughter-house, he feels that the whole subject is, somehow, unsavoury, and more or less frankly admits that he cannot associate the idea of slaughter with what are called "Utopian" theories of existence. But, in most cases, he is not ready to sacrifice the least of his appetites to his conscience. He likes the taste of flesh-meat, he will tell you, and does not wish to deprive himself of the pleasure it gives him. It is the custom of Society to eat it, and he has no desire to make himself conspicuous by refusing to partake of the dishes set before him by his friends. Such an attitude of mind, of course, can only be dealt with effectually by an effort of will on the part of the individual himself. The excuses thus formulated are precisely those with which every transgressor of every moral law turns to bay on the man who seeks to reform or convict him. The reason of such a man may be amply convinced that flesh-eating is neither scientific nor civilised, and yet he lacks the courage to carry these convictions into practice. No logic is able to influence a person of this kind. His affair is with his Conscience rather than with his reason.

But sometimes we meet opponents who tell us that the plea for purer and more merciful living rests on mere "sentiment." Beasts kill one another, they say, therefore man may kill

beasts. And if he did not so kill them, they would so increase in numbers that he himself would become their prey. Let us examine the value of these arguments. It is no shame or reproach to us that a large part of our doctrine rests upon the basis of the sentiments. It must necessarily be so if the doctrine be really a scientific and reasonable doctrine, because God and Nature are not at strife but in harmony, and that mode of living which is best fitted for our bodies and most helpful to the development of our minds is, of course, most in harmony with our moral nature. Nature has not made the consumption of flesh necessary or suitable to the human organism, and the bodily needs of man are not, therefore, in continual antagonism to his reason and to his spiritual instincts. Were it otherwise, we should be forced to admit the tendencies of civilisation and of morality to be at war with the dictates imposed by natural law. And it is precisely the power to recognise and exercise the sentiments which makes man to differ from the beasts. The glory of humanity does not lie in its physical form, for, from time immemorial, the world has seen brutes in human shape, with whose ferocity, malignity, and lust no lower animal could compare. Nor does it lie in sagacity, or perfection of method in mechanical contrivance,—the basis of all we call Intellect ; for on this ground, the mere bee, the ant, the beaver, the bird, the fox, the dog, compete with and even surpass us, as may easily be ascertained by any observer of nature. Nor does man's superiority rest on his physical strength, for what is his muscular force compared with that of the elephant, the rhinoceros, or any of the terrible beasts of jungle, forest, and plain ? It is none of these things that makes man ; but it is the possession of moral reason, the conception, practice, and veneration of Truth, Love, Mercy, Justice, Self-denial, Honour, Charity. And these are the sentiments. And our system of living is pre-eminently a sentimental system, founded in the nature of Humanity, and made for true Men.

The rule which applies, therefore, to the lower animals,—our brothers in all but in the development of spiritual faculties,—is no rule for us, and cannot be twisted into a criterion for our conduct, or an apology for our cruelties. If we are to justify ourselves in killing and eating them because some of the fiercer races among them kill and eat one another, we might, by the same logic, descend to their plane in respect of all other practices attractive to low-minded and vicious men, and revert

to polygamy, disregard of personal rights, and still worse manners. For if certain animals see no harm in bloodshed, neither do they see harm in theft, rapine, and seduction.

As for the objection that unless we ate our animal brethren, they would eat us, nothing can be more ill-considered or pointless. One would suppose the objector to be under the impression that cattle, sheep, and other market animals grow wild like trees or grass, instead of being the objects of an elaborate system of forcing, breeding, rearing, buying, and selling. It would be quite as logical to fear being devoured by our unused potatoes and turnips as to dread being eaten up by our herbivorous animals! For these creatures are exactly in the position of the edible crops we plant annually for our use, and if they were not artificially bred, they would rapidly diminish in numbers, change their character, and return to the orderly balance of Nature. The fact is that the force of our objector's argument is all the other way, and that it is precisely to the flesh-eating habits of our present population that we owe a very real danger of being eaten up by flocks and herds. For in order to meet the exorbitant demand for animal food and for field sports, thousands of English men and women are annually compelled to give place to cattle and to sheep runs; land which would support scores of families with corn and crops is laid waste for pasture, for cover, for warrens, for preserves, for deer-forests; and the peasantry and the agriculturists, eaten out of house and home by beasts, are forced to congregate in overstocked towns, whose streets are hideous with the plague of drink-shops, slaughter-yards, and meat-markets; or else to quit their native shores and seek a new world far off beyond the seas.

Under our present regimen, the beasts of fold and of cover usurp the people's rights, and with this usurpation come the accompanying evils of poverty, dirt, squalor, drink, crime, the enforced exile of field labourers, and the consequent surplus of a helpless female population of a million souls, condemned thus, inevitably, to a loveless and lonely life, or to the alternative of misfortune and shame.

Is it too much to ask of the human race that it should consent to restore the world to the dominion of natural law and order;—that it should sacrifice the luxury and sensuality of the Few to the peace and joy of the Many, and that it should learn to be wise, clean, pure, thrifty, and virtuous?

Is it too much to ask the suppression of an organised system of carnage, involving a foul and unhealthy traffic, disgusting occupations, depraving spectacles, and gross barbarity?—to plead for the restoration of Beauty in the morals of the people, in the surroundings of daily life, in the haunts and homes of the poor; in the sports and at the banquets of the rich? Surely not, for alike from the scientific, the hygienic, the æsthetic, and the spiritual point of view, the Best Food for Man is that which does no violence to his nature, physical or moral, and which involves none to other creatures at his hand. For this we are Men, that alone of all Nature's children we should be able to understand the secret of her manifold transmutations, and the goal of her striving; for this we are Men, that we may be able to confirm her inspiration by our Reason, and that, standing open-eyed and face to face with our nursing mother, we may know what the best of our younger brothers only dimly feel, and grasp with strong, mature, responsible sense knowledges that are with them but instincts, and virtues which their undeveloped minds reflect as inborn impulse merely.

Thus may Man endorse the work of God, becoming its exponent and interpreter while others remain its objects, and realise upon a higher and spiritual plane the beautiful intentions of the Divine Mind in the world of natural forms and evolutions. And the more he himself becomes uplifted towards that Mind, the more also will he love and pity and long for harmony with all innocent incarnations of life in the great universe of Being.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF VEGETARIANISM ¹

I SHALL put before you, principally, the scientific aspects of the question. First, I will speak of the misunderstanding under which we Vegetarians lie. Only two days ago I took up a popular society paper in which Vegetarians were spoken of as "poor, crazy creatures flying in the face of nature." Another writer spoke of us, in the *Times*, as "poor weaklings." I don't think that phrase exactly applicable to us or our history, either past, present, or future, as Vegetarians. As there is a great deal of misapprehension about, let me point out a few facts about Vegetarianism scientifically considered. Some have the idea that we would send out men to graze like Nebuchadnezzar. They never seem to have heard of the class of animals called "frugivorous." They can never have read Huxley, or the works of the great anatomists and physiologists. They have never followed the arguments on the doctrine of evolution. I won't say if I am an evolutionist or not. On one point there is no doubt whatever : if we study the anatomy of man, we find it is just the same as that of the higher apes ; both are anatomically and physiologically the same. This is a little against our pride, perhaps, to think that we only belong to the family of apes ; but I am not speaking of their moral qualities. If you go into a dissecting room and see an ape on one table and a human creature on another, you have a great deal of difficulty in seeing the difference between them, especially if the skin has been stripped off. The teeth of man are precisely the same as the teeth of the ape. We hear a great deal from people, who don't understand it, about the canine teeth. These, they say, are flesh-tearing teeth. They

¹ From the Report of the Address given by Anna Kingsford on 12th January 1885 at Exeter Hall, London, at the close of the International Health Exhibition, under the auspices of the Manchester Vegetarian Society. It is one of many addresses that were, on that occasion, given by prominent vegetarians ; it is taken from the Report of the Exeter Hall Meeting that was issued by the above-mentioned society (see Biographical Preface, p. 52 *ante*).

are nothing of the sort. The cuspid teeth of the ape are for the purpose of defence and of cracking nuts, and certainly under no circumstances for eating beefsteaks or mutton chops. A grown man has thirty-two teeth, if he has them all, wisdom teeth included. There are apes of the Old World, and apes of the New. The apes of the Old World have thirty-two teeth also. The teeth of the ape are exactly the same as those of man, in form and method of growth. Will anyone say that the ape is carnivorous. If you go to any of our great museums or menageries, here or abroad, you will find the rations of the apes are apples, bread, and so forth. The keepers perfectly well recognise that the ape is not a carnivorous animal. I don't want to dwell too long upon this question of anatomy, or I could prove that in the formation of the mouth, the stomach, and the intestinal canal, man is exactly the same as an ape. Among the great writers on anatomy or physiology, you find no difference of opinion. Thus the food of man is fixed by science—and science is a very hard thing to argue against. Man is formed to eat the fruits of the earth, and not to eat flesh. If man has adapted himself to eat flesh, it is by custom, not by nature. With regard to the economical aspect of the question, we are told Vegetarians cannot be strong; it is impossible to have force unless you eat meat. Let us look at the question scientifically. The food needed by the body can be divided into two great classes—nitrogenous and carbonaceous. If you try experiments upon man, you will find that these two great classes answer two great purposes in the economy of the human body. The nitrogenous food goes to form muscle and tissue; the carbonaceous gives heat and force. It has been calculated that the amount of nitrogenous and carbonaceous matter we require—taken according to the proportions of Dr Pavy, Dr Edward Smith, and others—is of nitrogenous four to five ounces, and of carbonaceous fifteen to twenty-two ounces daily. The carbons are divided into two groups, the hydro-carbons and the carbo-hydrates; these are hard names. The hydro-carbons are all oils and fats; the carbo-hydrates are all starches and sugars. According to Dr Playfair, the starches and sugars are necessary in the proportion of seventeen to eighteen ounces every day. With one single exception, these are obtained from the vegetable kingdom. It is necessary that we should absorb a certain quantity of sugar; there is no sugar to be found, except in milk, out of

the vegetable kingdom. We will glance at the approximate value of these foods, and see how very much richer the vegetable kingdom is. We hear it said: "If you want to build up muscle and tissue and so on, you must go to the animal kingdom for it. If you wish to be strong you must consume nitrogenous matter contained in flesh-meat." Now, pork and ham contain 8 per cent., lean beef and mutton 18 per cent. of nitrogenous matter; flesh-meats thus contain from 8 to 18 per cent. If you get your nitrogen from the vegetable kingdom, you will find it much cheaper. You get from 25 to 30 per cent. of nitrogenous matter out of lentils, pease, beans, and all kinds of cereals. With regard to the carbonaceous foods, we get all we need from the vegetable kingdom. And the oils too are far more cleanly when obtained from the vegetable than from the animal kingdom. This is clear to the meanest capacity, and I do not dwell upon the point. Again, animals are liable to many diseases. All the worm diseases proceed from eating animal food, and the poor get the worst kinds of meat; that is, they are obliged to get the intestines, the lights and liver, precisely those parts where the germs of disease abound. These germs of disease are not to be seen by the naked eye, but as soon as they get into the human frame they develop slowly and surely. In the intestinal canal, perhaps, there is a tiny speck, hardly to be seen by the aid of the microscope. Yet this may develop into a worm four or five feet long. Nor is that the only animal disease. Another disease, well known to butchers, is "pearl" disease, which is a form of tubercular disease. We heard the other day of butcher's meat being 80 to 90 per cent. diseased. We even can give for this the authority of Dr Alfred Carpenter, speaking before the Medical Congress of 1881; so we may take it for granted it is true, yet it seems almost incredible, that from 80 to 90 per cent. of butcher's meat should be unfit for food. Put it down at a lower figure, and you may say that 60 to 70 per cent. is diseased. This is frightful when you come to think of it. From the worm diseases the vegetable kingdom is absolutely free. Men may, of course, get unsound vegetables, but they are easily seen to be not good, and we do not eat them. Meat, however, deceives us; it may look perfectly well, and we may not be aware of disease in it, but it may contain the very germs I mentioned just now. Now, about one of the "strong" arguments our opponents adduce. They say if we did not kill animals we

should have our fields and back gardens swarming with cattle ! It is amusing that people do not stop for a moment to see what this means. Is it not perfectly well known that we breed animals to kill ? They say if we do not destroy the bullocks and other animals we shall have sheep and oxen running all about the streets. We should be eaten out of house and home by cows. We should soon see if they were indigenous to this country, were all the people Vegetarians. The fact is that the land which ought to be the people's is given to the beasts. In this England of ours we want to have the cottagers on their own land. We want to have this land of England cultivated as a garden, and not left for sheep to wander over and for game deer to run wild in. We want to prevent men being sent out of the country as they are now. Now, many of the best and ablest of the people cannot find work, so they cross the seas and leave behind them a surplus of women, a mass of terrible distress and awful sin and misery. We want to give the land back to the people, that they may live in an economical and happy manner ; that when old they may live on their savings by their own firesides. You know, perhaps, in foreign countries, especially in France, there are no workhouses. They live there in a very economical manner, in order to keep their homes together, the result being that whole families gather together round one fireside, and in one cottage, instead of being separated as in England, where we send old people to the workhouse, and our sons over the sea to find bread. Instead of pressing large numbers into degrading occupations, now necessitated by the requirements of the people, were we to be Vegetarians, at once these would be set free. How much more happily they could live on vegetable produce ! It is lamentable that the poor have the idea that no food is good except meat. A friend of mine used to give the poor in his neighbourhood vegetable soup, and they gladly received it at first ; but as soon as they found there was no "stock" in the soup they would not have it. This is a very common idea. Who should be blamed for it ? We have the doctors to blame. In the hospitals again and again we hear the words, " You must take flesh-meat," or, " You know you must get some port wine," and that sort of thing. Well, my own experience is this—I cured myself of tubercular consumption by living on vegetable food. A doctor told me I had not six months to live. What was I to do ? I was to eat *raw meat* and drink port wine.

Well, I went into the country and ate porridge and fruit, and appear to-day on this platform! Then, again, there is the Leather Question. I was determined that on this point I would not have my boots thrown at my head as a reproach; so I went about London to find a man who would make boots without leather, and I found him, and have the boots on this evening. The argument about leather then is answered, for soles, uppers, and everything else are made without it. Two years ago I climbed the hills of Switzerland in boots made without leather. I have pretty well solved this question, then. When there comes a demand for boots made without leather, you will be able to get them. I am afraid I have over-talked my time now. I had a great many things to say, but I am afraid I shall forget them. There is much to say with regard to the history of Vegetarianism. There have been a great many very illustrious names connected with Vegetarianism: men of such calibre as Gautama Buddha, whose life has been given to the world in that beautiful poem, *The Light of Asia*, which is now issued as cheap as possible—at one shilling. You should read that work and the teaching of Edwin Arnold, and if that does not convert you to Vegetarianism, nothing will; it is full of the most beautiful language and most pathetic sentiment possible to imagine. You will find that a book to smile over, and a book to weep over. It is the sort of literature I should like to see widely disseminated in London. I could point to such men as Pythagoras, as Seneca the friend of St Paul, and to a whole army of Vegetarian saints—in the Church and out of it; to Shelley, the king of poets, to whose beautiful poem, *Queen Mab*, there is appended a long note in the form of an “Essay on Flesh-eating.” Plutarch, too, is with us, and all the greatest teachers and philosophers in the world. It does not seem much as if we are “poor weaklings.” Physically, too, the gorilla, which is a Vegetarian, is one of the strongest animals. Du Chaillu tells us how once he was frightened by a gorilla, and dropped his gun, which that animal took up and snapped in two as though it had been a hazel twig! Yet this gorilla was fed on nuts and fruits. Well, the hardest work of the world in our cities, and in our battle-fields, and in our wheat-fields too, is done by animals which, side by side with us, build our towns and cultivate our lands, and are Vegetarians. So, from a physical point of view, we repudiate the epithet of “poor weaklings.” And we

do so as regards intellect also. With regard to the moral point of view, we have a tower of strength, and can easily prove we are not "poor weaklings." I think on every point we can prove our strength, and, let me say it with all modesty, our superiority also. We are superior to animals of prey, and we rise above them. We don't want to drag ourselves down to the level of the tiger, but we rather rise above it. Our motto is "Upwards and onwards!" We should strive to teach men to live simply and purely, and we should reduce our own wants as much as we can. We should assimilate ourselves more and more to the teaching of those men who have been pioneers of the cause. Let us adopt the teaching of Pythagoras—"Learn to love that which is right, and custom will make it pleasant and delightful." I will close my remarks by quoting two verses of a little poem¹ of Goldsmith, which perhaps you have heard. They appear to place our doctrine in a beautiful light, so I don't think I can do better than quote them to you. They are very simple, yet they are very expressive. They are :

"No flocks that range the valley free
To slaughter I condemn ;
Taught by the Power that pities me,
I learn to pity them.

But from the mountain's grassy side
A guiltless feast I bring ;
A scrip with fruit and corn supplied,
And water from the spring."

¹ In *The Vicar of Wakefield*.

HISTORICAL ASPECT OF FOOD REFORM¹

It has been allotted to me to speak of the historical development of this form of diet, and I think a reference to evolution quite necessary in this connection, for one can hardly take up the history of man at any given period without referring it back to the sources from which he sprang. For we must look upon the human race, not as a thing apart from the rest of creation, but as being in brotherhood and solidarity with the whole of those living forms with which we are surrounded. From the scientific point of view we all arise out of differentiation from one common stock; but the one point I wish to dwell upon is that there has been throughout that evolution a steady heading towards the best, a steady "stream of tendency which makes for righteousness"; and we see that evolution has been accomplished by the gathering up into the complex nervous structure, and especially into the large ganglion of the brain, of all the best that nature can give. That is to say, that it is by the elaboration of the nervous structure, and especially of the brain, that man has become man. I wish in connection with this subject to point out to you that man sprang immediately from the frugivorous group. It is a fact of great significance, that man became man as a fruit-eater, and not as a carnivorous animal, for it shows that the carnivora were incapable of producing man, and that the frugivorous group alone were capable of the necessary elaboration and perfection of the intellectual nature. The recognition of this fact must be an enormous gain to food reform. It is sometimes said to me, when I dwell on the anatomy and physiology of man in connection with this question, that he could just as well have sprung out of the races of the tiger or

¹ Reprinted from a Report, published in *The Food Reform Magazine* (No. I. vol. v., July-September 1885, p. 16), of an Address given by Anna Kingsford on Tuesday, 26th May 1885, at Exeter Hall, under the auspices of the National Food Reform Society.

the lion or the jackal. But I say no ; the very fact that he did not, proves those races incapable of such evolution. When you know that all the great anatomists have agreed to place the primates—the great anthropoid apes—at the head of the whole family of natural evolution, and have classed them according to the structural evolution of the nervous system, you see that we may claim for this frugivorous group the ascendancy and priority over all the rest. And not only is it true in connection with the ape ; it is also true in connection with all the first races of man. I do not care whether you take up your Ovid or your Hesiod or your Bible, you will find always the same tale. You will find that in the Golden Age (if you turn to your Ovid) men lived upon the fruits of the earth and upon such natural gifts as kind nature bestowed on them, “nor stained their lips with blood.” So, if you turn to the first chapter of Genesis you will find the command was to “eat the fruits of the earth.” Whether you take the popular religious point of view, the scientific point of view, or the poetic point of view, you always come to the same thing ; all have their starting-point in the frugivorous dispensation ; and from it have sprung all the great nations which gave us the laws, the sciences, and arts which the world has since elaborated. In Sharpe’s *History of Egypt* it is stated that the law-givers of primitive Egypt prohibited the use of flesh ; and I hardly need remind you that it is from Egypt that the Western world has received all the best that it now has of science and of knowledge. When we think of the builders of the pyramids, the mighty givers of the philosophy of the past—when we dwell upon the profound thoughts of those great men—when we remember the arts and sciences they have left behind, we perceive what we owe to that past—that past which lives so finely, so subtly, and so splendidly in the pages of history. Turn again to the East. They say Pythagoras, the Sage of Samos, learned all his knowledge in the East—but this point, of course, we are not discussing—however, this fact remains, that all the great tribes of India are frugivorous in their habits, and when we study the laws of the Brahmans, we find them divided into several sects or classes—castes, as they are called. The three first castes, the highest of course, are precluded from the use of animal meat—in fact the use of animal meat is associated in the minds of these Eastern people with the idea of pollution, and they allow it only therefore to the lowest

class, an idea exactly opposite to that to which we are accustomed in the West. I conversed with a Brahmin some years ago, a Brahmin who had broken his caste by crossing the sea. On learning what the custom of this country was he resolved before leaving his native country to accustom himself, in silence and darkness, to the degrading habit of eating flesh-meat. He was forced to eat it at night with the door shut for fear of his people coming upon him and discovering his apostasy. There was, however, one man in the house where he resided who was obliged to know of his habits. This one man was his servant, a member of the lowest class, who used to supply his master with the meat, so that he might habituate himself to a diet which he understood to be common in the country which he was about to visit. After a time the Brahmin noticed that various things about his house were stolen, valuables disappeared ; he suspected this man who waited upon him, and he charged him with theft, and said to him : " I will bring you before the magistrate and accuse you of robbing me." Then the servant turned upon him at once, and said : " You dare not ; for if you do I will bring against you a charge of the horrible crime of which you are guilty in the silence of the night, and the revelation of which would degrade you from your caste." And so the Brahmin was forced to hold his peace. You may gather from this something of the ingrained idea prevalent in the East of the pollution which a man undergoes by breaking his caste and eating flesh. I merely narrate this little story to show you how strongly this idea in the matter of caste is held among the Brahmins and Buddhists. Gautama Buddha (than whom I believe there never lived in the world a more gentle, more admirable, or more holy being) taught this doctrine to his disciples as the most precious and integral part of his teaching. He laid it down as a rule that no man should take the life of any living creature, and the whole tendency of the teachings of Buddha and of the Buddhist religion lies in this direction. I agree entirely with the Archbishop of Canterbury when he said, some time ago, that we ought to blend the teachings of the Gospel with the almost divine evangel of Gautama Buddha, and that we ought to take all that it has of good and incorporate it with ours. If you want to understand something of the religious life of the East you should read the beautiful poem of Edwin Arnold, *The Light of Asia*, and learn what nobleness, what grandeur there is in the heart of

man when he lives aright, as men should live, and becomes that which he is intended to be by nature. Then you will learn how splendid, how sublime, how beautiful, is the philosophy to which he can reach. I think that here, in the West, we shall do well to study the doctrines of Gautama Buddha and of the Buddhist religion. I am always struck with the idea that all the highest, the purest, the subtlest, the most deep-reaching philosophy which the world holds has come to us from the vegetarian races. Not merely is that the case in regard to the Buddhists, but in regard also to the great Egyptian teacher, Hermes Trismegistos, who held the same doctrines. And the whole of the greatest and purest thoughts that have come to us along the channel of time have been filtered down to us, it appears, through these great races. That is the case, it seems to me, with *thought*. The question that we now have to face is, "Is it the case with physical force?" It has been said: it is all very well for philosophers to live on a vegetarian diet, but when you come to fighting, you must eat flesh as do the warriors of the West, who distinguish themselves by conquest, while the East is distinguished by thought. All the races which have been vegetarian, it is said, have been contemplative, philosophic, and meditative races. Those which have been fighting races have been eaters of animal food. Well, that is an intricate question, and I am not quite sure that even if we so decide it we should be wholly in the right, for I remember that the most splendid heroes that the world has ever seen, the Spartans, under Leonidas, who held the Pass of Thermopylæ, were lovers on barley bread, oatcake, and oil. The heroes of Salamis and of Marathon were well-nigh all vegetarians; so also were the Persians, under Cyrus. When I consider this, I am inclined to think that all the true heroism of the world may fairly be gathered from among the flower of the vegetarian races. Remember, that to be a hero is one thing, and to have an itch and fever for war is another. It is one thing to make a stand with the Spartans and with Gordon, and it is another to long to fly at the throats of our neighbours and deluge the world in blood. He who can stand face to face with his foe calmly, with courage and without flinching, is a hero; but to desire to kill for the sake of conquest, to decimate a country for the passion of war, is an outrage upon human nature. I think that as long as men live upon the food of the tiger they will have the tiger's nature; but if they adopt the

food of the Golden Age,—the food of Eden, I care not which you call it,—they will have the nature of Paradise. If the world is to be redeemed we must get back to that beautiful time which is celebrated by all the poets ; which haunts evermore the dreams of the seers ; of which Shelley sang—Shelley, the king of poets ;—of which all the truest, sublimest, and purest souls of the world have had the divine and beatific vision. Let me cite to you those beautiful and prophetic lines in *The Revolt of Islam*, which foretell this Paradise regained.

[Here the lecturer recited the passage from *The Revolt of Islam* which is to be found at the conclusion of her Lecture on Food.¹]

¹ See p. 100 *ante*.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE VEGETARIAN QUESTION ¹

It appears to me that we may justly regard the century in which we live as *par excellence* the age of Reform and of Criticism. The work of our day seems to be almost exclusively that of applying tests to the discoveries and theories of the past. The civilised world has outgrown its childhood, and consents no longer to take things upon trust. With nations, as with individuals, the enthusiastic faith and credulity of youth yields, in process of time, to the sober reason of maturity. The mind, whether single or aggregate, reviews, with the searching eye of a critic, the opinions it has hitherto entertained, subjects them, one by one, to the test of logic, and retains only such as are sufficiently well-founded to stand the crucial examination unimpaired.

Thus, at the present era of our national history, we are dealing with our old beliefs, and by degrees are putting away our childish things. We are not now satisfied to pursue a certain course of life, or to hold by certain modes of faith, merely because that was the life and this the faith which contented our ancestors. We are asking the meaning and purpose of our existence, and inquiring why such and such things are to be done, and what is our warranty for doing them.

In this manner I account for the fact that the nineteenth century is so fruitful in critics and in censorship. Nothing can be said or done in these days without attracting comment. Everyone who stands forward to advocate any particular cause or opinion is asked why he supports it ; nor is it enough for him to reply that the duty of so doing attaches to his hereditary faith or family history. Such an answer would have suited the times that are past very fairly, but the people of to-day want personal convictions which shall bear with impunity the broad light of Reason.

¹ A lecture given by Anna Kingsford, reprinted from *The Ideal in Diet: Selections from the Writings of Anna Bonus Kingsford*.

This keen and searching fire of criticism which burns around us may well be likened to the famous cauldron of the enchantress Medea. Into it is put the old worn-out body of the world's past creeds and theories, inert, decrepit, powerless to touch any longer the minds and hearts of the people. But out of the purifying furnace springs the aspiration of the new age, vigorous and strong, full of life and youth and purpose. So it comes about that the popular movements of our time are the result, as a rule, of criticism applied to past ideas. Of late, people have dared to ask why, in old times, wives and daughters were subjected by their male relatives, and practically denied the dignity of humanity. As a result of this inquiry we have the agitation for women's rights. Other people, again, have questioned the sense and propriety of the flesh-eating habits which have prevailed so generally hitherto in European countries, and by consequence the Vegetarian Society rises into being. "Reform" is the cry of our day. With us the inquiry to be made is not "What did our fathers think?" or "What have been the belief and practice of the past?" but more reasonably, "What should *we* think?" "What should be the belief and practice of the *future*?" The consideration of that which ought to be is now of more importance to us than the consideration of that which has been. It is our duty and our desire to progress beyond our ancestors, not to imitate them. Intellect is ever on the march; the spirit of man is never contented with the possessions of a bygone age; his nature and the law of his being compel him to a continual striving after the highest and the best—that is, the Divine.

And for those who know and estimate the absolute dependence of Mind upon Matter, the Vegetarian movement will assume a vast importance and significance among the progressive theories of the age. *We are* that which we eat; our food is converted into our blood, our blood nourishes our brains, our brains are the *foci* and centres of our thoughts. In the old and beautiful story of the Fall of Man, we find the entire moral and spiritual condition of the individual independent on his choice of food, and a wrong selection in this respect immediately followed by the most dismal results to his soul. It is the same with each of us to-day. Our whole mental *status* rests upon our bodily condition. If we feed purely and wisely, we shall be pure and wise in spirit. If, on the contrary, we accustom ourselves to gross diet, and mould

our appetites to seek and to love food which is obtained at the expense of suffering and death to other sentient creatures, we shall assuredly develop in our souls the sensuality and the cruel tastes of the men of past times. Shall we not, then, place the spiritual progress of our race foremost in the catalogue of our necessities—foremost in our personal aspirations? Shall we not, all of us, combine to sacrifice every consideration of luxury to the higher claims of the soul?

And, again, do we not find, as a matter of fact, that the more earnest and the more advanced a man is in the study and practice of wisdom, the simpler and the more frugal become his habits of diet? Cast your eye back on the biographical records of former times, whether biblical or secular, and you will find that the prophets, the seers, the miracle-workers, the saints, the students, the teachers, the philosophers whose great names make the glory of the Past, were men of exceeding temperance, often ascetics in regard to appetite.

Some persons will tell you that the Divine Founder of the Christian Church was a flesh-eater. The utmost they can show from gospel narrative is that He ate fish, and the obvious inference from several passages is against the supposition that He partook of meat in any grosser form. When hungry in the wilderness, it was with the suggestion of *bread*, and not of flesh, that the demon attempted to beguile His pure desires; when famished with long abstinence and travel, it was with the fruit of the fig-tree that He sought to satisfy His appetite.

But the closing act of His life was one of such deep significance and interest to Vegetarians that I cannot avoid noticing it here. Surely it is at least remarkable that the memorial and type of His mission to the world should have been bequeathed under the emblems of unleavened bread and wine mingled with water. We know that the Jews were accustomed to celebrate the Passover by eating the flesh of a lamb, and this lamb has always been regarded as the type of the Messiah. It might, therefore, have been naturally expected that this same Messiah, celebrating this identical paschal feast, would have chosen the lamb before Him on the table as the type of Himself in time to come, and thus have perpetuated the use of the ancient symbol in the Church He was about to institute. But instead, we find Him consecrating a cake of unfermented meal as his sacramental representative. But instead of this innocent victim, Jesus of Nazareth lays His hand upon a loaf

of unleavened grain, and on a cup of unfermented wine, and these He gives to His apostles as the regenerating and bloodless food of the future Church—His legacy to the new-born brotherhood—fittest token and symbol of the gentle morality He advocated, and of the pure and simple aspirations He taught. “This,” says He, “is My Body, and this My Blood. These are the untainted elements from whence I draw my perfect Being, my wondrous power and vitality. This is the mysterious meat of which ye knew not; these the aliments on which ye also ought to support your lives. Henceforward eat and drink these in memory of your Master.” Thus His last act is to restore to the world a pure dietary, and, dismissing the barbarisms of the past, to assure His disciples that the age of slain victims and of paschal lambs should yield in the wiser hereafter to a more spiritual dispensation. “Whoso eateth this bread and drinketh of this cup for his sustenance shall never see death.” There is, rightly, a far more literal meaning in these words of Christ’s than theologians are apt to fancy.

Passing from religious to economical considerations, we may notice, first, a very general objection raised with regard to Vegetarianism which we may represent by the query: “What will become of *us* if we do not kill and eat other creatures? Shall we not be ourselves eaten by them?” In the first place I reply: “The animals at present used for human food are artificially bred. Cease to breed them.” And in the second place I would observe that there are many creatures which are not used for food which, nevertheless, do not increase to any appreciable, still less to any injurious, extent. Do we think we run any risk of being devoured by badgers, beavers, squirrels, dogs, weasels, hedgehogs, cats, or horses? Or of being pecked to death by robins, wrens, or titmice? Have we not even great difficulty in obtaining horses and other beasts of burden at reasonable prices, although these creatures are never killed for food, save by a few fanatics in Paris? It seems, indeed, that nature is so regulated as to prevent the undue multiplication of any one kind of animal, and that only a fixed and limited number of each species is permitted to exist.

Again, it is not in the least probable that the whole world, or even the members of one nation, or the population of one city, will be converted to Vegetarianism simultaneously. The adoption of a purer system of diet will be a gradual process

among us. Therefore, those creatures which are now reared artificially will have ample time to decrease gradually in number as the demand for their flesh gradually lessens and ceases. Most of these animals too, let us recollect, are not indigenous to our climate, but have been at a remote period imported from distant parts of the globe: the ox probably from Oriental countries, the sheep from Africa. That stupidity and docility of manner which we must all have noticed as peculiar to these beasts, and which is frequently remarked upon as a proof that they were created to be our prey, result from the circumstances of their unnatural and domesticated state, and is by no means characteristic of their tribe. Every art which tends to make the poor cow and sheep more helpless and useless to themselves has been adopted by man; and if we are to look for these creatures in their natural condition, we must seek them in the wilds of Tartary, or in the deserts of Africa. Among the captive descendants of the wild kine there have been so many changes wrought by civilisation as strangely to disguise their true nature. Those enfeebled and idolent animals which we see in our fields and streets are a degenerate race, trained by the hand of man, and propagated merely to pamper his vitiated appetites. Nature shows nothing so stupid, so inert, so defenceless.

Stand awhile in any one of our pasture-meadows and observe the sheep. He is a large mass of flesh, supported on four small straight legs, ill-fitted for carrying such a burden. His movements are awkward, he is easily fatigued, and frequently sinks under the weight of his own corpulence. And, in proportion as these marks of human transformation become more numerous and observable, the creature becomes more helpless and stupid. Oxen and sheep which batten upon very fertile lands become fat and entirely feeble, those that lack horns being the most dull and heavy, while those whose fleeces are longest and finest are most subject to disease. In short, whatever changes have been wrought upon these unfortunate brutes by man, are entirely calculated for imagined human advantage and not for that of the creatures themselves. It would require a succession of ages to restore the ox or the sheep to its primitive condition of strength and activity so as to match in point of perfection its compeers of wild or forest.

Sometimes, again, we are told by our opponents that if the whole nation, or any considerable portion of it, were to be-

come Vegetarian, we should not, in our latitude, be able to produce fruits and vegetables in sufficient quantity to meet the demand for food. But imagine all the miles of English pasture and sheep-runs converted into orchards, gardens, and grain fields; imagine the pig-styes, cattle sheds, and pens giving place to fragrant vineyards and fruit-houses! Will anyone be hardy enough to say we should not then have enough to eat and to spare?

Mr W. R. Greg, in a paper upon population and the prospects of the world in view of the ever-rapidly increasing tide of human life on the earth, observes: "There is one mode in which the amount of human life sustainable on a given area, and therefore throughout the chief portion of the habitable globe, may be almost indefinitely increased, *i.e.* by a substitution of vegetable for animal food. A given acreage of wheat will feed at least ten times as many men as the same acreage employed in growing mutton. It is usually calculated that the consumption of wheat by an adult is about one quarter per annum, and we know that good land produces four quarters. But let us assume that a man living on grain would require two quarters a year; still one acre would support two men. But a man living on meat would need three pounds a day, and it is considered a liberal calculation if an acre spent in grazing sheep and cattle will yield in beef or mutton more than fifty pounds on an average—the best farmer in Norfolk having averaged ninety pounds; but a great majority of farms in Great Britain only reach twenty pounds. On these data, it would require twenty-two acres of pasture-land to sustain one adult person living on meat. It is obvious that, in view of the adoption of vegetable diet, there lies the indication of a vast possible increase in the population sustainable on a given area."

Once more: there is a favourite argument brought against us on the score of the human teeth. People like to assume that they have carnivorous teeth—the teeth of the lion, the wolf, or the tiger. Well, if our opponents have such teeth, it is because they have developed them by habit through successive generations, just as many other abnormal characteristics of body have been developed in all manner of creatures by means of long-continued custom.

It really happens, however, that the human cuspids (or canine teeth, as they are erroneously called) do not bear the slightest resemblance to those of the carnivorous animals, and

it is on the shape and formation of these cuspids that the whole argument of the advocates of flesh-eating depends. In the human jaw there is no space between the opposite teeth for receiving the cuspids, as in the jaws of all carnivorous animals. And in the jaws of the horse, camel, and other individuals of the herbivorous tribes, the canines are considerably longer in proportion to the other teeth than they are in the human jaw ; therefore, these creatures must be held, if we are to be logical in our deductions, far more carnivorous than man.

Again, the teeth of the orang-outang, which is frugivorous in its habits, bear a much greater likeness to those of the flesh-eating animals than the teeth of man ; so that it is evident our race is farther removed by nature from the carnivora than is the race of apes, which more nearly resembles us. Let anyone who is still troubled with doubts on this subject examine the jaws of his dog and compare them honestly with his own. He will not find in *his* mouth the uneven, sharp-pointed incisors, or the projecting tusks of his dumb favourite ; but, on the contrary, he will observe that his teeth are short, broad, and blunt, closely adjoining one another like those of the deer and kine. Thomas Bell, in a work entitled "The Anatomy, Physiology, and Diseases of the Teeth," remarks that the formation of the human jaw and teeth, as well as the character of all the organs and limbs of man, class him indubitably among the frugivorous animals. Such also is the opinion of Roget, Broussonet, Ray, Sir E. Home, Baron Cuvier, Linnæus, Gassendi, Sylvester Graham, Professor Lawrence, and other eminent and learned physiologists and natural philosophers.

But, again, we have the witness of instinct on our side. We hear a vast deal about the infallible and sacred character of instinct. Theologians appeal to the natural instinct of man as a proof that he is a religious animal ; and, apart from Revelation, it is on human instinct that they rely as the chief assurance of immortality. Let us inquire, then, in what direction instinct leads us with regard to our choice of food. Man under his noblest aspects is compassionate, gentle, unselfish, benign ; he has a horror of injustice and of bloodshed ; he abhors cruelty. If he sees any creature in pain or distress, he instantly conceives it is his duty to assist and relieve it. His spirit is moved to indignation at the sight of oppression or tyranny. He feels that war is a lamentable barbarism, and endeavours, accordingly, to settle international disputes by

means of arbitration. Carnage and the odour of death occasion him the deepest repugnance. He is a peace-maker, and he believes that title constitutes his highest claim to be called a child of God.

How absurd and inconsistent to suppose that such a being as this ought to feed like a beast of prey! How ridiculous to invest him with the sanguinary desires of the tiger or the vulture! If the appetite for flesh were a true instinct in man, he would share the savage disposition of the carnivora; it would be a pleasure to him to kill and tear his victim, and the sight of blood would be an agreeable titillation to his hunger. The carnivorous tribes delight in slaughter because slaughter is normal to their nature. But civilised man, on the contrary, has so great an aversion to bloodshed and to the sight of death, that he is apt to shudder on passing a butcher's stall, to quicken his steps, and to thank Heaven that he does not belong to so repulsive a trade. He employs other people of coarser organisation than himself, men who are the helots of modern times, to slaughter victims for his use; and when, finally, their limbs are brought to his table, prepared by the art of cookery, he further disguises the taste and appearance of them with unwholesome sauces, fiery condiments, poisonous seasonings, and fantastic garnishes.

How I should like to compel all flesh-eating men and women to kill their own meat! Conceive the delicate lady of the period going out, knife in hand, to slaughter her victims for the next day's dinner! Imagine the clergyman, whose mission it is to preach mercy and benevolence, taking his pole-axe from the shelf and sallying forth to his cattle-shed intent on taking innocent life! What a vulgar picture! What a coarse and indelicate conception! Quite so! But this is just what would be natural enough if human instincts were really carnivorous. Observe the little child,—for in childhood you have the nature of man in its purest and most uncorrupted state. I lately saw a little girl weep bitterly for hours and refuse all consolation because a favourite rabbit had been killed for the mid-day meal. Let such training continue, and by and by that child will become hardened by habit, depraved by contact with a world which lives amiss, and be no longer moved by the sweet impulses of pity.

In the recent accounts of the Tichborne trial, most of us read the testimony given to the claimant's identity by a

metropolitan butcher. In the course of his examination it was elicited that butchers, while employed in the slaughter-house, are compelled to walk about upon clogs to preserve their feet from being soaked with blood. The floor of the slaughter-house is a great red pool of steaming blood! Can anything be pictured more awful, more infernal, than such a sight? Conceive what manner of men these unfortunate slaughterers must become after a few years of constant familiarity with scenes and odours of this character, in which it is also theirs to enact the chief horrible part! What chance have they, do you think, of being gentle, refined, or noble-hearted men? Can such men conceive lofty aspirations, or form high ideals? Can they appreciate pure happiness? And so long as a certain number of human souls is thus sacrificed to the debased desires of the rest of our race, must we not admit that our boasted civilisation is a chimera? Every flesh-eater is guilty, not only of shedding innocent blood at the hands of his helot, but is guilty also of causing the degradation and pollution of a human soul. The depravity and insensibility of the butcher rest upon the purchaser, who is morally responsible for retaining in a debased condition the intellect of a fellow-man.

[Here the lecturer related the incident of the butcher and the child, referred to in the first of her *Letters on Pure Diet in The Food Reform Magazine*.¹]

I confess, indeed, that I cannot perceive what logical basis for the support of the flesh-eating doctrine is left to those who affirm the wisdom of the Creator or who desire the progress of civilisation. For it follows, if the consumption of flesh be natural and necessary to man, that God must have intended his bodily appetite to do continual violence to his spiritual instincts, since he must, at the same time, have implanted in the human heart a love of gentleness and an aspiration after purity and divine benevolence, while obliging the human organisation to subsist by deeds of carnage. Such a supposition is, in the last degree, derogatory to the wisdom of God, since it maintains Him to have perpetrated a stupidity and inconsistency which the most simple of us can readily perceive. And because civilisation, with its concomitants of education, refinement, and morality, must certainly tend to increase the benignity of the human race, the opponents of Vegetarianism

¹ See p. 66 *ante*.

ought reasonably to advocate our return to a state of barbarism, that so the growing aversion to bloodshed might diminish among us, and the old ardour for battle and rapine return to the heart of mankind.

Not unfrequently, too, we are fated to hear the beautiful argument—"Animals must have been intended for the food of man; else, why were they created at all?" It really is very preposterous that man should imagine everything he beholds has been designed solely for his consumption! Are there not scores and scores of creatures which live, and move, and die around us, of which we cannot make, and have never attempted to make, any use as food? Are there not innumerable mineral and vegetable poisons throughout nature which we do not conceive ourselves in any way bound to consume? Is no creature to have a right to life for life's sake except ourselves? Nothing to exist but for our gratification? We have already observed that those creatures which men are accustomed to eat are not by any means such as God created them: man has degenerated and enfeebled them for his own ends. Obviously, therefore, the wild ox was no more created to be eaten by man than the rhinoceros or the river-horse. It would be much more logical to assert that the human races were created to be the prey of lions, bears, panthers, tigers, or wolves, which are certainly carnivorous animals, than to presume that sheep and oxen were designed to be victims for us, who are furnished with teeth and internal organs suitable for vegetable diet.

Time will not suffice me in this brief address to examine at length the objection raised against us on the head of the comparative value to the human system of mixed and of Vegetarian diet. Other writers and lecturers, vastly more fitted than I to deal with this important subject, have, already and triumphantly, vindicated our cause in this respect. Suffice it, therefore, to observe, briefly, that the origin of all nutriment is found in the vegetable kingdom; that the various articles comprised in a vegetarian dietary are more digestible than a corresponding average from the flesh of animals; that flesh-meat contains about twenty-five per cent. of nutritious matter, while rice, wheat, pease, and beans contain from eighty-two to ninety-two per cent., and potatoes twenty-eight; that one pound of bread, oatmeal, rice, or sago contains more solids than three pounds of flesh, and a pound of potatoes as much

as a pound of beef. Notwithstanding this, there are persons found, usually among the ranks of ordinary medical practitioners, who may be heard to declare, with much assurance, that the principles of nutrition found in vegetables differ in character from the fibrin, albumen, and casein of animal food, and that only animal food imparts muscle and strength to the human body. But the experiments of Liebig, Dr Lyon Playfair, Boussingault, and other distinguished chemists have established, beyond possibility of doubt, the fact that animal and vegetable substances are identical in fibrin, albumen, and casein, and that both contain precisely the same amount of azotised principle.

Moreover, vegetable diet is incontestably superior to flesh-tissue in point of purity, for the latter is often tainted or diseased in consequence of the unnatural state in which creatures bred for slaughter are habitually kept, the cramped, confined, and ill-ventilated spaces allowed them for exercise, and the unwholesome aliments on which they are fed in order to induce that abnormal deposit of fat which, though deemed a delicacy, is really a diseased condition of body. All of us are familiar enough, for example, with the sight and smell of a pig-stye. Many breeders of pigs feed their beasts upon every filthy substance that comes to hand—old sour wash, slops, the entrails of oxen and other offal. The flesh of hogs thus raised is sold for healthy pork. But even if pigs are cleanly fed and reared more expensively, it would still be better not to rear them at all. It is a very great wrong that a quantity of precious grain, which would be wholesome and nutritious as food for man, should annually be converted into poisonous hog-grease, which contains no nourishing element, and which corrupts the blood, vitiates the mind, and disorders the system of the consumer. Apart from these considerations, it is obvious that all cattle driven to market, and conveyed thither by rail or steamship, must be more or less disordered. The terror, the blows, the foul air, the fatigue, the maddening thirst these poor animals experience during their transit, all tend to set up an abnormal and feverish condition of body; the blood becomes inflamed, the secretions disturbed, the system suffers exhaustion and irritation, and the result is febrility and diseased tissue. Indeed, nothing less could be expected.

But while on the subject of animal disorders, I should like to draw your attention to a few significant particulars con-

nected with it. Did you ever reflect how strange a thing it is that man, the master of creation, appears, more than any other creature, to be the prey of disease and premature death? *Wild* animals rarely suffer from disease; they die of old age, or by accident. Oxen and sheep and other domesticated beasts are more frequently disordered, but the proportion and variety of even their complaints is not to be compared to those of man. For the truth is, as I once heard a preacher say, that every creature, except man, and those unfortunate animals whom man has seduced, obeys the will of God and fulfils its nature. Man suffers disease because he has sinned. "God made him upright," says a wise writer, "but men have sought out many inventions." And it is one of Nature's most remarkable laws that the children must bear the iniquity of the fathers. Nothing is able to save a man from the transgressions of his ancestors. Ages ago, our progenitors forsook the course of diet prescribed for them by Nature, and forgot that original command of Divine wisdom, "Behold, I give you every herb which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree; to you it shall be for meat." How impious to assert that the food which Divine appointment selected for man is inadequate for his sustenance, unsuited to his organisation! Yet this is the foolish and irreverent idea which man conceived, and upon which he acted. And Nature, who forgives nothing, has visited the crime upon every successive generation. The predisposition to such diseases as gout, consumption, or heart complaint, is usually an inheritance from parents or ancestors who have violated the most obvious conditions of hygiene. Nevertheless we go on, year after year, in the same vicious excesses, indulging our palates with improper food, and compelling our innocent babes to partake of the same nauseous diet, till they, too, learn to like and to crave for it. Thus our whole systems have become vitiated, easily disturbed, the prey of all manner of maladies; and recent years have added incalculably to the mischief by building up, upon this basis of flesh-diet, a culinary code of luxurious living which will, by and by, be the ruin of England, as it was in old times the ruin of the Roman Empire. All simplicity, all healthfulness, have disappeared from our mode of cooking; every viand of which we partake is disguised alike in name and appearance, and the very praise and glory of kitchen art seems to consist in making the taste and the look of any par-

ticular dish as unlike its original component elements as possible. Glancing over a fashionable cookery-book the other day, I lighted on a string of "ménus" for family dinners. I could not recognise in the catalogue of soups, meats, and puddings furnished a single English name, nor could I form the least notion of the appearance or taste of a single article! Fortunes are expended in these days over the preparation of a lunch, a breakfast, or a supper, not to mention the fabulous sums lavished on civic or on royal dinners. The entertainment lately given to the Shah of Persia, at the Guildhall, is estimated to have cost forty thousand pounds. With such statistics as this before us, what can we hope for the health prospects of the rising generation? Luxury and gluttony have their record in every newspaper we take up, in every fashionable chronicle or advertisement that comes to hand. English men and women cannot meet in committee, nor assist a charity, nor join in a religious service, without supplementing the act with inordinate eating and drinking. In old times, even in the age of our grandparents, flesh-meat once a day used to be considered sufficient. But the people of our generation, in the same class of life, accustom themselves to hot meat breakfasts, and to the same diet at lunch and dinner. Thus the history of the world repeats itself, and the rebuke which Horace applied to the Romans of his time is verified of us also: "The age of our fathers hath produced us still more wicked, hereafter to leave a posterity more vicious still."

There is yet another point in connection with Vegetarianism which influences my mind very strongly. As I have not elsewhere encountered any reference to this particular consideration, it may not be amiss to record my opinion upon it here. I allude to the aspects of Vegetarian diet as they affect the subject of woman's emancipation. Conservatives in social and domestic matters are constantly urging upon us the pretended fact that one of the chief duties of woman is—to cook. And the exigencies of modern cookery have grown to such an alarming extent that, if women are to satisfy all the present demands of this luxurious age with regard to the pleasures of the table, they certainly will have no time left them for serious pursuits. Now, the Vegetarian system is pre-eminently calculated to rescue women from the drudgery which threatens them in respect of the culinary art. Simple and wholesome cooking, such as we advocate, would relieve

the sex from more than half the hard toil and anxiety of the present régime, while it would promote the health of every member of the household. "At least four-fifths of all the money expended for medicines and medical advice," says a writer in the *Science of Health Journal*, "are paid because of the diseases of women and children. And nine-tenths of all the care, nursing, night-watching, and privation of sleep and rest because of sick children are performed and suffered by women." Hygienic diet would get rid of almost all this vexation and expense, for over-stuffing and improper food are the fruitful causes of both adult and childish complaints. The Medical Society in New York, on one of its festive occasions, toasted woman in the following terms: "Woman, God's best gift to man, and the chief support of the doctors." The sentiment, if not poetical, is, at least, significant, and should point a sting at the conscience of every housewife who prepares or sanctions the consumption of unwholesome and luxurious diet. In these days of close competition and expensive living, what a boon would the adoption of Vegetarian habits prove to young couples with small incomes! How it would lighten the anxiety of husband and wife! Love would then become a possibility for almost every man and woman, early marriages would be feasible, and the advent of children would cease to be a cause of distress. A young lady with whom I am acquainted recently engaged herself to a struggling lieutenant with scanty means. All her friends exclaimed against the absurdity and folly of the proceeding. "How are the butcher's bills to be paid with two hundred a year," they cried, "and meat a shilling a pound?" But a Vegetarian brother of mine observed very gravely, "If only they knew *how* to live, two hundred a year would amply suffice them."

But we shall be told, perhaps, that in cold climates like our own, flesh-meat is necessary to sustain the heat of our organisation. Chemistry will inform you that vegetable diet is, at least, quite as rich in heat-forming principle as animal food, and for proof the querist may be referred to the evidence afforded by the contrasted habits of the Finns and Lapps dwelling in the same bleak latitude. The former live upon grain, the latter on flesh. And as a result the Finns are strong, vigorous, well-grown men, while the Lapps, on the contrary, are stunted and diminutive.

One of the most sturdy agitations of the day is the movement

in favour of abolishing the Game Laws. It is conceived by many thoughtful persons that there must be something grievously amiss in a system which permits the expulsion of human inhabitants from large tracts of land, and the prohibition of tillage, in order to stock preserves with game and deer for the purposes of so-called sport. The people of England are beginning to assert that they have a right to their country; that it is unjust to parcel it out into private wildernesses and wastes, from which all human feet, save those of the owner and his friends, are to be excluded; that, in short, the landed system of our country needs radical reform. It is not my province to enter into the *political* bearings of this subject; but the occasion will, I think, permit me to say a few words with regard to the demoralising tendency of private sport. Week after week our newspapers record the wholesale slaughter of hares, pheasants, grouse, and other animals in the preserves of some illustrious member of the Upper House; and it is written for our learning that His Royal Highness, or his Ducal Grace, bagged, like any poulterer, so many head of game. I am not going to enlarge on the sufferings of these unlucky creatures, exposed so cruelly to the inexperienced fire of nervous or of unpractised shooters, but rather, I wish to point out the pernicious effects of such amusements upon the persons who indulge in them, and, through them, upon the moral tone of the country. At Hurlingham, where the members of the nobility accustom themselves to do butcher's work on a number of tame and defenceless pigeons, it is forbidden by the laws of sport to aim twice at the same bird. If, therefore, the shooter should not be sufficiently dexterous to kill his victim at first fire, the wretched pigeon falls wounded on the grass, and pants away its life as speedily as it may. And while bird after bird is let out of its narrow little trap to meet a death it has not much chance of escaping, creatures, with the forms and the faces of women, sit by it in their laces and ribbons, and look on with a smile—creatures who are destined to become the mothers of, at least, some of our rising aristocracy.

Then we have the battues, which are, perhaps, more horrible and un-English in detail than even the sport at Hurlingham, and these also are attended by ladies. In pastimes of such description there is no real healthy sport, but only a gratification of the savage desire to kill and shed blood, a desire unnatural to civilised man, and which, so long as it is fostered

and encouraged by a luxurious and excessive system of stimulating diet, will place the persons who manifest it outside the pale of this century's philosophy, and will greatly retard the progress and enlightenment of our race. Long since, the voice of the nation condemned bear-baiting, bull-fighting, and all the kindred sports which involved barbarous and demoralising cruelty. Very lately the law inflicted its punishment on a number of persons belonging to the upper ranks of society who had been found guilty of taking part at a cock-fight. But the spirit of these deadly games still survives at Hurlingham, and in the park-preserves of many a noble peer. Will the nation have nothing more to say on the subject ?

Only a few weeks ago I had a short conversation with a clever and well-informed clergyman of the English Church, who is also a classical master at one of our chief public schools. He told me that he had just been preaching a sermon at the school-chapel upon the Christian duty of kindness to animals. He gave me his sermon, in manuscript, and we commented on it together. I remarked : " As far as it goes, I think the advice you give most excellent ; but in my opinion it does not reach far enough." " No," returned he, with great honesty ; " I admit your logic. When I had finished my sermon I felt that, to carry my argument to its true conclusions, I ought to have recommended abstinence from flesh as food. It sounds foolish and inconsistent to warn boys of the wickedness of teasing or robbing a few wild birds and animals, while tacitly admitting the propriety of shedding the blood of any number of creatures daily in order to gratify a selfish appetite. I know I have been illogical, but everybody else is the same. It would never do to preach Vegetarianism in the pulpit : I should have my bishop down on me ! "

Alas ! alas ! Here, then, we have the very pith and core of our difficulty with the people ! Vegetarianism is supposed to be at variance with the dictates of religion ! Now, on this point I am prepared to deny resolutely the possibility of finding in the Jewish Scriptures a single phrase condemnatory of vegetable diet, given with the authority of Divine command. There are, on the contrary, many passages which plainly indicate the displeasure with which the God of Israel regarded the adoption of carnivorous habits by man. So many persons have instanced the original ordinance delivered to Adam with regard to his diet, that I think it superfluous to dwell on the

subject here. For the same reason, I pass over the record of the punishment incurred by the early Jews, in the desert at Sinai, in consequence of their lust after the flesh-pots of Egypt ; and, in respect of this incident, I will merely remark that the wandering Israelites could not possibly have been accustomed to feed on the flocks and herds which accompanied them, else the demand for flesh would have been beyond measure absurd and superfluous. It is evident that the vegetable manna described as "angel's food" was their only aliment until the supply of quails arrived in the camp. But these details have been, one and all, so ably handled, that I prefer to take other ground. Nevertheless, in order that no one may have reason to accuse me of unfairness in dealing with this part of my subject, I will, while on the treatment of texts, instance and examine the only passage in the whole Bible which appears unfavourable to the tenets of Vegetarianism. It occurs in the First Epistle of St Paul to Timothy : " Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to spirits of error, . . . forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving ; for every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." Now, in the first place, I observe that these Epistles of St Paul, and of other early Christian writers, although they have received the sanction of the Church, are not to be regarded as the direct communications of the Divine Being, nor to be invested with any superstitious awe. They are simply the utterances of minds which reflected all the early errors and prejudices of the infant Christian community. If we want proof of this, we need not seek far. The Epistles are full of exhortations, and warnings of the speedy dissolution of the world, plainly showing that their writers, one and all, laboured under the delusion that they were, even then, living in the last days. How far they erred in this respect we all know. Again : it happens that this special passage about abstaining from meat was written against an ancient sect of heretics, called the Manicheans, which had just then arisen to vex the orthodox. These Manicheans held that all *flesh* was from an evil principle, and of the devil's creation. Hence St Paul, who, by the way, erroneously imagined the appearance of this sect to prognosticate the arrival of the last day, assures the faithful that flesh is by no means

the result of an evil principle, but quite otherwise, the work of God Himself. This fact no modern Vegetarian denies ; but, so far to the contrary, *because* every living being is the work of God, he abhors the idea of defacing its beauty, shedding its innocent blood, and robbing it of the life he cannot give. Observe, too, that the progress of mankind and the advance of human intellect have caused many of the precepts contained in the Epistles to be set aside, with the full consent of the greatest intellects among us. St Paul has laid down several maxims with regard to the mutual behaviour of masters and slaves, for the word rendered "servant" in our English text is really "slave." And, for a long time, one of the arguments against the abolition of negro slavery was founded on the Biblical passage—"Cursed is Canaan ; a servant of servants shall he be." Slavery also was practised under priestly sanction among the chosen race, as the Pentateuch clearly shows. Yet we have abolished the buying and selling of human beings with the hearty consent and approval of modern Christendom. And, in like manner, the Apostolic injunctions with regard to the position and treatment of woman are receiving their dismissal from the civilised code of morality. St Paul strongly deprecated any attempt to bestow liberty upon womankind. Later on, the Christians brutally murdered a pagan lady, named Hypatia, who offended their sense of the proprieties by lecturing in public. So, you see, that if the doctrines of St Paul with regard to feminine conduct obtained to-day, as they once did, I should not certainly be permitted to address you, with impunity, from this platform. And, once more : although St Paul made use of the language I have quoted with regard to the eating of meat, it is, nevertheless, clear that all the chief saints of the religion he advocated were strict Vegetarians in diet. St John the Baptist was a notable example of Vegetarianism ; the locust-plant of the East and the honey of the wild bee supplying all his needs. And after St Paul, or almost contemporary with him, lived St Matthew the Evangelist, Augustine, John Chrysostom, Antony, Hilarion, Martin of Tours, Ambrose of Milan, Benedict, Francis Xavier, Catherine of Sienna, Dominic, Theresa, Bernard the Great, Gregory, Aphratus, Serapion, Genevieve, Columba, Charles Borromeo, Philip Neri, Alphonsus, Ignatius, all of them rigid abstainers from flesh, besides an army of hermits, Fathers of the Desert, and principals of ecclesiastical orders. And, in

more modern times, we count among the ranks of Vegetarians such men as Byron, Shelley, Wordsworth, Sir Isaac Newton, Sir Richard Phillips, Dr Lambe, Ritson, Haller, Howard, Swedenborg, and the reformer Wesley ; while among the wise thinkers and teachers of heathen times, Pythagoras, the philosopher, was eminent in condemning the use of flesh as food, and his practice and opinions were also those of Zeno, Diogenes, Plato, Plutarch, Proclus, Apollonius of Tyana, a seer and a worker of miracles ; Porphyry, Plautus, and many others.

Surely we cannot suppose that all these Christian saints and famous philosophers erred throughout their lives ; or that a solitary expression of apostolic opinion in one Epistle is to be taken as outweighing and condemning the belief and practice of so many good and wise persons ; to say nothing of the *direct* contradiction which the passage in question offers to many other texts throughout the Scriptures of much higher and Diviner authority.

I shall, therefore, beg you to reflect that, although it is right to regard sacred writings with every reverence, they ought not, by any means, to be understood as containing *all* that God has to say to the world and to our souls. God has not ceased to exist, nor is His voice silenced. As in old times He spoke to our race by the lips of men of poetic or prophetic genius, so also He yet speaks in the wonderful language of Science. Every truth which comes to light is God's truth, and to nothing but error can it be dangerous. Little by little, as the world is able to bear it, God uncovers the splendour of His divine face. Every new discovery in anatomy, physiology, chemistry, geology, or any other branch of learning, is a word of God, as truly and as powerfully as though it were the utterance of a Daniel or of a St John. " I have many things to say unto you," quoth the Messiah, " but ye cannot bear them now. But when the Spirit of Truth cometh, He shall lead you into all truth." Yes, the world must be *led* towards the light, step after step, and by slow degrees. Does not the very word "*lead*" convey to our apprehension the sense of *gradual* approach ? Therefore, to those wise and philosophic minds who stand before their brothers in the great army of advancing humanity, does the Divine Mind reveal, continually, more and more of itself ; inspiring them with the burning desire to enlighten others, and, so doing, to rise into still closer

union with the pure spirituality they covet. For the God of the Holy Scriptures is also the God of Nature; and, since it is impossible for God to contradict Himself, these two must agree, and must be equally divine. Whatever, therefore, we find to be the teaching of science, we must accept with perfect and entire reverence as being the true Word of God. Science is the Apocalypse of To-Day, the revelation vouchsafed to the present age. Not alone in the leaves of a printed volume, the text of which has undergone many vicissitudes and translations, many losses, additions, and interpolations, and the intentions of which often lie hid in obscure orientalisms, parables, and enigmas—not alone in the pages of our Jewish and Christian Scriptures, does the Voice of God address us, but far more clearly, majestically, and forcibly in the living Nature around us. His Word is written on star, and plant, and stone. He speaks to us in the thousand voices of the earth, bidding us aspire ever upward towards the perfect day; bidding us rise through sphere after sphere, hating and casting from our ascending spirits the garment spotted by the flesh. He bids us abstain from the pollution of blood, and revert to the original purity in which we were created, for thus only can we hope again to make our world a Paradise. Then the dream of Isaiah will be realised, and the Kingdom of God shall come in its fulness: “The wolf shall dwell with the kid, and the leopard shall lie down with the lamb; and the calf, and the lion, and the sheep shall abide together, and a little child shall lead them. They shall not hurt, nor shall they kill in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the covering waters of the sea.”

Vainly, to-day, we dream of universal peace—vainly we talk about abolishing war among nations, while we are still content to live like brutes of prey. As long as men feed like tigers, they will retain the tiger's nature. Universal peace will be impossible until man abjures the diet of blood. Thus, I regard Vegetarianism as the ultimate and the only means of the world's redemption. Even the commonest and most popular conception of the condition of things which will obtain under the immediate reign of Christ precludes the anticipation of bloodshed. Then, as Isaiah says in another of his prophecies, “He that killeth an ox shall be, in the sight of the Lord, as if he slew a man.”

Therefore, let us rid ourselves as soon as we may of the ab-

surd fancy that science and the instincts of humanity are less holy or less venerable than the text of Scripture. We shall yet see the day when no imaginary distinction will be drawn between so-called *sacred* and so-called *secular* knowledge. All knowledge is equally sacred. Nature can unfold nothing to us but God. Whatever theory, whatever aspiration receives the sanction of science, and the approval of virtue, is, undoubtedly, the inspiration of the Father of Spirits, demanding our ready and perfect obedience to its dictates. And I know that at some distant day, now, indeed, perhaps very remote, the message we preach in a corner will become the religion of great nations. To us, meanwhile, it belongs to inaugurate the Golden Age with words of entreaty and appeal, whose spirit and whose burden shall be these :

Rise, human soul ! “ Arise and fly
The reeling Faun, the sensual feast ;
Move upward, working out the beast,
And let the wolf and tiger die ! ”

FROM ADDRESSES TO VEGETARIANS ¹

I ALWAYS speak with the greatest delight and satisfaction in the presence of my friends the members of the Vegetarian Society. With them I am quite at my ease, I have no reservation, I have no dissatisfaction. This is not the case when I speak for my friends the Anti-Vivisectionists, the Anti-Vaccinationists, the Spiritualists, or the advocates of freedom for women. I always feel that such of these as are not abstainers from flesh-food have unstable ground under their feet, and it is my great regret that, when helping them in their good works, I cannot openly and publicly maintain what I so ardently believe—that the Vegetarian movement is the bottom and basis of all other movements towards Purity, Freedom, Justice, and Happiness.

I think it was Benjamin D'Israeli who said that we had stopped short at Comfort, and had mistaken it for Civilisation, content to increase the former at the expense of the latter. Not a day passes without the perspicacity of this remark coming forcibly before me. Comfort, luxury, indulgence, and ease abound in this age, and in this part of the world; but, alas! of Civilisation we have as yet acquired but the veriest rudiments. Civilisation means not mere physical ease, but moral and spiritual Freedom—Sweetness and Light—with which the customs of the age are in most respects at dire enmity. I named just now freedom for women. One of the greatest hindrances to the advancement and enfranchisement of the sex is due to the luxury of the age, which demands so much time, study, money, and thought to be devoted to what is called the “pleasures of the table.” A large class of men seems to believe that women were created chiefly to be “house-keepers,” a term which they apply almost exclusively to ordering dinners and superintending their preparation. Were

¹ Two examples of addresses given by Anna Kingsford to the Vegetarian Society (from *The Life of Anna Kingsford*, vol. ii. pp. 223-227).

this office connected only with the garden, the field, and the orchard, the occupation might be truly said to be refined, refining, and worthy of the best and most gentle lady in the land. But, connected as it is actually with slaughter-houses, butchers' shops, and dead carcasses, it is an occupation at once unwomanly, inhuman, and barbarous in the extreme. Mr Ruskin has said that the criterion of a beautiful action or of a noble thought is to be found in song, and that an action about which we cannot make a poem is not fit for humanity. Did he ever apply this test to flesh-eating? ¹ Many a lovely poem, many a beautiful picture, may be made about gardens and fruit-gathering, and the bringing home of the golden produce of harvest, or the burden of the vineyards, with groups of happy boys and girls, and placid, mild-eyed oxen bending their necks under their fragrant load. But I defy anyone to make beautiful verse or to paint beautiful pictures about slaughter-houses, running with streams of steaming blood, and terrified, struggling animals felled to the ground with pole-axes; or of a butcher's stall hung round with rows of gory corpses, and folks in the midst of them bargaining with the ogre who keeps the place for legs and shoulders and thighs and heads of the murdered creatures! What horrible surroundings are these for gentle and beautiful ladies! The word "wife" means, in the old Saxon tongue, a "weaver," and that of "husband" means, of course, a "husbandman." "Lady," too, is a word originally signifying "loaf-giver." In these old words have come down to us a glimpse of a fair picture of past times. The wife, or weaver, is the spinner, the maker, whose function it is to create forms of beauty and decorative art, to brighten, adorn, and make life lovely. Or if, as "lady" of the house, we look on her in the light of the provider and

¹ Edward Maitland says: "So, after all, Mr Ruskin is 'no vegetarian'; but, like his fellow-prophet of Chelsea [Carlyle], his principles are one thing, his practice another. . . . He can write exquisitely of beauty, honour, tenderness, 'fields and sunshine, babes and all that sort of thing,' and all the while be a patron of shambles, with their inevitable moral ugliness of long-drawn distress and barbarous violent death to gentle-eyed herbivores, and degradation unspeakable to a vast class of fellow-men. And this, too, when Science has demonstrated that man is, by his structure, adapted to be an eater only of grains and fruits; when Common Sense assures us that Nature must know best what is good for us; and when History shows that all great reformers, not of institutions merely, but of men themselves—the Pythagorases, the Buddhas, and Sages and Saints innumerable—have made it the first step towards the perfection preached by Mr Ruskin, that their disciples should so order their mode of sustaining themselves as to involve no shock to the moral sentiments."

dispenser of good things, it is not loathsome flesh of beasts that she gives, but bread—sweet and pure, and innocent type of all human food. As for the man, he is the cultivator of the ground, a sower of grain, a tiller of the field. I would like to see these old times back, with all their sweet and tender Arcadian homeliness, in the place of the ugly lives which most folks lead in our modern towns, whose streets are hideous, above all at night, with their crowded gin-palaces, blood-smearred butchers' stalls, reeling drunkards, and fighting women. People talk to me sometimes about peace conventions, and ask me to join societies for putting down war. I always say: "You are beginning at the wrong end, and putting the cart before the horse." If you want people to leave off fighting like beasts of prey, you must first get them to leave off living like beasts of prey.¹ You cannot reform institutions without first reforming men. Teach men to live as human beings ought to live, to think wisely, purely, and beautifully, and to have noble ideas of the purpose and meaning of Humanity, and they will themselves reform their institutions. Any other mode of proceeding will result only in a patchwork on a worthless fabric, a whitening of a sepulchre full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness. Flesh-meats and intoxicating drinks—the pabulum of Luxury—are the baneful coil of hydra-headed Vice, whose ever-renewing heads we vainly strike, while leaving the body of the dragon still untouched. Strike there—at the heart—at the vitals of the destructive monster, and the work of Heracles, the Redeemer, is accomplished.

I have stood so often on this and on other platforms throughout England, as well as in Scotland and Switzerland, to speak to my friends about the physiological, chemical, anatomical, and economical aspects of the non-flesh diet, that to-night, for a change, I am going to take another and a higher line. We will, therefore, if you please, take "as read" all the vindications of our mode of living furnished by various scientific arguments: that we have the organisation of the fruit-eater; that the constituent elements of vegetable food furnish all the necessary force and material of bodily vigour; that it is cheaper to buy beans and meal than to buy pork and suet; that land goes further and supports more people under a vegetable cultivation than when laid out for pasture, and

so forth. All these arguments, more or less eloquently and clearly formulated, most of you have by heart, and those who have not may buy them all for sixpence of the Vegetarian Society. So I am going to talk to you to-night about quite another branch of our subject, the loftiest and fruitfulest branch of the whole tree. I am going to tell you that I see in the doctrine we are here to preach the very culmination and crown of the Gentle Life, that Life which, in some way, we all of us in our best moments long to live, but which it is only given now and again to some great and noble soul, almost divine, fully to realise and glorify in the eyes of the world. I said just now that "in our best moments" we all long to lead the Ideal Life. Some of us have many "best moments," and long ones too: moments that dominate and top our work-a-day efforts always, like a light of stars overhead, through which the Heaven looks down on us. Some of us, again, have very few "best moments," short and feeble, like lights over a marsh, never steadfast, always flickering in and out, and paling and flitting when we get abreast of them. With this class of persons the Ideal is very faint and unstable, while with the former it is strong and masterful. Societies like ours are made to encourage the "best moments" of the weakly, and to glorify those of the strong. Societies like ours are made to train soldiers and provide them with leaders to fight for the Ideal. Beginners and feeble folk cannot stand without encouragement in the teeth of a hot fire, nor rush upon the enemy unless some hero heads them and shows the way. The Ideal Life, the Gentle Life, has many enemies, and the weapons used by these are various. They are pseudo-scientific, pseudo-religious, pseudo-philanthropic, pseudo-æsthetic, and pseudo-utilitarian. And the enemies are of all ranks, professions, and interests. But of all the weapons used, the most deadly, the most terrific, is—Ridicule. Yes, Ridicule slays its tens of thousands! To be laughed at is far more awful to average mortals than to be preached at, groaned at, cursed at. It is the weapon which the journalists almost always handle with the greatest facility. These are the men who laugh for their living. They have replaced, in modern days, the paid domestic jesters of olden times. Every town keeps its paid jester now in the office of its local paper, just as, a few centuries back, great nobles kept their man in cap and motley to crack jokes on the guests at table. We have not changed in manners, but

in manner only. And the very first thing that Reformers have to do is to get over minding the man in motley. Let him laugh. He cannot argue. Laughing is his stock-in-trade. If he laugh not too coarsely, and avoid blaspheming, he is, after all, very harmless. It is his privilege to laugh at all that is new and unwonted. All children do that, and the man in motley is but a clever child. Why let him knock you down with his fool's truncheon? Wince, and shrink, and expostulate: he sees his advantage then, and belabours you pitilessly. But heed him not, and go on doing your work with a great heart as though it were a royal thing to do, and he will soon be off to some other quarry. Only be sure in your own mind that you are *right*; only be set in dead earnest on keeping that royal thing in clear view and working up to it, and the Ideal will reward you by becoming the Real and Actual. It is not necessary to go very far afield to find this royal work. It does not lie—for most of us—in setting out to accomplish some vast task. Most of us will find it in just simply and calmly shaping out and lifting up our own lives so as to beautify and perfect and unify them, being just and merciful to all men and all creatures. We Vegetarians carry the Ideal a stage lower, and, therefore, a stage higher than do other folk. We find the duty to the lowliest the duty completest in blessing. Let me tell you a story. Once, in the far-away old days of romance, there was a Christian Knight of peerless repute, whose greatest longing and dearest hope it was to have the Vision of the Holy Grail. The Holy Grail is the name given in chivalry to the Chalice of the Altar containing the Sacred Blood of Christ, and this was said to be shown in a Vision by God to those whom He judged worthy of the sight of this supreme symbol of His Grace, in the moment when they pleased Him most. Well, the Knight of whom I speak, in pursuance of the Object of his desire, joined the Crusaders, and performed prodigies of valour and wonderful feats of arms in battle against the Infidels, but all in vain; he had no Vision and remained unblest. Then he left Palestine and went and laid aside his sword in a monastery, and lived a life of long penance and meditation, desiring always a sight of the Holy Grail. But that, too, was in vain. At last, sorrowful and almost despairing, he returned homeward to his domain. As he drew near his castle, he saw gathered about its gates a crowd of beggars, sick, maimed, aged and infirm, old men, women, babes, and children—all who were

left behind on the land while the hale and hearty went to fight the Saracens. Then he said to his squire: "What are these?" "They are beggars," the squire answered, "who can neither work nor fight. They clamour for bread; but why heed such a herd of useless, despicable wretches? Let me drive them away." "Nay," said the Knight, touched to the heart, "I have slain many abroad, let me save some at home. Call these poor folk together, give them bread and drink; let them be warmed and clothed." And lo! as the words passed his lips, a light from heaven fell upon him, and, looking up, he saw, at last, the longed-for Vision of the Holy Grail! Yes, that humble, simple, homely duty of charity was more precious in the Eyes Divine than all his deeds of prowess in the field of arms, or his long devotions in the cloister!

And so with us. Who so poor, so oppressed, so helpless, so mute and uncared for, as the dumb creatures who serve us—they who, but for us, must starve, and who have no friend on earth if man be their enemy? Even these are not too low for pity, nor too base for justice. And, without fear of irreverence or slight on the holy name that Christians love, we may truly say of them, as of the captive, the sick, and the hungry: "Inasmuch as ye do it unto the least of these, my brethren, ye do it unto me."

For, as St Francis of Assisi has told us, all the creatures of God's hand are brethren. "My sisters the birds," he was wont to say—"My brothers the kine in the meadows." The essential of true justice is the sense of solidarity. All creatures, from highest to lowest, stand hand in hand before God. Nor shall we ever begin to spiritualise our lives and thoughts, to lighten and lift ourselves higher, until we recognise this solidarity, until we learn to look upon the creatures of God's hand, not as mere subjects for hunting and butchery, for dissecting and experimentation, but as *living souls* with whom, as well as with the sons of men, God's covenant is made.

EVOLUTION AND FLESH-EATING¹

I HOLD that Darwin's theory of development is right in principle, even though it may be a little inaccurate in detail; and I am therefore prepared to admit *à priori*, in accord with his views and with the inspired declaration of Genesis, that "creation" has been, and still is, a process of evolution, proceeding from a lower to a higher grade.

Man, then, having developed from the Ape-Men (of Haeckel), and those Ape-Men being themselves the product of a lower type, all having, as have the Simian tribes to-day, the teeth and alimentary canal of frugivorous creatures, it is clear that Man became Man by means of fruit-eating. He did not, and could not develop out of the Carnivora. Humanity, therefore, is the product, not of flesh-eating, but of fruit-eating; and it is certain from history and from internal evidence that the "Golden Age," which was distinguished by the familiar intercourse of Man with God, or with "the gods," was an age of innocence and of abstinence from blood. Therefore, the more our mode of life removes us from the possibility of the privileges and spiritual powers which Man then enjoyed, the more it tends to degrade us; and the more, on the other hand, our diet accords with that of the Golden Age, the more it tends to develop our faculties and to *redeem* us. For there has been a Fall, and that Fall has lost to us, for the time being, the Perfect Humanity (the subject is a vast one, and I can only indicate its bearings here).

You must not overlook the fact that not all the races of Man have become habitual eaters of flesh. There are whole nations and tribes, especially in the East, who have adhered, and who still adhere, by religious tradition to fruit- and herb-eating, and the structure of their internal organs differs in no way from that of the European flesh-eating nations. But there is in this question of "adaptation" an element which I venture to

¹ From a letter written by A. K. to Miss C—.

suspect you equally overlook. A man's physical organism is made by his Spirit, and the spirits of many men are of such a nature and of such a pedigree that they oblige the body they control to nourish itself upon grosser particles than are necessary to the sustenance of bodies inhabited and controlled by higher and more advanced spirits. Perhaps I fail to make my meaning clear to you, for it is probable the idea may be a wholly new one to you. Observation of individuals, however, will convince you that I am right. In fact, a particular system of diet is not hereditary in many cases, and we often hear it affirmed with truth, "What suits one does not suit another"; or, in more homely phrase, "One man's meat is another man's poison." We adapt ourselves to our food—it is not our food which is adapted to us. If the inner and true Man be pure, his dietary will necessarily befit him, for he will be unable to assimilate gross and carnivorous modes of life to the purposes of and the nourishment of his finer organism. If a man should tell me that he has convinced himself by trial that his "internal organs are adapted only for a mixed diet," I should not wish to contradict him, but he would be wholly unable to convince Me that *my* organs are in a similar condition. It is my belief that there are among men as many different species, races, types, and orders as there are among the various kinds of animals. One man is a lion or a fox, while another is a dove or a gazelle. In this respect, one may cite Plato in the *Phædrus*, when he says: "Rather do I inquire about myself, whether I happen to be a beast with more folds and more furious than Typhon, or whether I am not a gentler and more simple animal naturally partaking of a modest and divine condition."

You will gather, madam, from what I have written that your question appears to me to involve other considerations than a merely material mode of looking at Humanity. But, as regards the simply material view, you may rest assured that there exists nothing in the anatomical structure of Man to warrant the supposition that he has become transformed into a carnivorous animal, seeing how distinctly comparative anatomy declares to the contrary.

EXTRACTS FROM "ENGLAND AND ISLAM" ¹

It consists with the exquisite harmony of Nature that man, the highest product and function of the sensible world, should, while so constituted mentally as to be free to develop his consciousness to the rank of a god, or degrade it to that of a demon, be so formed in every physical respect as to be able to attain the highest development of all his faculties, physical, mental, and spiritual, without doing violence to a single one of his finer sentiments, and therefore without inflicting suffering or death on his sensitive fellow-creatures ; and that he should also at the same time be so formed as to be able to sustain his physical life on a diet that destroys his higher faculties, and sinks him below the level of the beast, whose life he so recklessly takes, heedless of the injury done thereby to his own finer sentiments, and whose flesh he so greedily devours, equally heedless of its unsuitability for enabling him to attain his own highest development, as if the world's whole history did not amply show that all the highest thought, best work, and purest lives have, from ages before Pythagoras until now, been those of the abstainers from a diet of flesh.²

We are becoming a race of human carnivora. Man, as I have said, is so constituted that, while he attains his full perfection as man, in respect of all the higher faculties of man, only upon a diet, mental and physical, which is absolutely pure, he can, so far as his lower nature is concerned, exist, and to appearance even thrive, upon the foulest garbage.³

It is too much the custom to burden the outer and false self of the body and its mental apparatus with substances of which the consciousness is too low to be capable of being worked up

¹ *England and Islam ; or, The Counsel of Caiaphas* (1877), by Edward Maitland.

² Pp. 83-84.

³ P. 179.

by the system to the highest degree of vitalisation of which the individual is capable. It is through the voluntary choking of our inner and true flame, the soul, that we render ourselves so dense and dark.¹

The source of all evil in mortal existence is the limitation of the spiritual vision. The cause of that limitation is unsuitable diet, physical or mental. Neither mind nor matter is inherently other than "very good," even as they were when first created, and "God saw that they were good." Physical and spiritual health are interchangeable terms. The enemy of both is the same, namely, the blood that the orthodoxies force upon us at every turn of our lives ; on every plane of our consciousness ; and in every sphere of our activity. To be well, means to be in the possession of a faculty of spiritual perception as different from and as far surpassing any reason as sight differs from and surpasses touch.²

If I be asked for my authority for the statements I have made, . . . I reply that I find them all where all may equally find them, who will take the same pains to keep their reason and their intuition developed and balanced, namely, in that Self which, by being at once one's own self and the self of the universe, is the self of all men ; and which, by its presence in all men, constitutes man in very truth the microcosm of the universal macrocosm—only, we must be sure that it is the true self that is found, and that in our quest for it we are not induced to fall short of that. It is upon the true place of the *I* that our solution of the problem of existence depends. And that cannot be found so long as we create for ourselves a false *I* by sustaining ourselves physically, intellectually, or spiritually on a diet which we cannot vitalise by the force of our own spirits. For, in spite of all that the ministers of the orthodoxies may say, whether they be priests, doctors, or scientists of any kind whatever, it is not his food or his facts that vitalise the man, but it is the man who vitalises his food and his facts. And this he does by virtue of his own prior vitalisation by the soul of humanity. God is in that soul incarnate in every one of us ; and as a portion of God we are free and able to make for ourselves the materials upon which we operate into the heaven of a healthy, happy life, or the hell

¹ P. 360.

² Pp. 433-434.

of an unhealthy, miserable one. It is because at the bidding of orthodoxy we have adopted for body, mind, soul, and health a régime that is unsuited to us by nature, that we suffer so much misery. On the true, pure diet we should find all the delights of life infinitely enhanced. We should love and be loved far more tenderly, and work and play far more heartily. Envy, hatred, malice, jealousy, covetousness, and all uncharitableness would vanish. For we should be so *well* in mind and body that we should fret for nothing. And even death would be no complete separation, as we should be in the possession of faculties so sublimed as to enable us to hold intimate communion with those we have loved on earth. It is impossible for those who do not know by actual experience to imagine how large and noble existence may be made by following Nature as made by God, instead of as marred by the demons who take form in the orthodoxies. Do not think it is man who so hates his fellow-man as to take pleasure in his misery and destruction. Man, if left to himself, would sink into the negation of a mere animal existence, and soon die out. He is not actively malignant. We have to revive the world-old belief in the spiritual world to account for this world's evil. It comes solely of beings who have had long and vast practice in being selfish and rebellious; but who, notwithstanding their power and skill, are utterly incapable of harming man, if only man chooses to listen to the intuitions of his conscience, and to reject the promptings they instil into his lower nature. Even that lower nature of ours is not bad in itself. It is negative, and just what we choose to make it. It all depends upon whether we live up from, or live down to, it. In one case we lift it up to us; in the other case it drags us down to it. We are not it, or its; and it is not us, but ours; and we, properly, are God and God's.¹

It is not difficult to discern a reason why the Gospel as promulgated in India should specially address itself to the question of diet. We may be sure that, although the welfare of the animals themselves was an important consideration, that of man was a consideration not less important. As pre-eminently the land of ferocious beasts, India must have afforded many a striking lesson to the meditative Buddha respecting the mystery of the carnivora. He manifestly saw in them no

¹ Pp. 544-547.

essential part of the Divine order, but a result of man's own degeneration. The whole long line of creatures of prey, from the lion and tiger downwards, must for him have represented the after-condition of men themselves, who in their human forms had already been beasts of rapine and cruelty; and who now were condemned, through the operation of a natural law, to wear forms corresponding to the tastes they had manifested. The animal life of India must have shown him, as that of no other country could have done, the immensity of the influence for good or for evil exercised by diet upon constitution and character. For he there saw all the useful work of the world done by means of the strength, intelligence, and docility of the herbivora; and all the waste and rapine and cruelty committed by the carnivora. And he must have seen also that, even if at the first shock of conflict between the two classes of animals the advantage were for a moment on the side of the frantic and inflamed flesh-eater, the endurance and real strength, and therefore the final victory, lay with the pure liver. Buddhism had no ritual, no sacrifice. A religion of the "lamb" and the "dove," it repudiated bloodshed as the worst of sins against both the executioner and his victim. Of the latter, it might kill the body. Of the former, it must kill the soul. Buddha could no more than we can escape the logical conclusion, that if man is the better for feeding on the flesh of the creatures that most nearly approximate to himself, his best diet must be his own kind, and the step from the carnivora to the cannibal a step upwards. . . . It is our addiction to blood that has prevented the full consummation of the marriage in us of the dark and light races of men. For us to abjure the accursed drop would be at once to make a new heaven and new earth alike for the East and the West. The assertion that man requires in a northern climate a more heat-giving diet than he finds in his own vegetable products, is not wholly groundless in fact, but is an impeachment of the harmony and perfection of Nature. Between them, the sun and the earth provide for all their children whatever is good for them, without requiring the selfish infliction of suffering on any. The heat-giving properties of those most perfect of foods, the highly vitalised seeds and fruits which contain only the germ of the new generation, are everywhere apportioned to the needs of men.¹

¹ Pp. 559-561.

Just as the diet healthy for the soul is that which is permeated by the intuition of God, so is the diet most suitable for the body of the perfect humanity that which grows and ripens in the sunshine. Roots and herbs may sustain the lower nature. Man's mouth is not placed close to the ground that he may subsist wholly on them. He walks erect, with face turned upwards to behold the skies whence he has origin, even the sun above him, at once physical and spiritual. And his healthy, because *natural*, diet consists of the seeds and fruits which grow above the ground, within his reach as he walks along, and to be gathered *without stooping*. These the bounteous Mother prepares and sheds for us when fitted for our use by the elimination from them of every particle of fibrous and innutritious substance, shed, too, in such abundance that, if not used by us, they lie on the ground to rot. . . . Life is of many grades; but to assume of the warm-blooded animals that they and we are not brethren, is to expose ourselves to the liability of eating our own kith and kin.¹

We spoil the world and existence for ourselves and each other by our ignorant and brutal mode of sustaining our lives. And I say with the most absolute confidence, that no man has a right to pretend to know anything whatever about the nature either of the Creator or of the creature until he has, by a long, persistent, and rigidly conscientious experience of the pure and innocent régime natural to man, qualified himself for forming an opinion in the matter. As men live now, they have not, in any degree approaching its natural perfection, any one faculty that they would have if they lived in the way I am indicating. Physique, mind, and character alike are removed by an absolute interval below the perfection of which they are capable. And not only would a complete reformation in this respect constitute an absolute remedy for all our evils, individual and religious, but it would do so for our evils, political and social, at home and abroad, in all questions, from those of population and food supply, to questions of foreign policy. The great, primary, and absolute certain fact to be borne in mind is the fact that man cannot, by any possibility, subject any region of his nature to the unnatural diet of blood, without depraving every region of his nature, and that in respect to its every function.

¹ Pp. 588, 589.

As members of the great Aryan race, we attained our pre-eminence by means of the superiority of our diet. We came from countries where, by reason of the severity of the climate, life was harder than in the tropic; and where Nature, with the infinite wisdom and kindness manifested in her every act, adapted her vegetable products to the requirements of her children; giving in place of the cooling fruits of the torrid, the heat-producing cereals of the temperate zone. Changing its diet under seductions at once sacerdotal and devilish, the Aryan race has gradually and steadily sunk from its ancient perfection of mind and body, until it has come that, so far from aspiring to fulfil its original destiny by being the earth's redeemer from evil and wrong of every kind, and the restorer to man of the paradise he has forfeited, it is settling down into the lowest forms of selfishness and sensuality, and even erecting into a religion and a worship, principles and practices which are absolutely incompatible, not only with happiness, but with existence itself.¹

¹ Pp. 612-614.

VEGETARIANISM IN ITS HIGHER ASPECTS¹

FOR a mind at once philosophic and philanthropic, and possessed of that love for Existence at large without which it is impossible to analyse the nature and ascertain the meaning of Existence, there is no more interesting and important study than that of the various social movements by which, at any critical period of man's history, the human spirit indicates the direction in which it is seeking to make a fresh manifestation of itself.

That the period in which we are living is not only *a* critical period, but, probably, *the* most critical period of the world's history, has long been the conviction of every duly percipient and instructed mind. And the causes which combine to make it such a period are mainly two: one, that in our day the perpetual conflict between the two great elements in humanity—which ought to co-operate in harmonious accord—is raging with a fierceness and on a scale never before witnessed. These are the elements which, according to the sphere of their operation, are respectively head and heart, mind and conscience, force and love, intellect and intuition, body and soul, matter and spirit, centrifugal and centripetal, outer and inner—in short, the elements everywhere, masculine and feminine, of Existence. And the other cause is that now, as never before, between all orders of society and all parts of the civilised world, the relation has become so intimate and the intercourse so constant, that whatever seriously affects one class or one region similarly affects all. It is thus because the issue of this great

¹ This article was written by Edward Maitland. It is copied from the latter of two MSS. thereof left by him, the former of such MSS. being headed *Vegetarianism: its Advantages and its Significance*. The latter MS. contains a few revisions and some additions. Some of the passages in this latter MS. were, in an amplified or revised form, incorporated by Edward Maitland in his article *Vegetarianism: the Common Sense of It* (see p. 195 *post*). I have included in the present article some of such amplifications or revisions.

struggle, whether for good or for evil, must be widespread and long-lasting, affecting the race at large as well as its individual portions, that it becomes a prime duty with all to be heedful of the part they themselves are taking in it, and to be certain how far they are ranging themselves on the side of the good or of the evil.

To put the matter in yet another way. Humanity—or Existence, for they are really one and the same thing—represents always two streams or ladders: an ascending and a descending one—for Evolution implies the possibility of devolution or degradation—of which, while the former tends continually towards perfection and perpetuation, the latter tends continually towards negation and extinction. On one or the other stands, necessarily, every responsible being, whether individual, people, or race. And that which determines on which they stand is their own free choice of their direction, whether upwards or downwards. And this, again, depends on whether they follow or reject that guiding light with which all are, in their degree, endowed—the light, this is, of Common Sense. That is to say, man finds his way to happiness or misery, perfection of being or negation of being—in short, to what, theologically, is called heaven or hell—conditions which we need not quit this life to realise—according as he makes or declines to make Common Sense his guide.

Since this is the case, and since, also, it is upon Common Sense that we rest our argument for abstinence from a diet of flesh, it is necessary to make it perfectly clear in what Common Sense consists. This is not so simple a matter as may generally be supposed. Common Sense is not, as usually believed, the opinion of the great majority of people as founded in their habitual experience. If it were so, then it would be Common Sense to regard, for instance, the Earth as absolutely motionless, and the Sun and Stars as revolving round it every twenty-four hours, simply because we *feel* no movement of the one and *see* the revolution of the others. This shows that we have to call in the assistance of something more than Common Sense, as commonly understood, in order to explain so common a phenomenon as the alternations of day and night; and that Common Sense of this kind is apt to be uncommon nonsense.

There is a yet further application of this illustration, which we shall do well to note. For the sense which shows us only

the material world requires in its turn to be corrected by a yet higher sense, namely, one which, being not of the body and mind, but of the soul and spirit, informs us that Matter is but the veil of Spirit, and that behind and within the material and apparent world lies another which is spiritual and real.

The mistake has come of a defective conception of the meaning of the terms Humanity and Man. These are usually taken to mean mankind, that is, men and women, or the race at large. Now, Common Sense is, it is true, the sense common to Humanity or Man. But these are not constituted by men and women. On the contrary, men and women do but represent Humanity, or Man, *in the making*, or, it may be, in the marring. And not yet being complete or whole men, their agreement on any subject cannot possibly represent the Common Sense of the whole man. And, besides, the great majority of men and women are, as regards their minds, in so rudimentary a state that their agreement in any conviction, however numerous they may be, possesses no value whatever.

Not to delay our definition longer, then, Common Sense consists in the agreement, *not of all men, but of all parts of man* : that is, of all the various planes, spheres, or modes of consciousness which together constitute Man, and of which, therefore, when complete, he consists. Only when we take the sense of each and all of these do we get at the agreement, or Common Sense, of the *Whole Man*. And as, when the concurrence of any of these elements is wanting, there is no sense common to the whole ; so, when these are all in accord, their agreement is the Common Sense of the whole. And until this agreement is attained in ourselves, we have no right to consider ourselves in the possession of Common Sense. No one is entitled to consider himself as a whole man and possessed of Common Sense in its full acceptance until he has attained in himself the consciousness of all parts of man's nature, and agreement between them all. As it happens, very few persons indeed are possessed of Common Sense of this kind, though all think that they have it. And the way in which they manage to persuade themselves that they have it is by suppressing or ignoring that element in their systems which does not harmonise with the rest, and remaining content with the satisfaction of a portion only of their nature—conduct which, in its degree, amounts to a moral suicide, seeing that all parts of man's nature are good, and intended to be used. For

only so can we fulfil the whole duty of man as befits the Whole Man.

Having thus defined Common Sense as the *Consensus* of all the constituent elements of man, we are met by the further question, What are these elements? or, in other words, What is Man? For it is to this that by the very nature of our subject we are committed—a definition of Man. Well, formidable as the task may seem, we will not shrink from it. Better to try, and fail, than not to try. If we fail, we are in no worse plight than before the attempt. Whereas, if we succeed, we shall have found just the most valuable piece of knowledge the world affords; since to know oneself is the highest wisdom, and has ever been so accounted by all those great and good ones of the past who, being themselves Whole Men, have attained to the Common Sense of the whole humanity; and, in attaining to this, have known not only man, but God. For, in very truth, the two are so related that the knowledge of the one includes that of the other; and without the knowledge of the one it is impossible to have that of the other. So that the term Common Sense, as just defined, is not restricted to common things only, but applies to the whole universe of Being.

To come to our definition of Man. If we turn to our scientific books, we find him described somewhat in this fashion: Order, mammalia, first of the primates, gait erect, having two hands and two legs and feet; teeth so and so; stomach single; alimentary canal so many feet or yards; average height so much; little hair except on head; and so forth. But does any account of the mere form content us as a definition of ourselves? No, indeed. We feel that it is but a poor sort of man who is one in form only, and that the human form, to be valid, must, like any other form, *be filled up*, and this after a certain preordained image. To make a man, there must be the qualities as well as the shape of man. It is true that Form is the expression of qualities. But the form may be and is put on in advance of the manifestation of the qualities; and the prophecy of these indicated in it may never be realised. For the individual may fail to develop the qualities requisite to constitute him a whole man, and of which his form gave him the potentiality.

Now, there are in Man four distinct kingdoms or divisions, making him a fourfold being. In this he resembles both the

universe at large, of which he is the epitome, and the minute physiological unit, called a cell, of which his tissues are composed, and which is the epitome of him. This is a point on which the Bible and Science are agreed; though the professors of the latter have yet to learn the fact—that is, the modern professors of science. The ancients knew it well; as also the existence of a correspondence between all regions of Being—the doctrine of which they expressed in these terms: “As is the outer, so is the inner; as the small is, so is the great; there is one law; and He that worketh is One.”¹ And it is this fourfoldness alike of man and the world, the microcosm and the macrocosm, which is at once expressed and concealed under the types of the fourfold River of Eden, and the fourfold “Chariot” of Ezekiel—such being the nature of the “vehicle” in which Deity is represented as descending from Its own supreme condition to become manifested in Creation. The same idea dominated also the number and character of the Gospels, the symbols of which denote, respectively, the four elements, called in the Apocalypse the four “Living Creatures” or “Beasts” (Rev. iv. 6, 9).

The four great divisions of man, then, counting from without inwards, are Body, Mind, Soul, and Spirit, each of which represents a different mode of his substance, and has its own special nature, consciousness, and functions. Of these, the Body and Mind constitute the outer, lower, and “earthly” part of the man; and the Soul and Spirit constitute the inner, higher, and “celestial” or divine part, the Spirit being supreme. And as only when the individual has developed the consciousness of each of these is he a whole man and made, as the Bible puts it, in the image of God, the two halves of his system being as masculine and feminine, the Adam and Eve to each other: so only when all of these are in harmonious accord with each other, under the presidency of the Will of the Spirit, does he attain to the Common Sense of the whole. Prior to this he is, more or less, rudimentary, however largely developed may be his consciousness on any particular plane; and he necessarily takes cognisance only of that region of his system of which he is conscious, to the neglect of all the rest. Conscious of the outer and lower—that is the Material only, and the perishable—he provides for the satisfaction only of this. Conscious of the inner and higher—that is the spiritual

¹ See *C.W.S.*, Part II., No. iv. 1, 2.

and imperishable, the permanent Ego and true Self of the man—he provides for the satisfaction of all in subordination to the requirements of this. Thus, the man physical merely, such as the sensualist devoted exclusively to the gratification of the bodily appetites, or the athlete devoted exclusively to the development of the bodily faculties, recognises only the material part of himself, and considers that to be the whole man, and its perceptions the only rational guide, the intellectual and other regions having for him no existence. The intellectual man, again, while not oblivious of his material part—since the inner and higher always recognises the outer and lower (it is the outer and lower which cannot discern the inner and higher)—the intellectual man makes the mind his chief care, and, provided he can gratify that, remains altogether heedless of the Soul and Spirit. And for want of the consciousness of these, he limits his conception of Common Sense to the two lower divisions only of his system, and mistakes the common sense of half the man for the common sense of the whole man. Similarly, the man who has attained to the consciousness of his Soul recognises the *psychic* or affectional element in himself as superior indeed to the material and intellectual; but fails to recognise the Soul as itself but the immediate vehicle and abode of the Spirit—the nucleus to its nucleolus—and as perfected only when indissolubly united to the Spirit. The consequence is that he contents himself with the agreement of three parts only of his system, instead of attaining to that of the whole four, and therein to the Common Sense of the whole man. In doing this, he ignores the supreme element of his system. For the Spirit is the essential life and being of the whole. Wherefore, to fail in respect of the Spirit is to fail altogether, whatever may be his development in respect of the rest. And the cause of the failure is the defect of Common Sense. This, it will be remembered, has been defined as the sense, or perception, common, not to all men, but to all parts of man. So that if there were but one whole man in the world, and all the rest were unanimous in differing from him, his view, though held by him alone, would be the true common-sense view, since it would represent the agreement of every part of man's nature, of which he alone has developed the full consciousness, making him the sole representative man of his race.

Now, to apply what has been said to our immediate subject,

and show that, so far from our renunciation of flesh food in favour of the products of the vegetable kingdom being, as it is generally regarded, a piece of foolish sentimentality, it is founded in a profoundly scientific and philosophic estimate of the nature at once of man and of the world, and represents the common sense of all those who, from the beginning, have shown themselves whole men in respect of their development in themselves of the consciousness of every region of man's nature. But first, in order to dispose of the objection sure to be made in some quarters that the regions which have been described as constituting the superior portion of man's nature are but the product of the imagination, and have no real existence, it is necessary to state, first, that the imagination is not a *creative*, but a *seeing* faculty, being, as it were, the telescope of the mind, which discloses only that which already exists, and this, more or less truly, according to the excellence of the instrument. Secondly, that as only that which *is* can project an image of itself, we could not have an idea of anything beyond the material and inferior world, if there were no spiritual and superior world. Thirdly, that while it is easy to conceive of a person discerning in the universe *less* than it actually contains, it is impossible to conceive of one discerning *more* than it actually contains. And, lastly, that if we are not justified in regarding as real the subjects of the inner and spiritual consciousness, we are not justified in regarding as real those of the outer and material consciousness. The man who, on the strength of his own inability to discern the phenomena of Spirit, denies that there is such a thing, is like a man who, being blind, should deny the existence of a Sun in the sky simply because he is unable to see it, or to touch it with his stick.

Now, knowing as we do that the spiritual and superior part of man is as natural to him as the physical and inferior part ; and also that it is as natural to him to be able to discern the one as it is to discern the other ; and observing as we do that he is, in this age, to an extent never before known, devoid of this perception ; and also that for lack of it he has brought the world into utter confusion and himself to despair, we set ourselves to ascertain the causes of so serious a degeneration with a view to their removal. And, doing this, we find—thanks to the correspondences between her different spheres whereby Nature indicates her unity—an admirable guide in

analogy. For, recurring to the illustration already used, that of the telescope, the nature and solution of the problem at once suggest themselves. If the telescope fail to reveal an object which ought to be visible, there must be a fault in at least one of three things. Either the instrument itself is defective through foulness or some other cause, or the gazer's vision is weak or misdirected, or else the object itself is too dim and small to be so discerned.

To apply this to the representative man of our day, who is striving so mightily to make the mankind of the future in his own defective image, we find that he fulfils all the conditions just described. For he is himself the gazer, the instrument, and the object. It is his own spiritual and higher nature which he ought to recognise, but which is imperceptible to him, first, because he has suffered it to become so dim and dwarfed as to be well-nigh extinct; secondly, because his instrument of observation, the mind, is so clogged and dulled with materiality as to be unable to transmit or reflect to him the necessary rays; and, lastly, because he himself is, through his engrossment by the things of sense, incapable of appreciating, and too indifferent to seek for, the object at all. Finding the whole system thus degenerated, and this without any lesion or positive disease, it is natural that we seek for the cause in some general and gradually deteriorating influence, such as an unhealthy manner of living, or insufficient or unsuitable nourishment.

Examining this last first, the mystery is cleared up. As a man eats and drinks, so he is, physically, intellectually, morally, and even spiritually. For the consciousnesses of all parts of his system are sustained by the consciousnesses of the material particles ingested into it as food. For, as must be understood, Matter is but a mode of Spirit, which is Consciousness; and while every kind of matter possesses the potentiality of each of the four modes of consciousness—namely, the mechanical, the chemical, the electric or mental, and the spiritual—there are some kinds which the more readily yield the lower, and some the higher, of the consciousnesses which combine to make the man.¹ Those which have affinity for the lower part

¹ On another occasion, when writing on the same subject, Edward Maitland said: "This is a truth recovered from the past, and one which the science of the present is, after long and persistent denial, only now just beginning to recognise—Consciousness is Being, and nothing is or can be which is not, in some sense, Conscious. And, like the universe, it is

of him,—stimulating the body at the expense of both body and soul, until the latter can no longer duly animate and direct the former,—are those which, being derived from the flesh of animals, involve, by their use, violence, bloodshed, and slaughter; and this in respect of creatures which, being harmless, defenceless, and highly organised and sentient, are entitled to exemption from such treatment, and which, after all, do but yield at second hand, and in inferior quantity and condition, at great cost, and frequently vitiated by positive disease, the nourishment contained in the herbs on which they have been sustained. Those substances, on the other hand, which best promote the higher side of man's nature are those which, being produced directly by the elements and ripened by the sun, are—especially when allowed to retain their magnetism unimpaired by the action of fire—permeated by vitality in the highest degree, and, so far from being obtained by means involving degradation, minister by their very culture to man's welfare. Such food as this it is which, according to the unanimous testimony of those who have qualified themselves by experience to judge, best ministers to the health, strength, activity, and endurance, at once of the body and mind, the lucidity and serenity of the soul, and the plenitude and satisfaction of the Spirit, and thus to the perfectionment of the whole man. In the man who thus nourishes himself, and this from the highest motive—the love of perfection for its own sake, and the desire to promote at once the glory of God and the good of man—harmonious accord reigns between all the spheres of his system and in all their constituent particles, enabling these so to polarise towards their proper centre as to minister freely of their higher consciousness towards the substantialisation and perfection of the man. Thus sustained, and unimpeded by exhalations arising from below, the central Ego or Spiritual Sun of his system distributes of its energy, vitalising and illumining him throughout, and so “atoning” or making at one in subjection to itself all the elements of his individuality, that, as in soul so in body, “as in heaven so on

fourfold, namely, mechanical, chemical, electric or mental, and spiritual. And, while every kind of matter possesses the potentiality of each of these four modes of consciousness, and ‘even of stones God can raise up children unto Abraham,’ some kinds are better adapted for the purpose than others; some minister equally to the perfectionment of all parts of the man, and some are either inferior or positively injurious, if not to one part, yet to another” (*Vegetarianism: the Common Sense of It*).

earth," one will prevail, and that the will of the highest. For this central Ego it is which is the true and permanent self of the man ; the radiant point of all the higher consciousnesses of his system being formed by the polarisation of their substantial essences. This it is in him to which that is objective and real, which to the outer man is subjective only and imaginary, and whereby alone he becomes capable of absolute cognition and certitude of truth. For it is his own regenerate Self, born of a pure Soul and divine Spirit, in a purely nourished body,—the Christ within him,—who, when wholly lifted up above earthly things, draws up the whole man to him, bestowing on him " the gift of God, even eternal life." ¹

It is, of course, not to be supposed that results such as these follow as a matter of course the use of any dietary, however perfect. Something more than the possession of a perfect musical instrument is necessary to the production of perfect music. We do, by such a diet, but secure, and make ourselves into, a perfect instrument whereby, if so disposed, we can reach the supreme point of human evolution, and be the best we have it in us to be. The mount, as the ancients called it, of regeneration, whether in the individual or in the general, must be climbed, and this with all the energies of our nature, if the summit is to be reached. And it depends on the point aimed at, and the effort made, how high we rise. Seeking only the physical, we attain only the physical. Seeking only the intellectual, we attain only the intellectual. Seeking only the moral, we attain only the moral. Only by seeking the highest do we attain the highest. But, whatever the altitude gained or desired, the operative force must always be one and the same, the centripetal force of Love. According

¹ Speaking of the four spheres of man's system, Edward Maitland says : " In order for man to be at his best in regard to any one of these he must so live as to be at his best in regard to all the others. The various regions of his system are, thus, not rivals, but fellows to each other. But whether the criterion adopted be that of body, mind, soul, or spirit, the verdict is the same. One and all thrive best on substances derived from the vegetable kingdom. Using these, the body is not stimulated or made gross as by the flesh of animals; the mind is not narrowed or vitiated; the soul is not darkened or revolted; and the spirit is not quenched or grieved. In the regions ordinarily accessible to perception, the man comes to see as he has never before seen; and other regions, before undiscerned, become open to his gaze. This, of course, provided he turn his faculties, thus enhanced, in the requisite direction. For the mere change to a pure diet will not of itself accomplish all this. He is thereby but rendered a better instrument for such achievement, in case he desires and strives to effect it."

to the purity and intensity of this force in us, are we lifted inwards and upwards towards the supreme goal. Now Love, which is one with Sympathy, is the recognition of the omnipresent Self, which is the "Father" of all.¹ And therefore the precept, "Be ye perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect," is complemented and interpreted by the precept which forms the basis of the Vegetarian's creed, "Be ye merciful, as your Father in heaven is merciful." For "Love is the fulfilling of the law."

As history shows, the first step insisted on by all those benefactors of their kind who sought to reform, not institutions merely, but men themselves, was the adoption of a manner of sustaining life which involved no shock to the moral sentiments, which are of the Soul. With the Intuition restored and completed—as it can be only upon such a diet, since the Soul neither can nor will impart of her knowledges to those who, nourishing themselves upon blood, follow a mode repugnant to her,—with the Intuition completed and crowning the Intellect, all other reforms necessarily follow in due course; for then man attains to a full knowledge of his nature and its needs. It is for this reason that, while cordially welcoming and encouraging all other schemes which seek by legitimate means the improvement of man and his conditions, we regard as the chief and most important, because the most radical and thorough, and as that, indeed, without which the others will be in vain, the movement on behalf of the substitution of a vegetable for an animal diet; because by this the very material itself of our humanity will be purified and invigorated. And to this conclusion we are compelled by the common sense at once of every sphere of man's nature, and of every age of his history in which a full intuition of that nature has been attained.

¹ See *C. W. S.*, Part I., No. iii.

VIVISECTION AND VEGETARIANISM¹

SIR,—Pray permit me, as a vice-president of the Vegetarian Society—an organisation comprising many thousands of members, associates, and sympathisers in all parts of the world—and also as an active opponent of vivisection and every other form of cruel injustice, to correct the misapprehensions represented in the letter signed “W. C. Sidgwick” in the *Times* of the 5th instant, and to define at the same time our position in the controversy.

To speak, first, of the diet question. We hold that neither by his physical nor his moral constitution does man belong to the order either of the carnivora or of the omnivora, but is purely frugivorous; and in this we have the assent of all competent physiologists, including the Faculté of Paris. Hence we consider that in accepting the indications of Nature as our guide, we do but act rationally. Adding to reason, experience, we have on our side, first, the profoundest wisdom of all ages and countries from the remotest antiquity,—the wisdom, namely, of all those really radical reformers, of whom a Trismegistus, a Pythagoras, and a Buddha are typical examples, whose aim it has been to reform, not institutions merely, but men themselves, and whose first step towards the perfectionment of their disciples was to insist on a total renunciation of flesh as food, on the ground that neither physically, intellectually, morally, nor spiritually can man be the best that he has it in him to be save when nourished by the purest substances, taken at first hand from Nature, and undeteriorated by passage through other organisms, and eschewing violence and bloodshed as a means of sustenance or gratification.

And we have next our own personal experience amply confirming that of the past, and the results of which, so far from proving us “Weaklings,”² are such as to justify our confident

¹ Letter, dated 6th January 1885, written by Edward Maitland to the *Times*, but not inserted.

² See p. 113 *ante*.

belief that the general adoption of our practice would be a sovereign remedy for all our difficulties and defects, hygienic, economic, and social, and enormously enhance our intelligence and moral conscience as a people.

To come to our relation to and treatment of animals. If proof be wanted of the dulling effect of a diet of flesh, whether upon head or heart, we assuredly have it in the opinions which find expression upon this subject. A generation or two ago a certain difference of colour was sufficient to exclude a sentient fellow-creature from our sympathies, and to justify us in kidnapping and enslaving him. And now a certain difference of form is held to constitute a justification, not only for killing and eating, but for deliberately torturing him to the utmost extent which the ingenuity of modern science can devise. And so unfathomably low in the scale of morality does the physiologist of the period rate us no less than himself, that he seeks to bribe us into acquiescence in the wrong by offering us an interest in the expected proceeds, not in the least perceiving that the proffer of gains procured at such cost to others is an insult to our manhood, and one that must make us doubly resolved to root out the practice, if only to escape the disgrace of complicity.

The arguments they ply us with are such as to make it hard to believe they are not laughing in their sleeves when they propound them. Indeed, their want of seriousness is no less conspicuous than their want of accuracy, so abundantly illustrated of late. To give a typical instance. One of the foremost of their apologists, a man distinguished not only as a physiologist, but—as a recent eulogist put it—“for his well-reasoned recognition of the claims equally of Religion and Morals upon the fealty of mankind,” has tried to persuade us that because animals have no moral nature, therefore man has no moral obligation towards them, but may without blame treat them as cruelly as he pleases. Which is to say, that our rule of conduct is to be, not our own sense of right and wrong, but the sense of right and wrong we ascribe to those with whom we happen to be dealing. So that if they are murderers, thieves, liars, or ruffians, we may be the same in our dealings with them, and, without disgracing our humanity, utterly ignore and belie that humanity. Not that we for a moment concur in denying a moral nature to animals. Rather do we hold with Porphyry that “there are animals who are

more forcibly actuated than man himself with a sense of justice, gratitude, fidelity, and other virtues."

The same distinguished physiologist—it is Dr W. B. Carpenter, writing in the *Fortnightly Review*, February 1882—goes on to say in reference to the vivisector—"I can, from the bottom of my heart, wish him God-speed, in the full conviction that his work is good and right, and will be approved of as merciful in the highest sense by that divine Father who requires of us the obedience of the spirit, not that of the letter." From which we learn that, for the scientific mind, either there is no "divine Father" common to all created beings, but that the animals proceed from some other and unholy source; or, that a "divine Father" is one who approvingly permits the stronger and craftier members of His family, for their own selfish ends, ruthlessly to torture the weaker and simpler. And the man who by doing this follows such a "father" is pronounced by implication a god-like man! And the world is summoned to renounce a religion which exhibits humanity as demonstrating its divinity by its voluntary sacrifice of Self for others, in favour of one which insists upon the compulsory sacrifice of others for Self! If the doctrine of man's physical evolution is to have for its outcome his moral degradation, the sooner we hark back upon old lines the better. One would have thought it calculated to "make the whole world kin," and teach us to regard all existence as but a larger self, partaking the same universal life and substance, and but occupying different steps on the same universal ladder, and united, therefore, in a common sympathy. The failure of the physiologist to see that in denying any moral nature to the grades below him, he is denying the possibility of it to himself,—since he represents but a further development of what they are and have,—is a fact of no slight significance in the controversy.

I have said enough to show the havoc which the specialist of physical science makes of religion and morals when he quits his own sphere to deal with them. It is for Society at large to resent and repel the claim of any specialists whatever to impose upon it the limitations to perception to which, by the fact of their being specialists, they are inevitably subject.

To the question what is our rule about the killing of animals, we reply that we respect the instinct of self-preservation, and slay those only which, either by their nature or their numbers, are noxious to us. We also put out of their misery those which

are hopelessly suffering. But always as mercifully as possible, considering that any defect of mercy or justice on our part is the same and equally a reproach to us whether the subject be noble or mean. The only allowable infliction of suffering is that which is designed to benefit the sufferer. This rule does not exclude what are called farmyard operations ; since these are not only slight in themselves, but are more than compensated either by subsequent kindness or by fitting the animal to earn a comfortable livelihood for itself. The tortures of the laboratory are wholly uncompensatable by their inflictors. The kindly use of animals may not unreasonably be regarded as an educational process adopted to promote their evolution, and certainly our treatment of them must have a very considerable influence upon our own.

The plea that experimentation is practised in self-defence against disease and death is utterly unsound, since it is not from the subjects of it that the danger comes. Such a plea is valid only as against the enemy himself.

As to utilising the death of an animal for physiological purposes, provided it be done painlessly, our position is clear and consistent. Unless the animal belong to the category above mentioned of those doomed to death, it ought not to be killed at all. If it be one of these, there is no wrong done in utilising its death as proposed. BUT—and this is a very formidable *but*—who is to guarantee the painlessness of the process ? The physiologists have shown us that they are not to be trusted. The honour of humanity is not safe in their hands. They have written and published whole libraries of books to prove that this is so, and are not entitled to resent our assertion of it. We would therefore prohibit vivisection altogether by forbidding the introduction of a live animal into the laboratory.

Exception is asked for experiments which consist in a scratch or a prick with a needle on the ground of their triviality. Here we find that we cannot depend upon them to tell us the truth. For the effect of these trivial wounds is apt to be terrible in the extreme, seeing that they are made for the purpose of introducing into the system some kind of poison, virus, or venom. Even with the best will on the part of the Operator, the idea of painless vivisection is altogether an illusion, if only because it is impossible to forecast or limit the extent or result of any experiment once undertaken without depriving

the practice itself of its reason for being. There is no alternative but entire suppression ; and the consolation to be derived from the reflection that if medical science indeed suffers, and human lives are lost thereby, the loss of those who would consent to accept benefits for themselves, obtained at such hideous cost to others, would rather enrich than impoverish the world. It is not for people that the earth languishes, but for humanity. And men and women do not constitute humanity ; they are but humanity in the making, or, it may be, in the marring. For we Vegetarians have thus a standard of definition for man other than that afforded by physiology. And it is in virtue of our definition that we take up the same position with regard to the peculiar barbarism of the present that we should have taken with regard to those of the past, had we lived then. And just as we should have fought to the death against bloody sacrifices, human or animal, prisoner-killing, witness-torturing, gladiatorial and other brutal sports, witch-baiting, heretic burning and racking, and negro slavery, so now we fight to the death against vivisection in order to set ourselves and our children free to follow with unstained hearts and hands those knowledges which, be they ever so legitimate and even divine in themselves, become unlawful and damnable when sought by means which are not human, but sub-human.—I am, etc.,

EDWARD MAITLAND.

Oxford and Cambridge Club,
January 6, 1885.

P.S.—A word to your correspondent T—— C——. In claiming the right to torture, as a prerogative of dominion, is he not rather confounding the rule of a king with that of a tyrant ?

THE HIGHER ASPECTS OF VEGETARIANISM¹

I PROPOSE to give a concise account of a certain aspect of our movement which is at once highly interesting and important, and but very little known, as it belongs to the class of knowledges styled esoteric and occult. I mean the School to which it belongs, and the Philosophy which it represents. To do this will be to show, among other things, that so far from our practice of rejecting the flesh of animals as an article of food being, as some allege, a senseless and mischievous innovation, it has the sanction of the profoundest wisdom of all ages from the remotest antiquity. For the School to which it belongs is that of a Hermes Trismegistus, a Buddha, a Pythagoras, an Apollonius, a Porphyry, a Plotinus, and all those really radical reformers whose aim it has been to reform, not institutions merely, but men themselves. It is the School of all those earnest Seekers after Perfection whose devotion to the loftiest ideals has made them redeemers of their kind, by showing men how to rise above and dominate the lower elements of their nature, and become truly human.

While so lofty in its aims, the philosophy of this great School was founded on experience and common sense, these of a kind far transcending the ordinary. Thus, in its ordinary acceptation, Common Sense means the *consensus* or agreement of the generality of people, and represents, therefore, the opinions of those who, although they are the great majority, are, for want of development possible as yet to only a few in any one age, cognisant only of the outer and lower, or superficial, planes of man's nature, the physical and animal; and who cannot, therefore, be regarded as constituting an adequate measure of humanity.

¹ The address given by Edward Maitland on the 12th January 1885, at Exeter Hall, London, at the close of the International Health Exhibition, under the auspices of the Manchester Vegetarian Society. (See Biographical Preface, p. 52 *ante*.)

The Common Sense of the School I am describing is altogether independent of popular majorities. For the agreement it represents is that, not of *all men*, but of *all parts of man*: of body, mind, soul, and spirit, and therein of the *whole man*. And it can, by its very nature, belong only to those who have developed in themselves the consciousness of all these constituents of man, and become mature, complete, or whole men; being which, and only so, they can of themselves represent humanity as no majority, however large, of undeveloped or rudimentary men can do.

Being thus whole men themselves, our teachers and exemplars were beyond the danger of committing the stupendous and disastrous blunder which marks the immaturity of those who have dictated the philosophy of the present age, and who form the chief obstacle to our movement. This is the blunder which consists in confounding form with substance, and mistaking the exterior and phenomenal part of man for man himself, and fancying that to gratify this is necessarily to benefit the man. No: for those whom we follow, the human form, in order to be valid, required, like any other form, to be *filled up*. It must have the *man* inside it. It was not the form, but the qualities, or character, that makes, and that *is*, the man. And hence their prime care was to perfect this inside and real man, knowing that the rest would duly follow.

Intelligent and reverent students of Nature, they were able to discern the spirit through the form, and to recognise her perfection. And, finding that her method consists in working from within outwards, they did the same, but always in sympathy and justice, recognising all Existence as but a larger Self, and remembering that righteous ends can be attained only by righteous means, and that to seek any end by unrighteous means—such as in the seeking of one's own at the cost of another—is to renounce the human for the sub-human, and to descend instead of ascending the ladder of evolution. Their method was at once simple, uniform, and capable of universal application. It was, moreover, comprised in a single word, to pronounce which is to sound the keynote of all genuine reforms, dietetic and other. It is the word *PURITY*. For every plane of man's fourfold nature they insisted, as the condition of perfection, on purity. On purity of blood, as meaning health, strength, activity, and endurance of body. On purity of mind, as meaning clearness of perception, in-

tellectual and intuitional. On purity of soul, as meaning largeness of sympathy and loftiness of aspiration. And on purity of spirit, as meaning righteousness of intention and fearlessness of will. It was their endeavour, by cultivating purity on every plane, to raise each plane to its highest perfection ; to bring all planes into harmony with each other ; and to subordinate the whole to the will of the innermost and highest, the Spirit, which they called the God of the man, and which would thus, as his central and radiant point—the Sun, in fact, of his system—vivify and illumine the whole man, binding him together, and drawing him inwards and upwards, and making him one with itself. In this way they sought to accomplish within the individual that which all true religion and sound science agree in regarding as the consummation of perfection—namely, the reconciliation, unification, or *at-one-ment* of the whole man, and his complete suffusion by a perfect will and spirit.

To come to the point to which all I have said leads. The very first step on which these profoundest of all professors of the Science of Man insisted with their disciples was the total renunciation of flesh as food. This was in order, first, that their systems might be cleansed, and built up anew of the purest materials,—materials which, being derived at first-hand from nature, would be uncontaminated, and in every way undeteriorated by passage through other organisms, and capable also, at least to a great extent, of being used with their vitality unimpaired by the action of fire. And next, that they might live, as it is indicated by man's physical and moral constitution that he is intended to live, and as, to be fully human and realise all that is implied in the term man, he must live.

Their object was always quality, not quantity. It was not to multiply, but to improve the race. It was not of men and women that the earth had need, but of humanity. And men and women did not, for them, constitute humanity. These were but *humanity in the making*. And, when made, man was not only a particular arrangement of organs and limbs and other characteristics merely physical and wholly perishable. They had a higher standard of definition than Physiology can supply. They had a definition of man which, for all who really accept it, makes of existence a new heaven and new earth. Man, for them, was nothing less than the manifes-

tation, in the individual and finite, of all those principles, attributes, and qualities, at once divine and human, which appertain to the universal and infinite, and in their original, undifferentiated perfection constitute the nature of God.

They of whom I speak did not merely suppose or surmise these things. They *knew* them. For, by living purely and seeking earnestly, they developed powers and faculties surpassing the ability of man, flesh-fed, even to believe in, foremost among which is that supreme mode of the mind which, added to the intellectual, converts man into an instrument of perception capable of surely discerning the highest truths. This is the faculty called the Intuition. Representing the centripetal force of the mind, it enables man to obtain access to his innermost and substantial Self, his permanent and true Ego, and to learn that which his Soul has learnt of the nature of the universe in the long ages of her past. For there is no knowledge but by experience, and Intuition is the memory of the Soul.¹ And, being of the Soul, it and its knowledges are accessible only to those who live as the Soul approves, and eschew violence and bloodshed as a means of sustenance or gratification, whether committed in person or by proxy.

Such is the system—at once Hermetic, Cabbalistic, and Oriental—from which Buddhism and Christianity alike sprang, and of which they were intended to be expressions—the latter being the highest, because the more interior, revelation. And if silence of the Christian Scriptures respecting our rule be adduced as an argument against it, the reply is, first, that it was already so fully recognised as an essential in the same system as to require no further enactment; and, next, that it is involved in the spirit itself of religion.

Those of us who have qualified ourselves by experience to pronounce upon its virtues are confident that its general adoption would be a sovereign remedy for all our defects and difficulties, personal, domestic, social, and national, and would lead to such enhancement of our intelligence and moral conscience as a people, as would lift our country to an elevation hitherto unimagined, making her in the highest sense the enlightener and exemplar of the nations.

¹ See A. K.'s *Illumination Concerning Inspiration and Prophesying*, C.W.S., Part I., No. ii. 25.

EVOLUTION AND FREETHOUGHT

As Evolutionists and Freethinkers, the Wise of Old anticipated and surpassed the science of our day. For, with them, evolution meant the unfoldment, through manifold experience, of the potentialities of the Spiritual Ego, or permanent self of the individual, which through all changes and chances persists and remembers, creating itself and its conditions according to the tendencies voluntarily encouraged by it, thus determining for itself its character and its place on the ladder of existence. By this doctrine they at once vindicated the divine justice and exonerated nature from responsibility for the qualities of her offspring. She but suffers each one to manifest itself according to the spirit it has cultivated. The form is but the expression of its qualities.

And they were Freethinkers. But not as those who in our day are wont to usurp that noblest of the titles of man, and who either do not think at all, or else exercise their thought in but one single direction, or on one single plane only of existence, and this the outermost and lowest, assuming it to be the whole. They whom we extol as true Freethinkers projected their thought in all directions, and into every sphere and mode of being : upwards and inwards, as well as downwards and outwards, to the world of substantial Idea, as well as to that of phenomenal Fact ; to Spirit and reality, as well as to Matter and appearance, being everywhere impelled and sustained by their faith in and love for the divinity which they instinctively recognised as lying within and behind all existence. By such means they completed their philosophy, and attained to that supreme necessity of man rational—a perfect system of thought and rule of life—a system and rule the observance of which is to realise man's highest possible aspiration ; for it is to turn existence to the best possible account *in the long run*. And they proved also that, duly purified and developed, man has—nay, *is*—in himself an organon of

knowledge, competent to attain to certitude of truth, even the highest.

For ages and ages have this system and rule been in the world ; and though oftentimes ignored, suppressed, or forgotten, they have never been confuted or rivalled. And whenever they have found recognition anew, it has been through a recovery of the special faculty whereby alone is the perception of divine things. The name of this faculty is Intuition. It represents the experience of the Soul, and is therefore possible in its fulness to those alone who live as the Soul would have them live, and eschew slaughter and bloodshed as a means of sustenance or gratification.

THE HIGHEST ASPECT OF VEGETARIANISM¹

I

WHILE fully recognising the value of the vegetarian regimen in its hygienic, economic, æsthetic, and other social aspects, I propose in this essay to take these as granted or leave to others the advocacy of it on such grounds, and to treat it from a standpoint which transcends and crowns them all, but which has yet to receive—from the modern world at least—the recognition it deserves.

This is the standpoint in which it concerns man considered not merely as a social being and in relation to his fellows, human or animal, but as an individual and in relation to himself as a permanent and perfectible being endowed with potentialities the realisation of which is at once his highest interest and his highest duty, and involves the satisfaction of that which is necessarily the supreme desire of every sane

¹ This article was written by Edward Maitland, in 1893, at the request of the Vegetarian Society, to be read at the Vegetarian Congress at the World's Columbian Exhibition, which was held in Chicago during the six months following the 1st May of the same year. The object of the Exhibition was to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America by Columbus. Writing on the 11th April 1893, to the late Rev. J. G. Ouseley, Edward Maitland said that in this article he had taken a line that would startle all those to whom his teaching was new—for in it he had laid stress on "the impossibility of a man completing his system of thought while flesh-fed, for want of the intuitional faculty to which such a diet is fatal; and hence the failure of both religion and science; while the prophecies of the restoration of the 'woman,' Intuition, which is to mark and make the second and spiritual coming of the Christ and the establishment of the kingdom of God, is distinctly associated with the renunciation of flesh as food: 'They shall neither slay nor hurt in all my holy mountain'—the mount of regeneration—and other like sayings pointing to the same event and to this age as its period." According to a memorandum endorsed by Edward Maitland on his MS., the article was, on the 8th June 1893, "read at the Chicago Vegetarian Congress," and "about one-half of it was printed in the *Hygienic Review*, World's Vegetarian Congress, No. — October 1893 (with a lot of horrid misprints.)" The present article is taken from the above-mentioned MS., which is in my possession.—S.H.H.

and intelligent being : namely, the turning of his existence to the utmost account *in the long run*, by making of himself the best that he has it in his nature to become.

It is obvious that, in order to work intelligently to this supreme end, man must know how and of what he is made. And it is also obvious that, in order to be able to know this, he must have, or must *be*, an organon of knowledge competent for the comprehension of the truths upon which his highest welfare depends, and therefore not merely of truths belonging to the material and phenomenal world, but of truths belonging to the spiritual and substantial world.

From which it follows that the supreme question for man, in regard to diet, is the question what best ministers to the unfoldment of his faculties of perception and reflection, and thereby to his perfectionment as an organon of knowledge and understanding.

While that which I have to say on this head has the fullest confirmation of my own experience, it is not upon the strength of any individual testimony that it will be rested here, but upon the universal testimony of all who have been gratified to bear witness in the matter, as well also as upon the intrinsic nature of the case. The testimony thus represented is that of the world's foremost men of all times and places. These are not the men who have been renowned as kings, conquerors, legislators, discoverers, authors, or founders or reformers of institutions. They are those who, having first perfected themselves to the utmost, have made it their aim to show others how also to perfect themselves, and who, having thus been reformers of men, have gained the love and veneration of mankind as its redeemers and regenerators. That, therefore, which I have to propound represents the doctrine and practice of all those earnest seekers after perfection whose devotion to the highest ideals has made them, each in his degree, the saviours of men, by showing to others that which they likewise have it in them to become, and how to become it.

With all of these—whose order I will call “ the Wise of Old ”—the first step to this end was the unfoldment of the understanding by means of that which is the secret of perfection in all things, namely, Purity, and this on all planes of man's nature. Purity of life, purity of heart, and purity of thought : these were the three steps of the ladder to the desired perfection, first, of the faculty of understanding, and next, of

the individual himself.¹ For purity was the means only, not the end. The end was the perfection, first of faculty, and next, through this, of character. This was because, for the wise of old, it was the character, and not the form, that made the man. Lacking the faculty of understanding, and being, therefore, agnostic, man, for them, was not really man, but man rudimentary only. For they would not allow him to be man until he had developed man's distinctive attribute, an organon of knowledge, and become capable of understanding, and this in respect of the highest objects of cognition.²

To say that for such perfection of faculty they recognised as absolutely indispensable the equal unfoldment of the mind in respect of its two factors or modes, the intellect and the intuition, is to come to the central theme of this essay. Stated as briefly as may be, the doctrine is as follows.

In correspondence with the analogy of universal Nature, the law of duality as the condition of productivity obtains in the domain of the mind; and the co-operation of the two modes of the mind, the intellect and the intuition, are no less essential to the mental system than that of the corresponding modes of force and sex to the solar and the reproductive system.³ And the attempt to construct a system of thought

¹ See A. K.'s *Illumination Concerning the Three Veils between Man and God*, C.W.S., Part I., No. i.

² On another occasion, when speaking of the wise of old and vegetarianism, Edward Maitland said they "were not abstainers from flesh-food by accident, caprice, or custom. They were grave, studious, earnest men, of vast knowledge, understanding, and faculty, who deliberately adopted this regimen in pursuance of that which they regarded as the supreme object of ambition of rational beings. This object, they held, is to turn existence to the best possible account in the long run. This, they held, involved the making of ourselves the best that we have it in us to be. And this, again, they held, can be done only by developing to the utmost all the higher faculties and capacities of our nature. It was in pursuance of these ends that the wise of old . . . insisted on the [vegetarian] diet, . . . the diet which all seekers after perfection have followed, and the principle of which is that which alone is consistent with perfection, namely, Purity. The first step towards perfection is to build up one's organism of the purest and most suitable materials. And so perfect is the harmony of nature, that that which is best for man on one plane of his system is best for him on all planes. This is to say, that whatever diet best ministers to the health and strength of his physical part, best ministers to those of his intellectual, his moral, and his spiritual part."

³ On another occasion, Edward Maitland said: "The first and most obvious fact about Humanity is its duality—its duality, not of form only, but also of qualities. From this duality it follows that in order to be fully man, and, so, to represent humanity in its integrity, it is necessary to possess, not the outer forms, but the essential qualities of both sexes of man—the qualities of man male and of man female. It is necessary, that is, to combine in oneself the force, intellect, and courage of the man with the love, intuition, and fortitude

by means of the intellect alone is an act of insanity every whit as flagrant as would be the attempt to construct the solar system by means of the centrifugal mode only of force, or the reproductive system by means of the masculine mode only of sex. That is no organon of knowledge which lacks either of these two faculties, but only something mutilate and unsound, of which the product is necessarily also unsound, and this no matter what may be the extent and capacity of the one factor actually possessed and employed. The mind can no more complete the system of its thought and attain to certitude of truth by means of one only of its two modes, than a bird can fly with a single wing, be that wing large or powerful as it may. The sparrow with two wings can laugh to scorn the eagle with one wing. Only by means of the intuition can the mind rise from the "ground" of the sense-nature. Man as intellectualist only is necessarily materialist and agnostic. He is similarly disqualified as intuitionist only, since without the balance of the intellect he falls inevitably into superstition.

Hence the disastrous failure of modern science to solve the problem of existence. Instead of seeing in the intuition the supplement, complement, and indispensable mate of the intellect, and cherishing it accordingly, science has contemned, denied, and rejected the intuition, with the inevitable result of paralysing the intellect. It is true that the intuition had gained an evil repute from the misuse made of it in connection with religion. But the fact that the priests of religion had corrupted the intuition—thus compassing what, mystically, is called the "Fall"—was no justification for its total suppression by the priests of science. As representing the revolt against the state of things thus induced, they ought to have purified it, and restored it to its proper place beside the intellect. Doing which, they would have restored to man his organon of knowledge, making him once more whole, sound, and sane; instead of phenomenalist, realist; instead of materialist, substantialist; instead of agnostic, gnostic; competent to complete the system of his thought, and able to work intelligently for the realisation of those divine potentialities of which he has lost the consciousness, first, through

of the woman. Only by the combination of these two halves of humanity do we obtain a whole man. And a pure and bloodless regimen alone is consistent with all the qualities belonging to these two divisions, and especially with those which belong to the better half" (Lecture on *Man's Best Food*).

the depravation, and, next, through the deprivation, of the intuition.

It follows from the very nature of the intuition that it should require, as the condition of its exercise, a pure and bloodless regimen, and this on grounds both physical and moral. Man can be his best, physically, only when his system is built up of the materials indicated by his structure as his proper food—materials derived at first hand from Nature, undeteriorated by passing through other organisms and, so far as may be, unimpaired in respect of their vitality by fire. And he can be at his best, morally, only when he orders his manner of living in accordance with the dictates of his moral nature. And he does the reverse of this when he so orders his life as to require for his sustenance, amusement, or health the slaughter or torture of sentient creatures. For by so doing he dulls his conscience and hardens his heart to the obscuration and even destruction of his powers of perception.

The seat of the intuition is the Soul. And by it man obtains access to his inmost, true, and permanent self, and learns that which in the long ages of her past, as an individuated entity, the Soul has acquired by experience of sure knowledges concerning the nature of existence. For all knowledge is by experience, and intuition is inborn experience, the perceptions and recollections of the Soul. And only in such measure as man cherishes the sentiments which, being of her, are alone those of humanity, are her knowledges accessible to him. Every limitation of the love-principle operates to cut him off from such source of information by disqualifying him for the exercise of the intuition. And, contrary-wise, every enhancement of the love-principle ministers to the fulness of the intuition. This follows from the nature itself of the faculty. As the centripetal mode of the mind, the intuition is the force whereby the mind's perceptive point is withdrawn from engrossment by the outer and lower region of the material and phenomenal to the inner and higher region of the substantial and real. Hence its accordance with the principle which, as the centripetal force of the universe, binds it together, redeeming and perpetuating it, namely, LOVE. "There is no enlightenment from without; the secret of things is revealed from within."¹ And only by thus retiring inwards and up-

¹ See A. K.'s *Illumination Concerning Inspiration and Prophesying*, C.W.S., Part I., No. ii.

wards to his central and radiant point can man find the substantial idea which informs and interprets his phenomenal fact. For the idea is not of the senses, but of the Spirit ; and the kingdom of the Spirit is Within, whose immediate residence is the Soul. Wherefore, only by love can man exercise the intuition and reap the harvest of his soul's dearly-bought knowledges.

But more than this. In such measure as man becomes thus vitalised and sensitised in his inmost consciousness, he becomes able to hold commune with those souls, his elders, who have accomplished their evolution and preceded him to the spheres for which he is bound, having transcended alike the material and astral—as the intermediate sphere is called—and attained to the celestial and divine, and who in virtue thereof are able to speak positively from their own experience concerning the nature of existence and the way of perfection. Wherefore, to deny the intuition is to reject the experiences at once of one's own soul and of those who have attained the summit of their evolution, and who, therefore, “ know as they are known.” The wise of old but enunciated a truth which present experience has fully verified when they affirmed the reality and accessibility of a world invisible and celestial, and ascribed the failure of men in general to come into open relations with it to the atrophy of their spiritual part induced by their grossness of life and thought. Men are themselves the makers of the barrier which separates them from the upper world, as they are themselves the makers of the nether world.

It is absurd to suppose that affirmations of experiences of this order are in any way invalidated by the denials of the science so-called of the day. Being densely materialistic, that science neither has nor can have cognisance of spiritual things. And its chief aim has been, not to discover truth, but to sustain its own hypothesis. And to this end it has turned a deaf ear to all relations of experience which transcend that hypothesis. This is to say that, while claiming to be nothing if not experiential, modern science has, on the strength of its own non-experience, denied affirmations based on experience, simply and solely because they contradicted its hypothesis, thus stultifying itself by making non-experience instead of experience its basis of conclusion. This is a course which constitutes a breach of logic so grave as to indicate radical unsoundness not only of method but of faculty. The in-

tuitionist knows that such is the case, and also wherein the unsoundness consists, and the cause of as well as the cure for it. For he knows that it consists in the voluntary mutilation of the organon of knowledge, by the suppression of the mind's intuitive mode; through the indulgence in habits of life and thought totally incompatible with the exercise of the mind in its proper integrity. This is to say that those who pose as the official truth-seekers and instructors of the age have failed to fulfil the very first condition of knowledge, namely, the qualification of themselves for their office by the adoption of a regimen indispensable to their perfectionment as instruments of perception and reflection.

The inevitable result has followed. Through their suppression of the mind's intuitive mode, they have not only failed to discern the real nature of existence, but they have propounded a doctrine of existence at once false and so revoltingly hideous as to drive men wholesale into madness, despair, and suicide. And, as is no secret, the formulators and propagandists of that doctrine are, one and all, ardent patrons of the shambles and the physiological laboratory.¹ The pessimism now so prevalent is due to men of pronounced carnivorous propensities. Now, the sole corrective of pessimism is the intuition. By means of it, and of it alone, man gets to the back of the phenomenal and discerns the real, with the result of knowing positively that the doctrine of the supremacy of evil—which is what pessimism means—is a lie, and the blackest of lies. But to do this, and obtain demonstration of the truth, is not given to the man flesh-fed.

II

That which first and foremost the intuition reveals is the falsity of the hypothesis which, assuming matter to be the substance of existence, limits evolution to the apparent capacities of matter, and denies to man any permanent conscious being after the dissolution of his phenomenal capsule.

¹ On another occasion Edward Maitland said: "The recognised science of the day—being wholly occupied with forms, and believing that the form makes the man—is doing its utmost to extinguish the true idea of man by insisting that he is so evilly constituted as to be able to maintain his health and strength only by a system of slaughter and torture! This is to say that such is its ignorance of the nature of humanity, that it claims to be able to benefit humanity by means which are in themselves subversive of humanity" (Lecture on *Man's Best Food*).

In defining evolution as the integration of matter, science has committed the stupendous blunder of mistaking the appearance for the reality, and building its system on the shadow instead of on the substance. And so consistent in unreason are its exponents, that even while admitting—as they are compelled to admit—their total ignorance of the nature of the force by which evolution occurs, of the substance in which it occurs, and of the impulsion through which it occurs, they have not scrupled to assign limits to its process by restricting it to their conceptions of matter. At the same time, moreover, by denying the existence of any permanent *Ego* to retain and evolve by means of the experiences undergone while in connection with matter, they have excluded that which alone makes evolution possible.

To say that sins against reason so flagrant as these are due to defect of faculty, is not to say that the defect is constitutional and irremediable. Such an allegation is resented by the intuitionist as a libel at once against God and man. For he knows by himself that the defect is conditional only, and is therefore remediable, being due to the causes already specified, namely, defective nutrition of the mental apparatus such that one moiety of its dualism cannot function at all, and the other can but function imperfectly, the former being the intuition and the latter the intellect. And in the vain imagination that it is the whole mind, this latter has rejected the collaboration of its indispensable mate, and insisted on working alone. Of this dissociation of the centrifugal from the centripetal mode of the mind, the inevitable result has been the mind's complete submergence in the objects presented to it by the bodily senses, and its utter helplessness to transcend them, for want of the faculty whereby to return inwards and upwards from the apparent to the real. Nevertheless, while thus crippled and confined to the lowest planes of its consciousness, and reduced to the humiliating confession of impotency implied in its designation of "Agnostic," it has dared, by calling itself "Free Thinker," to assume man's noblest title—a piece of effrontery matched only by that of the body when, ignoring the soul, it claims to be the whole man, or of the man when, ignoring the woman, he claims to be the whole humanity.

It has now to be shown what is the conception of existence and what the definition of evolution at which man arrives when, purifying his system and sustaining it by means truly

human, because humane, he adds to intellect intuition, and, having thus perfected himself as an organon of knowledge, works with a whole instead of with a mutilate organon. It will be seen that, thus equipped, the conception and definition arrived at are at once logically inexpugnable and absolutely satisfactory to man's highest needs and aspirations, intellectual, moral, and spiritual. And they are, moreover, experientially verifiable by the means already indicated. They are in this wise.

Evolution is the manifestation of inherency. The Force and Substance of existence—being self-subsistent in and proceeding from the divine Original Being—are divine. And in virtue of the divinity of these its constituent principles, the inherency of existence is divine. Wherefore, as the manifestation of a divine inherency, evolution is accomplished only by the attainment of Divinity.

The impulsion whereby evolution occurs is in this wise.

Although the Substance itself of existence is, like the Force, divine—both being Spirit—it quits its divine state when projected into the conditions and limitations requisite for creation, becoming thereby Matter. But, being essentially Spirit and divine, Substance tends ever to revert to its lost divine condition, ceasing to be as matter. And the tendency thus to revert is the cause of evolution. Force of itself is diffuse, and the naked flame is liable to mix with other flame. But, enclosed in Substance, it becomes an indiffusible personality. Wherefore, fully defined, evolution is the method of the individuation of Divinity, the integration of matter being but the sensible part of the process. And the outer personality, or physical body, is the matrix in which this substantial and divine individuality is engendered, nourished, unfolded, trained, and tested, as in a chamber of ordeal, until sufficiently elaborated and matured to be able to dispense with material conditions. For it has then put on the body which, being substantial and indissoluble, is called the "resurrection," or *raised*, body. And such is the nature of the Force and Substance of existence, that there is no limit to its unfoldment, whether within man or without him. For, when once generated—an event which takes place in the lowest forms of organic life—the Soul is by its nature immortal, and survives all changes of form and condition, until finally perfected. Nevertheless, it can disintegrate and perish; but only through its own per-

sistent perverse will to the outer and lower, exercised in defiance of its own intuitions.

Such is the doctrine of existence which, from the world's spiritual beginning, has been recognised as surely true by all who, in virtue of their due unfoldment in respect of the mind's two modes, the intellect and the intuition, have succeeded in penetrating to the centre of their system, and have learnt from the Soul herself her nature, history, and destiny. And to say that such knowledge, thus derived, constitutes divine revelation, is only to say—what is perfectly true—that divine revelation is a prerogative of man, and belongs not to the superhuman, but to the higher human, namely, man's own divine part, being the communication of truth from the within to the without of his own system. And that modern science has so disastrously failed in its quest for the solution of the problem of existence is solely because, in its blind idolatry of the sense-nature, it has despised and rejected the one faculty whereby that nature can be transcended and the reality of things discerned through the appearance.

Recovering its organon of knowledge, it will understand that the appearance can by no possibility be the reality, inasmuch as matter is phenomenon, and phenomenon is the resultant of Force and Substance, being generated of their mutual interaction. Hence, the axiom of the spiritual science of old—product of a whole mind—“Every entity which is manifest, is manifest by the evolution of its trinity”; and these three, force, substance, and phenomenon, are not three entities, but one entity.

But—and here the true theme of this essay intervenes—to this end, Science must require of her votaries that they order the manner of their lives accordingly, and eschew whatever ministers to obscuration of vision, mental or moral. “They,” and they only, it is divinely written, “who do the Will, shall know of the Doctrine”; and “The Fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom.” For the condition of admission to the kingdom of Truth is, first of all, Reverence, the corollary of which is Humility. Then follow in order the rest of the Holy Seven—Righteousness, Knowledge, Power, Love, Understanding, and Wisdom. Saturn first, Jupiter next, and lastly the kingdom of Phœbus. But this only after Understanding, which itself comes after Love, as the condition thereof. For, as there is no knowledge but by labour, so there is no under-

standing but by sympathy. Wherefore, in the ascent of man to the innermost and highest sphere of his microcosmic system, whose symbol is the Sun, Venus precedes the planet of Hermes. And that she is called, as by Isaiah, the "Spirit of Counsel," is because "Love is the counsellor of heaven."

III

If the effect of such treatment of the subject be to approximate Science to Religion and in a measure to blend them together, making Science the handmaid of Religion and Religion the crown and completion of Science, let not this be accounted any derogation of the treatment. Representing, as they do, two aspects of one and the same Existence, Religion and Science are indissolubly joined together, and cannot be put asunder without disaster both to themselves and to man. For neither is that true science which is irreligious, nor is that true religion which is unscientific. And that Science has become irreligious and Religion unscientific, is precisely through the want of the faculty of which, by gross living and thinking, man has lost the use, and of which, therefore, by pure living and thinking he will recover the use. And such is precisely the doctrine which the religion and sacred books of Christendom, when apprehended in their intuitional and intended sense—upon which they themselves emphatically insist—are designed to illustrate and enforce. So that herein lies a further and omnipotent argument for our cause.

For, thus apprehended, the Mystic Woman of Holy Writ, she by whose corruption comes man's fall, and by whose restoration man's redemption, is no other than the mind's feminine mode, the Intuition. And the Bible is, in respect of all that portion of it which, being mystical, constitutes it a Bible or Book of the Soul, a history, both actual and symbolical, on the one hand, of the endeavour of the Intuition to obtain recognition as the sole means whereby man can transcend the sense-nature and attain to certitude of knowledge concerning the things which belong to his perfection and peace. And it is a history, on the other hand, of the counter-endeavour of the sense-nature, leagued with the Intellect, when divorced from the Intuition, to thwart and suppress the latter, her promptings and aspirations. And whereas her champions are ever those who, in virtue of their endowment with her, are called prophets

—the chief of them being for his possession of her in plenitude called emphatically the “Son of the Woman,” and she for her exemption from taint of materiality a “Virgin”—the champions of the fallen Intellect and the sense-nature are called priests, and exhibited as systematically conspiring against the Intuition, and killing her Sons the prophets, even the greatest of them, in order to substitute for the pure ideals of faith and practice insisted on by them the diabolical doctrine of a blood-loving deity and a ritual of carnage. And so successful has been this dire conspiracy against the soul of man, that—as was foretold at the outset would be the case—the “Woman” has never yet been able to establish the divine kingdom, even though once, by her chiefest Son, she inflicted a “deadly wound” on her enemy’s head. For he recovered from it to work to man worse woes than ever, as that most frightful chapter in the world’s history—the annals of priest-craft in Christendom—bears witness.

Nevertheless, it has never ceased to be declared that the time will come when she shall effectually “crush the head of the serpent” of the sense-nature, and shall herself “be exalted, clothed with the Sun, and carried to the Throne of God; and her Sons shall make war with the dragon, and have victory over him.” And so, at length, “Intuition, pure and a virgin, shall be the mother and redemptress of her fallen Sons, whom she bore under bondage to her husband, the intellectual force”;¹ and the controlling evil spirit who has caused all the mischief—dividing man that he might rule—shall be “bound for a thousand years.”

But—and herein lies the point of the present contention—the condition of such blessed restoration to man of his organon of understanding and, therein, of his proper sanity, was to be a return to the pure and bloodless regimen of the “garden” of his primal perfection. For of that time it is said, “They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain”; but “he that killeth an ox shall be as if he slew a man.” For “when He,” the fully unfolded, equilibrated Humanity, “is come, He shall save both man and beast.”

Now, this “holy mountain,” which is called also the “hill of the Lord” and “Mount of Regeneration,” is—like that on which the Ark of Noah rested—the spiritual elevation to

¹ See A. K.’s *Illumination Concerning the Interpretation of the Mystical Scriptures*, C.W.S., Part I., No. v.

which man attains when, following a pure intuition, he transcends the level of the sense-nature, upborne on the Waters of the Soul, the mystic *Maria* of holy writ. And the era of such attainment is, also mystically, called the "Woman's Age," the "Kingdom of the Mother of God," and the "Coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven," the heaven within man of his own regenerated understanding. And when it is further said of that time that then "Mercy and Truth are met together, Righteousness and Peace kiss each other," it is implied that the recovery by man of his mental balance—through the loss of which, after being "made upright," he fell—will be the reconciliation of religion and science. And it is this same recovery that is signified in the announcement of the reign then to commence of "that great prince which standeth for the children of God's people." For, as the principle of equilibrium in things spiritual, Michael, like Melchizedec, represents the balance of the factors masculine and feminine of man's mental system, and the reign of Equity to proceed therefrom.

Thus stupendous and manifold are the advantages divinely promised to accrue to the world when, reverting to the regimen of his unfallen state, man shall restore the "Woman," Intuition, to her proper throne beside the "Man," Intellect. For they, as God's "Two Witnesses" in man, shall rise from the death ever inflicted on them in "that great city wherein the divinity in humanity is ever crucified"—the world as hitherto it has been—and ascend into the heaven of their rightful supremacy. With the "Fall" thus reversed, and the "Curse of Eve" removed, the lost "garden" will be replaced by the "New Jerusalem" or "Holy City" of the perfect doctrine and rule of life which shall come down from the heaven within man of his purified ideal.

Such, in brief, is the argument concerning the "Highest Aspect of Vegetarianism." And that the exposition of it has been reserved for the present epoch in the world's history may reasonably be ascribed to the fact that only in our day has the need for a new presentment of doctrine and life, such as that which it constitutes, come to be so sorely felt as to be everywhere recognised by thoughtful and percipient persons as the most urgent of all the world's needs.

And that the occasion of this exposition should be the World's Congress at the forthcoming Columbian Exhibi-

tion¹ may also reasonably be ascribed to the facts, first, that at no other time or place in prospect would there be for it an audience comparable to that which will be there assembled; and, next, that the scene of the gathering is the chiefest headquarters in the world, past or present, of the practice of animal slaughter. That this deliverance should first find voice at the City of Chicago is a coincidence which, to say the least, savours more of the providential than of the accidental.

¹ The World's Columbian Exhibition, at Chicago, was opened on the 1st May 1893. The total admissions are said to have been 27,539,521.

VEGETARIANISM—THE COMMON SENSE OF IT¹

THERE are three terms which, together, will form the keynote of the remarks I have to offer on the subject which has brought us here. These terms are Common Sense, Common Custom, and Ideal of Perfection. Ringing the changes on them, I propose to show that, novel and eccentric as the exclusive use of a vegetable diet may seem to the generality of people about us, it has a complete justification in Common Sense ; that in using flesh-food we are blindly following, not Common Sense, but Common Custom ; and that for rational beings, not custom, but an Ideal of Perfection founded in Principle, is the proper guide of life.

We are accustomed to believe—especially since the doctrine of Creation by Evolution has gained ground among us—that we necessarily, by the very fact of our coming later in the world's history, surpass our ancestors in knowledge and wisdom. But it has to be remembered that the ladder of Evolution—if indeed there be such a ladder—must, like any other ladder, be as capable of being descended as of being ascended ; so that we must find some reason, beyond the fact of our having come at a later age, for regarding ourselves as at a higher level. Now, one thing is certain. If the common sense of the ancients led them to regard the vegetable kingdom as the best suited to supply man with his food, and our common sense leads us similarly to regard the animal kingdom, there must be a serious difference either between their constitutions and ours, or between their conception of Common Sense and ours. Of course, we may at once give up the former of these two alternatives, and conclude that, somehow, the conception of Common Sense has undergone a change.

Now, not only is this exactly what has occurred, but the cause of the change is to be found in the respective diets of the two periods. The ancients, living—as we consider—purely,

¹ From a MS. of Edward Maitland.

took the correct view as to what constitutes Common Sense. The moderns, living—as we consider—grossly, take a wrong one. We, eating dead animals, call that Common Sense which represents the agreement of the great majority of men—the opinion, that is, of common folk; while the ancients, eating living herbs and fruits, called that Common Sense which represents the agreement, not of all men, but of *all parts of Man*.¹

Having defined Common Sense as the *consensus* of all the constituent elements of man, we are met by the further question, What are those elements? That is to say: What is man? This is a question which cannot be evaded; for, unless we know what man is, we cannot possibly determine his proper diet. No mere description of the physical form or its characteristics suffices to answer this question. We feel that we are something more than forms, and are not content to be described simply as of the order mammalia, having two hands and two feet, stature erect, such and such organs, and so forth. We consider that he is a poor sort of man who is one in form only; and that the human form, to be valid, must, like other forms, *be filled up*—must have a man inside it, and that to make a man there must be the qualities as well as the form of a man.

So far there is agreement between our Common Sense and that of the ancients. But theirs excelled ours in that it enabled them to say positively, of certain knowledge, what the moderns either cannot say at all, or can say only speculatively. I speak, of course, of the representative men in the two periods—those whose knowledge forms the standard and measure of their age. That, then, wherein the ancients excelled the moderns in this relation was their ability to recognise all those different spheres or regions in existence whereof man and the universe are alike constituted, whereas the modern world can recognise but one only, and this the outermost and lowest, namely, the physical or material.²

¹ Here follow definitions of "Humanity," "Man," and "Common Sense," as defined in the article *Vegetarianism in its Higher Aspects*, p. 159 *ante* (see pp. 160-162 *ante*).

² Here follows an account of the four great divisions of man as in the article *Vegetarianism in its Higher Aspects*, p. 159 *ante* (see pp. 162-163 *ante*).

Now, in this simple statement [concerning the four great divisions of man], we have a clear account, divested of symbolism, of that which constitutes the subject of all true religions, the theme of all true Bibles, and the object of all true Churches. Developing, first, the consciousness of his physical and lower nature, man falls wholly under the dominion of this, is ruled by Sense, the animal is uppermost, and Matter is, for him, God. This is his "Fall"; and it is said to occur through the Woman, because it comes of the fall of the Soul beneath the control of the body, instead of her being governed by the Spirit; and as the Soul is the true mother of the man, she is mystically called "the Woman." The reversal of this process, which consists in the removal of the seat of the Will from the body to the Soul, constitutes what is called the Redemption. So that Redemption is equally of "the Woman." For then the lower elements of the man are in due subjection to the higher, and the Spirit is all and in all. And as it is through impurity of desire and habit that the Soul falls under the power of the body, so it is through purity of desire and habit that she rises towards the Spirit, and becomes at length indissolubly united with it, to that final perfectionment of the man which is, mystically, termed *Christ*.

As the Scriptures proceed to declare, the fall of the Soul beneath the power of the body, and the loss of the intuition of Spirit, are at once as cause and consequence to each other. Of the Soul thus debased, and the body with its passions made exclusive ruler, the offspring is always *Cain*, the murderer and even the torturer of his brethren, human and animal. And when Abel, who, as the minister of the Soul and her intuition, represents the prophet, offers to God the "firstlings of his flock," namely, the "Lamb" of a pure and gentle heart, comes to rebuke him, he is forthwith slain by Cain, or the priest, who, as the minister of sense, offers of the "fruits of the ground" or lower nature, and instead of the Spirit, worships the Letter, thus making himself an Idolater.¹

The same spiritual truth recurs again and again in the Sacred Books, under various allegorical representations. One of these, for instance, is that of the Deluge. In this, after a period of declension into utter materialism, mankind again, under a flood of intuition, attains, as the height of perfection, the full consciousness of his spiritual nature. But no sooner

¹ See Biographical Preface, p. 28.

does he come down from the mount of purification and regeneration, than he betakes him to grossness, bloodshed, and idolatry. And when, in consideration of his having brought his system down to so low a state that it can hardly thrive on the pure sustenances proper to it, he is permitted to use a lower mode of diet, he pleads, as we constantly find people doing, this permission as an excuse for declining to make any effort to recover his lost altitude! The Wilderness is now so pleasant to him that he refuses to return to the Garden! Besides, are there not set angels with flaming swords to drive him back should he make the attempt! People have yet to learn that she in reference to whom it is said:

“The lion will turn and flee
From a maid in the pride of her purity,”

is no other than the Soul bent upon restoring his lost perfection to the man she animates. And in this quest, not only will “lions” flee from her, but angels will aid and protect. No, the only impediments to the regaining of paradise by us are, not the angels, but the demons of that bottomless pit, our own lower nature. This part of us it is which, having sole recognition, desires to keep all for itself, and does its best to withhold us from attaining that Common Sense of our whole nature, which includes the perceptions and recollections of the Soul and Spirit, and requires of us that we so order our manner of living as to involve no shock to our moral sense.

But it is not only because bloodshed is repugnant to our moral part that we thus reject a diet of flesh. It is also because, owing to the nature of the substance itself, man cannot become upon it the best that he has it in him to be in respect of any part of his nature—because, that is, the bodies of dead animals are not the stuff of which to make the best man or woman; and we consider it the paramount duty, owed alike to themselves and to God, of all men and women to make themselves the best that they have it in them to be, and thus to turn to the best possible account the portion allotted to them of the universal life and substance. It is to this end that Nature is ever working—to evolve out of the elements of existence a perfect humanity—a humanity, that is, which constitutes a perfect manifestation of the qualities of the

Divine Spirit underlying and pervading Nature. It is a remarkable coincidence, whether accidental or designed, that the term Man should of itself indicate the nature and purpose of the universe. Creation is Manifestation; all things are elements in Humanity; and Nature is a diffused Man. And he is the most perfect man who, having a perfect system of thought and perfect rule of life, most perfectly manifests the qualities of the divine, universal Spirit which is ever operating within us to build us up in its own perfect image in order to find full manifestation of Itself.

But to this highest of ends our own co-operation is indispensable. Man is free to make himself after the image either of God or of devil, and the world a heaven or a hell; but he must take the consequences of his choice. Neither Nature without nor the Spirit within can make the man as they would, unless he supply them with the fitting materials—pure thoughts, pure desires, pure deeds, pure food and drink. These last are as necessary as the first, and without these last the first are impossible to him.

.

The direction in which to amend our practice in respect of diet will best be shown by citing the practice of those who, attaching supreme importance to it, have made a practical study of the question. For, as you must understand, we come before you with no new-fangled or untried notions, but relying on actual experience of ourselves and others. For Vegetarians have, in all ages, been that which is the especial boast of the scientists of this age—namely, experimental philosophers; though they have not—as is the especial disgrace of the scientists of this age—sought their ends regardless of the cost to others, and therein by means immoral and illegitimate. No, the typical vegetarian—whether a Pythagoras, a Zoroaster, a Buddha, or any other of the many redeemers of this kind—always, while admitting the necessity of painful experimentation, considers the sole legitimate subject thereof to be himself. Claiming the noblest titles of man—Freethinker and Free-liver—he proves his claim to the first, not, as do the usurpers of it in our day, by suffering his thought to operate in one direction only, namely, outwards to matter, negation, and the void, and there binding it fast. No, he proves his claim to be Freethinker by suffering his thought

to range in all directions open to thought, from the outermost to the innermost, from appearance to reality, from Matter to Spirit, from all things to God.

And he is Free-liver, not as they who ordinarily usurp the title—the veriest slaves of all that tends, not to make, but to destroy life. But he proves his claim to be so-called by refusing to make mere custom his rule, and following the ideal of perfection, dictated to him by the agreement of every region of his fourfold nature—the Common Sense of the Whole Man. And, according to the unanimous testimony of thousands of years—of even more than the world's whole historical period—he shows that his success in thus attaining to the best that he has it in him to be has been in proportion as he could sustain himself on the highest and purest products of the vegetable kingdom—the fruits and grains, and these ripened or baked in the sun, and with their vital magnetism unimpaired by exposure to fire. The nearer the approach to this diet, the greater the health, strength, activity, and endurance of the body and mind; the lucidity and serenity of the soul; and the plenitude and satisfaction of the Spirit.

.

But while such is that only Perfect Way which leads to the restoration of the Intuition and the realisation of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that results in any degree equal to these are to be obtained as a matter of course through any kind of dietary however admirable. Not only is a long course of physical renovation often necessary to fit the instrument—the organism, that is—for the higher duties required of it, but the man himself must be duly disposed and capable in order to use his instrument to the best purpose. The body is not us, but ours; and no mere renovation of the organism will change a disposition or supply an intellect. Nevertheless, no effort in a right direction is ever really wasted. For even though no other result follow, we are the better for having made it. And now that we know absolutely—thanks to the faculties recovered through a return to the basis of nature and her way of perfection—that man is not only a permanent being, but is also the creator of his future self and conditions, whether here or hereafter, we know that every real gain, however small, is a permanent gain, and that, therefore, if we

do not sooner or later become and have all that we want in the way of perfection, the fault will be our own. And that which is true of the individual is true also of the general. The way of perfection is the same for all. But while Society at large cannot attain perfection save through the perfectionment of the individuals which compose it, individuals can attain perfection irrespectively of Society at large. All that is needed is love, knowledge, faith, and courage.

MAN'S BEST FOOD

HAVING defined "Man" and "Common Sense," as in the article *Vegetarianism in its Higher Aspects*,¹ Edward Maitland continued:—

Now, it is of Man as thus defined, and according to Common Sense as thus defined, that we claim as man's best food the produce of the vegetable world. Not only is this the only food to be procured by means which involve no shock to our moral and higher nature, it is also the only food which ministers to the development of that higher nature and of our consciousness of it. It needs no special scientific knowledge to tell us that it is not from bodies of the dead, from which all the vital elements have departed, that we can extract the best and purest substances for building us up into the full stature of the man perfect, whether in body, mind, soul, or spirit. Only the grains and fruits, ripened in the sun and filled with nature's vital magnetism in its highest perfection, can yield us these.

The key to all perfection is Purity, purity of body and conduct, purity of mind and thought, purity of soul and feeling, purity of spirit and desire. And in so far as we follow purity in all these, we follow that supreme Perfection whose name is God. This is the perfection which numberless men in all ages have aspired after, but which vegetarians only have been known to realise, since, even to see it mentally, it is necessary to have the luminous vision which is possible only to a purely nourished organism. For the perception of it requires the exclusion from man's system—which is but a repetition in small of the parent solar system—of everything, physical or mental, from which there might arise exhalations to darken his spiritual atmosphere and hide his spiritual sun. Of that sun, which is the radiant point of the man himself, no clear view can be obtained by one whose affections are such that

¹ Pp. 159-169 *ante*.

he can deliberately nourish himself upon blood, or exact for himself sacrifice of the innocent, and whose mental surfaces are constituted of such gross materials.

For, even though excelling in much else, such an one is deficient in the most essential of all respects—that of Love. Love is the centripetal power alike of the universe and of the individual—the power which binds together all things in heaven and on earth, in the world of thought and the world of sense. It is the power, therefore, of religion, which implies bound together; and the power which draws inwards to God. It is, therefore, the power by yielding to which alone man can find his own true centre and pivot, and attain to the common sense of every region of his manifold nature.

I have said that we have on our side in this matter the experience of history. It is by following this Perfect Way in Diet, and in all things, that the typical Man Regenerate has ever attained his pre-eminence. Such was a Hermes Trismegistus, who gave the Egyptians the wisdom that constituted the chief treasure of which Israel, fleeing, despoiled them. Such, in varying degrees, were Zoroaster, the prophet of Persia; Pythagoras, the prophet of Greece; Buddha, the prophet of the whole East. Such were Daniel, Apollonius, Plotinus, and all the great masters of his school. Magicians they were deemed by some, for their wondrous wisdom and powers. But they were really Magians—men become wise and mighty through their supreme Common Sense. And, of them all, the method and motive was one and the same. For their motive was the love of perfection, and their method was inward purification. And all were examples only of what we have it in us to be.

Experimental philosophers were they, and not shrinking from painful experimentation. But, for them, the only legitimate subject of such experimentation was a man's own Self. For, knowing that divine ends can be attained only through divine means, they held it a madness to expect to get good by doing evil.

Freethinkers were they; but not as those who in our day usurp that noblest of man's titles only to travesty and degrade it. For they did not restrict their thought to one single direction, and this the outward, to Matter only and negation, and there bind it fast. But they impelled it freely in every

direction open to thought, both outward to Matter and inward to Spirit, from the phenomenal Fact to the substantial Idea, complementing the Intellect by the Intuition, and so completing the system of their thought as alone it can be completed, and proving that man is not of necessity agnostic, but has indeed an organon of knowledge whereby he can attain to certitude of Truth, even the highest.

And they were Free-livers too ; not as those who are wont to be so-called, and who are the veriest slaves to the bodily sense. But they were free in that they formed and followed their own ideal of perfection, suffering neither tyranny of custom nor any weakness of their own to stand in the way of its realisation.

And, according as they were all these, and for love of perfection followed the law of purity, they rose higher and higher on the ladder of our common Humanity—the ladder on the summit of which, where it melts into Deity, we Christians place the Christ, the Finding of whom is always the result alone of following the Perfect Way of which the first step is the adoption of “the best food for Man.”

The magic so successful in the past is equally potent, equally available now. For the world and man are made now as they were made then, and have ever in themselves the seed of their own regeneration. Of this divine magic the only implements are a pure life, a firm will, and a loving heart. Given these three, and the loftiest ideal which can be conceived in thought can be realised in fact. For of Man and Nature the capacity is boundless, extending from the “bottomless pit” of the negation of Being to the very throne of God. And, as God is Love, and Love hath nothing of its own, all that God has and is is man’s also, if he but seek it aright. Operating through eternity, man’s will becomes an infinite will. And to infinite will all things are possible.

And since that which is true of the individual is true also of the general, the rule that will perfect the man will perfect also the nation, aye, and the world. Recognising and welcoming as we do all the many admirable movements now in operation to the same great end of our social regeneration, we regard this one as by far the most essential, and are convinced that, until we return as a people to man’s best food, all other schemes together will be ineffectual, since, for man and

woman to be their best, it is necessary that they be built up of the best materials. What science, economy, and health say these materials are, my predecessor has told you. What history, philosophy, and religion say they are, I have told you.

VEGETARIANISM AND ANTIQUITY

I ASSUME that we are, all of us, rational beings, and, being so, that we desire earnestly to be the best that we have it in us to be, and to turn to the best possible account the share allotted to us of the universal Life and Substance.

This is to say, I assume that we are, all of us, men, in the true and high sense of the term, and this whether we be of the masculine or of the feminine gender ; for humanity is of two sexes, comprising man male and man female ; so that in order fully to represent humanity, and to be perfect man, or perfectly human, it is necessary to combine in ourselves the essential qualities of both sexes, namely, the force, the intellect, and the courage of the man, and the love, the intuition, and the endurance of the woman. It is only in virtue of our manifestation of the qualities of both sexes that we can justify our claim to be made in what is called the Divine image, the image, that is, of God ; since God is all of the qualities of the two sexes in their highest perfection.

It is, then, we may assume, as men that we desire to know what is the proper food of and for man ; what is the food best fitted to make us *whole* men, after the image I have just described, and so to enable us both to be the best that we have it in us to be, and to turn our existence to the best possible account—the best possible account, of course, *in the long run*, considering what, though a certainty for a few only, is a probability for many, and a possibility for all, namely, that we are permanent beings, continuing after the life of our bodies, and that according to the tendencies we encourage here, we determine our nature and condition hereafter.

Since it is as whole men that we want to learn the proper food for man, and since, also, in this, as in other matters, experience is the only safe guide, it is necessary that we turn to those whom the world has recognised as being whole men,

having, in the highest degree, the qualities of both sexes, and being in virtue thereof made in man's proper divine image, and representatives at once of God and of man.

Doing this, we shall at once follow the common-sense course, and ascertain the common-sense view on our subject. For, although we shall not necessarily arrive at the conclusion agreed in by all or even most men, we shall assuredly arrive at the conclusion agreed in by—and this alone is the true criterion—*all parts of man*. For only those who, in being whole man, have developed in themselves the consciousness of all the different spheres or regions of man's nature which together constitute and make man, only those can by any means be possessed of the common sense of man.

Now, the chief divisions in man's system—not to trouble ourselves about their subdivisions—the regions or spheres in man the *consensus* or agreement of which constitutes common sense, are four in number, and they are, counting from without inwards, the body, the mind, the Soul, and the Spirit. And as all these go to the making of the man, in the absence of the consciousness of any of them he is not yet a whole man, but is, however great he may be in respect of any one or more of them, only a rudimentary man.

It will be interesting as well as instructive to state that, in being thus constituted, man is made exactly like the universe of which he is the outcome, and so constitutes an epitome of it, being a microcosm to its macrocosm. It is this fourfold nature at once of the universe and of man which the Bible and other sacred books of the ancient religions describe under the symbol of the fourfold River of Paradise, the fourfold Chariot of Ezekiel, the four Beasts or Living Creatures both of Ezekiel and the book of Revelation, and the number, characteristics, and symbols of the four Gospels, all of which are intended to denote the fourfoldness of every complete entity, small or great, manifested in Existence, and to show the order and respective value of each sphere or department. For the Ox of St Matthew represents the material part, the body or earth; the Lion of St Mark represents the electric or mental part; the Angel-headed man of St Luke denotes the Soul; and the Eagle, or bird of the air, of St John denotes the Spirit. These two last constitute the upper and divine part of man, his true and permanent self. And the whole man is, when perfect, as a luminous globe consisting of these four concentric spheres,

of which the innermost, or Spirit, is the centre and sun, the radiant point which, while receiving of the substantial essences of all the particles of which the system is composed, redistributes of these in the form of light and life to every part, vivifying and illumining the whole man, and this precisely in proportion to the purity of his manner of living, thinking, acting, and wishing, so that one Will actuates and rules every part—"on the earth," or body, "as in heaven," or divine part—and this the Will, not of the body, but of the Spirit, which is the God of the man, and which, when pure, is God in the man. For pure spirit is God. Attaining to this condition, the man is at the summit of humanity, perfect as man, and having the "gift of God which is eternal life." And in order to attain this condition, or in any way to make approach to it, not only must the man's food be pure in itself, but it must be purely come by, that is, without fraud, rapine, violence, or bloodshed. Divine ends can be attained only by divine means; and the truly human is divine, as regards both ends and means. And the flesh of corpses is not pure food, nor is the slaughter of harmless creatures for selfish purposes a pure act. "They shall not hurt or slay in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord." And "He that killeth an ox shall be as if he slew a man"—such is the burden of all true prophets whenever, forced by the degeneracy of the times to speak plainly, they have departed from the mystic language usual to them.

The definition I have given you of man and humanity is one which fits very many other occasions than that which has called us together here. And it is also one for which, in this age of ours, there is peculiar need. For it is precisely because the world's habits in respect to eating and drinking have become so gross and depraving that it has forgotten what it once knew about the nature and lofty possibilities of humanity, and has come to think that not the Mind and Soul and Spirit, but the outward form, makes the man, and that to be man it is not necessary to have the qualities of man. This comes of the prevailing materialism, itself due to grossness of the diet, first physical, then mental, on which we nourish our bodies and minds. And so low has become the conception of humanity and of existence at large, that people are to be found expressing their doubts as to whether life is worth living at all!

Having given you a definition and a doctrine—a definition

of man, and a doctrine concerning his nature and destiny,— I am bound to give some examples and their practice. That I have given a definition at all of man, is because until we know what man is we cannot possibly determine what his food ought to be.

Now, for the best examples it is necessary to go a long way back in the world's history, to a time when there were men who regarded *being* above *seeming* or even *having*, and who cared to *know* only in order to *be*, and who, therefore, made the one object of their lives the attainment of personal perfection.

But we must not suppose that this object, though personal, was a selfish object. Their pursuit of perfection in themselves was prompted, first, by love of God, as the supreme perfection ; and, next, by love of man, to whom they desired to point the pathway to perfection by showing in their own persons how lofty are the possibilities of the existence we all share. Their motive was thus not selfishness, but love—the love which recognises in the universe one omnipresent self, and that self God. As seekers after perfection, they were necessarily seekers after God ; and according to the intensity of the love which impelled them, did they succeed in their quest for themselves, and in raising others towards their own level. Such were those true heroes of the far past, those redeemers and saviours of men from the grossness of mere animality long before our era, who were as steps in the ladder at the summit of which we are wont to place the Christ—a Zoroaster, a Moses, a Pythagoras, an Apollonius, a Buddha. And so transcendent were the powers exercised by them, alike over men and over the forces of nature, by virtue of their own pure spirits, that while by scoffers they were regarded as magicians, by the devout they were regarded as divinities.

And their method was worthy their motive ; for it, too, was divine. Reformers, not of institutions merely, but of men themselves, and reformers of the most radical kind, they went straight to the very root of man's nature, seeking to change at once their spirits and their bodies by means of that inward purification which is the secret and method of Christ. And as a first step towards this, they required of their disciples the total renunciation of flesh-food, of stimulating drinks, and, so far as was practicable, of fire in the preparation of their food : and not only did they object to *heating* food and drink, but they objected to hot foods and drinks.

All the reasons on which the case for a vegetarian regimen rests are scientific reasons, but some of them belong to a science which is not of the physical, but of the mental and moral, and some to a science which is neither of these, but is what is termed occult, in that it deals with the inmost and spiritual essence of man, and all that relates thereto. Of this science the ancients were masters, having become so primarily through the purity of their mode of living, by which they were enabled to develop faculties of which the modern world hears only to deride and deny them, that world having, through the grossness of its modes of living, altogether forfeited them. They are, nevertheless, now in the process of recovery through a return to the ancient regimen; and in virtue of what has been thus recovered, both of faculty and of knowledge, we are able to confirm positively the truth of the ancient doctrine concerning the nature both of man and of his proper food; the food, that is, which at once enables man to be his best, and makes the best man.

It was in virtue of such knowledge that the practice was adopted of dividing mankind into the different grades called castes. These were regulated, not according to social position, race, or wealth, but according to the involucional development, or interior unfoldment, of the individual; and each caste denoted a different step upon the ladder of evolution, by which one on the lowest might climb to the highest. Any man was of high caste, however lowly born or placed, who had developed the consciousness of the inner and higher part of his nature, that of the Soul and Spirit. And any man was of low caste, however highly born or placed, who had not developed the consciousness of these, but only that of the body and superficial reason. The higher the caste of the man, the purer and lighter was the food on which he could sustain himself, the purest of all being sun-ripened fruits and sun-baked cakes of grain. Those who were of this grade could be initiated into the sacred mysteries of the god or arch-angel of the sun—in Greece named Apollo—the highest of all the mysteries in virtue of the sun being recognised as the symbol of the supreme deity, “the brightness of the glory and express image of the person” of God. The lower the caste, the grosser the food,—as roots, herbs, fish, and eggs. The flesh-eaters were regarded as beyond the pale altogether, and therefore as outcastes, but not in the sense of reprobates. These were

the materialists of those times, persons so devoid of spiritual perception as to be incapable of discerning anything beyond the material world, and so narrow in their sympathies, and deficient in their sense of beauty and fitness, as to renounce the pure and exquisite products of the soil, and to slaughter inoffensive animals and make themselves tombs for their corpses. In the Mysteries of Hermes, also called Raphael and Thauth, the Divine Spirit of Understanding, and the second of the Elohim, it was especially forbidden to eat anything that could see, the initiates being charged in this wise :—

“ Purify your bodies, and eat no dead thing that has looked with living eyes upon the light of Heaven.

For the eye is the symbol of brotherhood among you. Sight is the mystical sense.

Let no man take the life of his brother to feed withal his own.

But slay only such as are evil, in the name of the Lord.

They are miserably deceived who expect eternal life, and restrain not their hands from blood and death.”¹

Such was the institution of Caste as originally conceived, the grades being four, in accordance with the fourfold nature alike of man and the universe. The disuse of fire in the preparation of their food by the superior caste was for this reason. Fire disorganises the component particles of the substances submitted to it, thereby destroying their magnetic properties and impairing the vitality which constitutes their highest virtue as food, so that instead of ministering directly of their own consciousness to that of the man, and so heightening his powers of perception alike of body and mind, they serve but to dull both sense and understanding. One of the purposes in the famous parable of Prometheus was to illustrate the mischievous effect of fire in respect of food. Not only does it enable man to use the flesh of animals and thus, while over-materialising himself, to habituate himself to carnage, but by supplying him with hot foods and drinks, it dries up the magnetic power of his nerves, dulls his senses, and shortens his life. Matter itself, moreover, is the product of heat, being due to motion, which is a mode of heat. And matter (though essentially Spirit, as are necessarily all things) is the antithesis of Spirit in its original condition. And hence, in the parable, the appointed punisher of Prometheus is no other than Hermes,

¹ See *An Exhortation of Hermes to his Neophytes*, C.W.S., Part II., No. xii. (2) vv. 17-21 ; and see Biographical Preface, pp. 32-33 *ante*.

the representative of the Understanding, and called also the Physician of Souls, since that alone is the true faith—the faith which saves and cannot be shaken—which is founded on the rock of the Understanding. And as the promoter of a diet directly at conflict with the intuition, and incompatible with the full development of the mind, Prometheus was regarded as having invaded the province of Hermes. Equally significant were the penalties of his offence, for by his enchainment to a rock was denoted the bondage of the Soul to matter or the body through following gross courses ; and by the vulture which devoured his liver was denoted the diseased condition of the blood consequent on an unnatural diet.¹

It is, of course, impossible in our climate to dispense with fire in the preparation of food, as we have so few things which we can eat without cooking them. But the evil can be greatly mitigated by taking our food cold, or at least not hot ; and a still greater gain would come of such an increased production of fruit as would enable all to use it as a main article of their diet. On the score of physical health alone, the gain would be immense. For, as many a medical man has said, if only people would take fruit at their breakfasts, they would rarely require a doctor.

It will be seen from what has been said that the grounds on which our practice rests are very far from being restricted to the physical, or even to this present life, since it has relation to the permanent as well as to the temporary element of man. For it is founded on the Common Sense, not merely of the great majority of mankind—that would be a very narrow definition of Common Sense—but of *all parts of man*—the physical, the intellectual, the moral, and the spiritual. And it is precisely because it has the concurrence of every region of man's nature that all generations of men who have, by the development of the consciousness of all these regions, become whole men, and thereby representative of humanity, have both made it their own practice and required it of all who have sought of them the secret and method of that pearl of great price, personal perfection. The quest of this, or, in other words, the culture of the Soul, at once individual and universal, was the supreme object of the initiates in all those præ-Christian Churches known as the Sacred Mysteries of Antiquity, alike in Hindostan, Egypt, Persia, Judæa, Greece, and other lands.

¹ See Biographical Preface, pp. 26, 37.

But this was prior to the invasion and consequent degeneration of these Mysteries by Materialism. For then the prophet was overborne by the priest; the minister of the intuition by the minister of sense; and for the "Lamb" of a pure and gentle heart, men offered of "the fruits of the ground," or lower nature, sacrifices material merely, and stained with innocent blood the pure altars of the Lord, as well as their own bodies, which ought to be as temples of God. And so was abandoned, until well-nigh forgotten, that Perfect Way which, beginning with a renunciation of a diet of flesh, properly followed, ends with the Finding of Christ.

Recalling the world's experience, and confirming it by our own, we are absolutely convinced that no perfection of the individual, no civilisation of the general worthy to be so called, can be attained while violence and injustice, even to animals, prevails, and men sustain themselves by methods at variance with the nature and needs of every region, unvitiated, of their nature.

VEGETARIANISM AND THE BIBLE

THERE are very many persons for whom the arguments scientific, social, economical, and even moral, in favour of a vegetable diet, do not suffice, but who require in addition the sanction of the Bible. As we are prepared to meet inquirers at this point also, I have drawn up a short paper in solution of what may be called the religious difficulty in the way of vegetarianism, which I will now read to you. You will perceive as I proceed that I make no question of the authority of the Bible. The only question, if there be one, will be of the interpretation of the Bible, or at least of certain parts of it. And the more effectually to obtain a patient and tolerant hearing for anything I may say at variance with your accustomed beliefs, I will remind you in advance that while belief in the infallibility of the Bible is one thing, and is compatible with that spirit of humility with which alone things sacred should be approached, belief in the infallibility of one's own interpretation of the Bible is another thing, and is incompatible with such spirit of humility. Of course, this exordium may be altogether uncalled for, as it may turn out that the views expressed by me are already your own. But however this may be, it is necessary for the proper advocacy of our Cause that they be stated.

First of all, then, as to the character and purpose of the Bible. It is before all other things a religious book; not a scientific, or historical, but a religious book. And, further, as religion is not a thing of the outer sense and reason, but relates to the Soul, the appeal of the Bible is not to the outer sense and reason, but to the Soul.

Agreeing on these premisses, we ought to have no difficulty in agreeing on these other premisses also. As the Soul is not perishable like the body, but is immortal, and may become eternal, the teachings necessary for it must refer, not to persons, things, or events, which are of time and transitory, but

must consist in verities, which are eternal, and capable of perpetual application.

And again, as the Bible, in being a religious book and addressed to the Soul, or spiritual part of man, deals with things inward and spiritual, and not with things outward and material, it is in the spiritual signification, and not in the outward form, that its true value consists and must be sought.

On this last point the Bible itself speaks decidedly, saying that the Letter is dead and killeth, but the Spirit alone hath and giveth life. And not this alone, but the Bible insists also on the necessity, to the reader or hearer, of an inner sense of his own by means of which alone he can discern its inner meaning. Constantly it is said, in reference to some utterance of which the principal meaning is so deeply concealed as to constitute it a mystery—"He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." And constantly does it speak reproachfully of persons who have eyes that see not and ears that hear not the mystic meaning hidden beneath its symbolical phrases. And so far from approving of blind, unintelligent assent, it repeatedly exalts a Spirit of Understanding as the chief of divine gifts. And in doing this, it may be observed, the Bible is not inconsistent with itself when, enumerating the divine graces Faith, Hope, and Charity, it declares the first of these to be Charity. For Charity is one with Love, and Love is one with Sympathy, and Sympathy is the first and last step to Understanding. Now, it is to your Understanding that I appeal for recognition of that which I shall say on this occasion.

From the premisses thus laid down, there follows this important conclusion, which is a master-key to the interpretation of Scripture. All that is true in it is spiritual, and no dogma or doctrine is true that seems to bear a physical meaning, or that is not spiritual. If it be true, and yet seem to us to have a material signification, we have not solved it, but it is a mystery to us of which we have yet to seek the interpretation. That which is true, is for Spirit alone.¹

Now, not only does the Bible address itself to the Soul, but it contains, and is, the history of the Soul. And it is written, as would be expected from its Egyptian origin, in hieroglyphics, or sacred symbols, the method usual to the Egyptians, and adopted from them by the Hebrews, or, it may be, the

¹ See A. K.'s *Illumination Concerning the Prophecy of the Immaculate Conception*, C. W. S., Part I., No. iii.

method of the Hebrews, or sacred people, from the first, and by them introduced into Egypt. This method of writing consists in describing things spiritual and appertaining to the Soul, under figures or in terms derived from the natural world. So that that which is meant is not the animal, plant, person, or other object drawn or written, but something else which such object has been selected to represent, and of which it thus becomes the type or symbol. Being written in this way, the Bible, or at least the spiritual and not merely historical part of it, is a hieroglyph, denoting under various physical objects, such as narratives of events apparently earthly, and biographies apparently of actual persons, and other natural things, processes which are purely spiritual and mystic. The Bible, in short, may be defined as a collection of parables setting forth the history of the Soul from its first descent into matter, to its final return to its original condition of pure spirit. And as the Soul undergoes the same process whether it be one or many—a person, a church, a race, or even the universe at large—the narrative that sets forth, or the parable that represents the history of one, does so equally of all. And the same terms, which are three in number, comprise the entire process. These are Generation, Degeneration, and Regeneration, and these, therefore, as applied to the Soul, are the subject of the Bible, as we shall presently show, and not the physical history of any person or people whatever, though described in terms derived from persons and people. And to take such persons, people, or other symbol from their proper place as symbols, and, ignoring their true signification, to pay to them the honour due only to that signification is, in biblical language, to commit idolatry. For, in so doing, we materialise spiritual mysteries, and accord to the Form the regard due only to the Substance. Whenever we understand the things of Sense where the things of Spirit are alone implied, and so conceal the true features of Divinity with false and spurious presentations, we commit what the Bible regards as the most abhorrent of sins, and make ourselves idolaters, and, at the same time, identify ourselves with that materialistic school which is fast overspreading the world with the avowed object of eradicating the very idea of God and the Soul.

For “Idolatry is Materialism, the common and original sin of men, which replaces Spirit by Appearance, Substance by Illusion, and leads both the moral and intellectual Being into

error, so that they substitute the nether for the upper, and the depth for the height. It is that false fruit which attracts the outer senses, the bait of the serpent in the beginning of the world ;”¹ and this alike for the race and for each individual who has ever lived, for all are liable to its attraction.

We ought then to know, for the right understanding of the mystical scriptures, that in their esoteric, or interior and real, sense, they deal, not with material things, but with spiritual realities ; and that neither is Adam an actual man, but denotes rather the lower personality or intellectual force in every human being ; nor is Eve an actual woman, but denotes the feminine element in every human being, namely, the Soul or moral conscience ; and she is therefore called the “ Mother of the Living ” or spiritually alive, namely, those in whom the Soul has attained self-consciousness. Nor is Eden an actual place, but a condition of innocence prior to a fall from a height attained. Nor is the Tree of Life in its midst an actual tree, but God standing in the midst of the Universe as its life. Nor is man made all at once in the image of God, but only after long ages of development, beginning in the lowest forms of vegetable life, and passing upward through many forms, till he reaches the human form ; and even then he is not made in the image of God, is not truly man in the Bible and mystic sense. For in this sense it takes something more than the man physical, more than the man intellectual, more, even, than the man moral, to be a man. To be made in the image of God he must attain his spiritual majority, through his development of the consciousness of his spiritual nature. He must be soul as well as body ; Eve as well as Adam ; as on the physical, so on the spiritual plane, he requires the woman to make him man, and the mystic woman is his Soul. Prior to her advent, he is man materialistic and rudimentary merely, human in form only, and an animal in all else. But she comes at length, manifested as alone the Soul can be, when his lower self is wrapped in deep slumber, and he awakes to find himself wholly man, in the image of God, male and female, in that he represents the two aspects, masculine and feminine, of Deity, the divine power and the divine love, and also the Seven Spirits through whom God creates all things. Thus constituted he is indeed Man, for he is a manifestation of God,

¹ See A. K.'s *Illumination Concerning the Interpretation of the Mystical Scriptures*, C.W.S., Part I., No. v.

by whose spirit, working within him, he has been created. And thus created has been and will be every man who ever lived or will live.

But the process includes a point called the Fall. Yielding to the outward impulses of the lower nature ere she is sufficiently strong to resist them, Eve puts forth her hand and plucks the fruit which, as she is spiritual, and it is material—is Matter—is forbidden to her. In other words, and divested of allegory, the Soul, or higher self, falls beneath the power of the lower self and loses the intuition of Spirit, and the man, no longer sustained by her, follows her in her fall. The lower self, with the bodily appetites and reason, becomes sole ruler, and its offspring is Cain, the murderer and even the torturer of his brethren, human and animal. And when Abel, who, as minister of the Soul and her intuitions, represents the prophet, offers to God the "firstlings of his flock," namely, the "Lamb" of a pure and gentle heart, makes his appearance, he is forthwith slain by Cain, who, as the slave of sense, offering of the "fruits of the ground," or lower nature, represents the priest.¹

In this view, then, Abel was no initiator of blood and death to innocent creatures either for sacrifice or for food. His "Lamb" signified simply the holiest and highest of spiritual gifts which, rejected and slain from the foundation of the world, is represented in the Apocalypse as finally occupying the throne of God, surrounded by all those who, redeemed through following it, have the Father's name written on their foreheads. For it is still the Soul that, under the appellation of the woman, when purified from Matter, becomes the Bride of the Spirit, and Mother of the eternally living; while it is the Soul persisting in evil who is styled "Mother of Abominations," and who shares the doom of "Babylon," or "that great city" the world or system of civilisation in which Matter is exalted to the holy place of God in the Soul, and the body is made all and in all.

The same spiritual truth recurs again and again in the sacred books, under various allegorical forms. Always are tenderness of heart and purity of habit the accompaniments of the higher life; always are bloodshed and flesh-eating the results of a fall to a lower level. The story of the Deluge illustrates the same truth, and to the slaughter of animals adds

¹ See Biographical Preface, p. 28.

drunkenness. In this parable, man is represented, after a period of declension into utter materialism, as once more, under a flood of intuition, regaining that height of perfection, the full consciousness of his spiritual nature. But no sooner does he come down from the mount of purification and regeneration, than he betakes him again to grossness and bloodshed, such that the Deity is represented as giving him up as hopeless, saying it was of no use to punish him, and giving him reluctant permission, to use flesh for his food. For such is the obvious and true meaning of the passage so confusedly translated in the ninth chapter of Genesis. And yet we constantly find a permission, which was the result of a fall, pleaded as an excuse for declining to make any effort at recovery! That such recovery is not regarded in the Bible as impossible, is shown by the appointment of a symbol of hope in the rainbow with its seven rays. For this is again the type of the Woman or Soul, who, when restored to purity, and divinely illumined, manifests the Seven Spirits of God of which the Soul always bears the potentiality in her bosom, and in virtue thereof will some day again be the producer of men "made in the image of God."

The feud, already referred to, between prophet and priest, as the ministers respectively of the Soul and of sense, of the pure life and of bloodshed, is carried on throughout the whole of the Bible, until it culminates in the murder by priests of the greatest of prophets. For the prophets were not shedders of blood; and all the narratives which represent Moses, Samuel, Elijah, and other prophets as engaged in slaughtering either their own people or the neighbouring tribes—narratives which for their apparent horror are at once a stumbling-block to the faithful and an occasion of scoffing to the unbelievers—represent simply the conflicts of the Soul with the evil tendencies of the man it animates. And had, moreover, the translators of the Bible been duly fitted for their task, first, by their possession of the requisite knowledge of Hebrew; secondly, by their possession of the requisite insight into divine things; and, thirdly, by their freedom from prepossession in favour of a sanguinary conception of the divine character, they would have rendered into English the names of the victims of these massacres, instead of retaining them in the original; and thus we should have seen in these narratives but an anticipation of the method pursued in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* and *Holy*

War. And as to the writers themselves of the Bible, we may well believe that, could they have foreseen to what depths of dulness a regimen of flesh and stimulants can reduce an otherwise not unintelligent people, living two thousand years after them—the dulness shown by our taking their parables as literal truths—they would have renounced forthwith their favourite method, and spoken plainly.

No other than the method described was that of Moses. Learned in all the Mysteries of the religion of the Egyptians, he delivered like mysteries to his own people, teaching his initiates the spirit of the heavenly hieroglyphs, and bidding them, when they made festival before God, to carry with them in procession, with music and with dancing, such of the sacred animals as were, by their interior significance, related to the occasion. And of these animals, he chiefly selected males of the first year, without spot or blemish, to signify that it is beyond all things needful that man should dedicate to the Lord his intellect and his reason, and this from the beginning and without the least reserve. The priests, then, were idolaters, who, coming after Moses, and committing to writing those things which he by word of mouth had delivered unto Israel, replaced the true things signified by their material symbols, and shed innocent blood on the pure altars of the Lord.¹

The prophets, then, as already said, were not shedders of blood. They dealt not with things material, but with spiritual significations. Their lambs without spot, their white doves, their goats, their rams, and other sacred creatures, are so many signs and symbols of the various graces and gifts which a mystic people should offer to heaven. Without *such* sacrifices is no remission of sin. But when the mystic sense was lost, then carnage followed. The prophets ceased out of the land, and the priests bore rule over the people. Then, when again the voice of the prophets arose, they were constrained to speak plainly, and declared openly that the sacrifices of God are not the flesh of bulls or the blood of goats, but holy vows and sacred thanksgivings, their mystical counterparts. For, as God is a Spirit, so also are His sacrifices spiritual. It is but folly and ignorance to offer material flesh and drink to pure Power and essential Being. In vain, even for us, have the

¹ See A. K.'s *Illumination Concerning the Interpretation of the Mystical Scriptures*, C.W.S., Part I., No. v. pp. 20, 21; and Preface, p. 28 *ante*.

prophets spoken, and in vain has Christ been manifested.¹ For the whole burden of Christ's teaching and moral of Christ's life by which He vindicated at once the Law and the Prophets, is that a man cannot be saved by any act of another, or by any process occurring outside himself; that "none can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him"; that, therefore, not burnt-offering nor sin-offering, nor any physical or material sacrifice whatever, could save man from his sins and their consequences, but only a lowly and contrite heart, and a pure spirit within the man himself, and a life in accordance therewith. Only let us once read the Bible with vision, unobscured by a veil of blood, and undistorted by prejudice, and its whole mystery—the mystery of our fall and of our redemption—becomes clear as the cloudless sky. For then we can trace as occurring in our own souls the whole process from beginning to end which the Bible from Genesis to the Revelation sets forth under types and parables precisely after the manner of our Lord Himself. And, doing this, we come to know absolutely by the personal experience of our own souls that the secret and method of the Christ is no other than that process of inward purification and regeneration whereby alone the spirit in man returns to its original condition of purity, making him a new man, at one with God, who is pure Spirit. It is this process of transmutation, or redemption of Spirit from Matter, alike in the individual and in the universal, which constitutes the theme of all sacred scriptures, the object of all true religions, the task of all true churches. And they are the several stages of this process which constitute respectively the Fall of Adam through the yielding of the Eve in him to the serpent of Matter; the going down of Israel or the Soul into Egypt or the world and the body; and the Exodus or flight from the world across the water of separation and consecration into the wilderness of beneficial experience; and the crossing of the Jordan or river of purification to take possession of the promised land of perfection. They are still the several stages of this process which are represented in the Gospel-history of the typical man regenerate. Whether they be termed water and the spirit, a pure soul and the divine operation therein, or the Virgin Mary and Holy Ghost, it is of these two in each man himself who finally is redeemed that

¹ See A. K.'s *Illumination Concerning the Interpretation of the Mystical Scriptures*, C.W.S., Part I., No. v. pp. 18, 19.

the new man, or man regenerate, the Christ Jesus—who always is the “only begotten son of God”—is produced. And it is always by the crucifixion and death on the cross of renunciation of that old Adam, the lower self, and the resurrection and ascension to a condition of final perfection that salvation is finally attained. And the reason why all these eternal verities in the soul’s history are made to centre in the prophet of Nazareth is simply because, recognising in him the tokens of his attainment of perfection in a degree never reached before, and in his history the fitting symbolical correspondences, the Divine Spirit, under whose inspiration the Gospels were composed, selected him as the type of the possibilities of humanity at large.

But even while thus rejecting as idolatrous, blasphemous, and pernicious in the highest degree the doctrine as ordinarily understood of Vicarious Atonement, we still see in “Christ Jesus” “the only begotten Son of God,” and still cling fast to His blood and cross as the sole means of salvation. But it is the Christ Jesus, or man reborn of a pure soul and spirit, as Jesus Himself declared that all must be born—even precisely as He is dramatically described as having been born—within ourselves, to whom we look for salvation. And the means are His cross of self-sacrifice, renunciation, and purity of life; and the reception into ourselves of that “Blood of God” which is no mere physical blood—between which and moral imperfection is no congruous relation—but which is the *life* of God, even pure Spirit, which is God, and which God is ever freely shedding for His creatures, giving them of His own life and substance.

How pernicious is the doctrine of vicarious atonement as ordinarily accepted may be seen in the world’s present condition, intellectually, morally, and spiritually, no less than physically. Man ever makes himself after the image of his God, that is, after his idea of God. And believing in a God who is unjust, selfish, and cruel, man cannot be other than unjust, selfish, and cruel also. It is precisely this misrepresentation of the divine character, and this perversion of the true and only possible doctrine of the atonement into one that makes man’s salvation a process external to himself and dependent on the action of another than himself, which, by falsifying Christianity, have ensured its failure, and, instead of a world ordered on the principles of justice, sympathy, and

purity, have given us a world of wrong-doing, selfishness, and sensuality. According to the true gospel, as declared by the prophets, the substance of humanity is not material and created, but spiritual and divine. And man rises out of his lower into his higher nature by subordinating the former to the latter, and so rising wholly into that higher, becoming thereby divine—for between Spirit and Matter there is no boundary line. The knowledge of this was the priceless treasure of which Israel fleeing, “spoiled the Egyptians.” And it was the grand secret of all sacred mysteries from the first. That, on the contrary, is a false gospel, proceeding from the priests, which, defying at once the intellect and the intuition, ascribes salvation to a vicarious operation, and, instead of the sacrifice of our own lower nature to our own higher nature, and of ourselves for others, insists on the sacrifice of our higher nature to our lower, and of others for ourselves. It is of this inversion of the divine order that the prevalent habit of flesh-eating and of vivisection—that most infernal of all practices that ever issued from the bottomless pit of man’s lower nature—are the direct and inevitable outcome. And until the divine order is restored, in act as well as in thought, by the renunciation of the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice as ordinarily held, and by the consequent rehabilitation of the character of God, all our efforts at improvement must be futile; our civilisation will be but a mockery of the term; and our morality and religion will be things we should be the better for being without.

In conclusion: that at which we aim is no reform of institutions merely, or promotion of benefits merely material, but a radical renovation of the very Substance of men themselves on every plane of their nature, with a view to the realisation of the long-promised “new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth Righteousness,” and the advent of that perfected state, the New Jerusalem, or City which hath God for its light, and which cometh down from the heaven of man’s own celestial region, even that kingdom of heaven which is within him, but which can never be realised by those who persist in so ordering their lives as to make bloodshed and injustice necessities.

“He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?” “They

shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord."

And if it be asked what is the source of, and what the authority for, these interpretations, the reply is that there is but one source and authority for truth, and that is the Soul of man himself, and that to obtain access there, and to know of the doctrine, it is necessary to do the Father's Will, and to live the pure life required. For the Soul sees divinely, and never forgets what she has once learnt. And all that she knows is at the service of him who duly tends and cultivates her. From her comes, directly and without admixture of human alloy, that which has just been said. And no other source or method is there of divine revelation. It is true, as is commonly supposed, that divine revelation is uttered by a voice from heaven. But the heaven is the innermost sanctuary of the temple of man himself, and the voice is that of God speaking therein. Only where the soil, which is the body, is pure and purely nourished, so that no noxious exhalations arise to obscure the atmosphere, can the man and his Soul thus hold converse together. Living as does the world to-day, it cannot know the potentialities of humanity. Hence it divinises one foremost specimen, at the expense of the rest of the race, whereas all are divine, if they will but let themselves be so. And revelation is, no less than reason, the natural appanage of man. Only let him live purely, and he will reverse the Fall.

INDEX

- Abel, 28, 197, 218.
 Adam and Eve, 28, 217, 218. *See* Fall.
 Animal Protection Acts, 63.
 Animals, duty to, 51.
 good and evil, 33.
 immortality of, 9, 24, 33, 47, 53, 97.
 killing, *see* Killing.
 as living souls, 150.
 moral nature of, 171, 172.
 Antients, the, 182, 183, 195, 196, 203, 204, 209, 210. *See* Vegetarians.
 Arbitration, 6, 143.
 Atonement, *see* Vicarious atonement.
 Authority, 154, 224.
 Baths, *see* Blood.
 Bible, 27, 28, 67, 68, 73-77, 107, 108, 139-143, 214-221.
 sacrifices of the, 27, 28, 39, 218-221.
 Blood, *see* Sacrifices.
 baths of, 48.
 eating, 41, 46, 48, 49, 82.
 of God, 222.
 Body, resurrection, 189.
 Buddhism, 53, 99, 107, 117, 121, 122, 155, 156, 178.
 Cain, *see* Abel.
 Castes, 40, 120, 121, 210, 211.
 Cattle-shows, 20.
 Character and food, 125, 126, 152, 153, 166, 167, 170, 210.
 Christ, 108, 109, 168, 197, 204, 213, 221, 222. *See* Jesus Christ.
 Christianity, *see* Christmas.
 and cruelty to animals, 52-54.
 falsification of, 222, 223.
 and flesh-eating, 45, 46, 68, 72, 74, 75, 108, 139, 178.
 Christmas, 19, 20, 37, 38, 108.
 Civilisation, 96, 97, 99, 145.
 Common sense, 160-162, 175, 176, 195, 196, 207, 212.
 Cooking, 26, 37-39, 42-44, 66, 167, 177, 185, 209-212. *See* Fire.
 Cruelty, *see* Christianity.
 legal, 63.
 Death, *see* Soul.
 Deluge, parable of the, 197, 218, 219.
 Devolution, 160, 195. *See* Evolution.
 Diet, *see* Food.
 Digestion, 79-87, 104, 105.
 Drink, *see* Blood, Jesus.
 fermented, 37, 39, 42, 47, 209.
 hot, *see* Cooking, Fire.
 question, the, 103.
 Duality, 183, 184, 206.
 Duty, *see* Animals.
 Eden, Garden of, 217.
 Education, *see* Civilisation.
 Enthusiasm, 42.
 Eve, *see* Adam and Eve.
 Evolution, 151, 160, 188, 189, 195. *See* Devolution.
 Fall, the, 46, 151, 184, 193, 197, 218, 219, 221, 224. *See* Adam and Eve.
 Fire, 26, 37, 38, 39, 200, 211. *See* Cooking.
 Fish, *see* Food, Jesus.
 Flesh-eating, *see* Christianity, Food, God, Jesus, Perfection.
 Food, 154. *See* Blood, Digestion, Character, Jesus, Perfection, Christianity, Vegetarianism, Religion.
 cold, 42, 209, 212.
 diseased, 89, 90-94, 115, 134, 135.
 fish, 22, 39, 40.
 flesh, 23, 65, 87, 198.
 renunciation of, necessary, 40, 41, 181, 198.
 grades of, 153, 154, 166, 167, 210, 211.
 and health, 1, 4, 44, 91, 92, 105, 153-155.
 hot, *see* Cooking, Fire.

- Food must be rightly come by, 48, 208.
 perfect, 24-26, 43, 44, 157, 167, 200, 202.
 pure, *see* Purity.
 effect of, 44.
 and spirituality, 7, 40, 41.
 value of, 168, 200.
 vital, *see* Cooking, Fire.
 Fourfoldness, 207.
 Free-livers, 200, 204.
 Free-thought, 179, 188, 199, 200, 203.
 Free-will, *see* Man.
 Furs and feathers, *see* Leather.
- God, *see* Blood.
 and flesh-eating, 74, 132, 133.
 image of, 206, 217, 257.
 and man, 162, 189, 206, 208, 217.
 Gods, feast of the, 24-26.
 Goldsmith, 118.
- Health, *see* Food.
 History and vegetarianism, 77, 78.
 Humanity, *see* Man.
 Hunting, 2, 63. *See* Sport.
- Ideal life, the, 148, 149, 200.
 Idolatry, 28, 216.
 Image of God, *see* God.
 Immortality, *see* Animals, Soul.
 Injustice, *see* Justice.
 Inoculation, 93-95, 173.
 Instinct, 130, 131.
 moral, 7.
 Intuition, 178-193.
- James, Saint, 26.
 Jesus Christ, 222.
 and fermented drink, 46, 47, 68, 126, 127.
 and fish-eating, 46, 68, 69-73.
 and flesh-eating, 46, 68, 69, 126, 127.
 Justice, 2, 3, 10, 12.
 essential of, 150.
- Killing, when lawful, 33, 172, 173, 211.
 Knowledge, of the soul, 190, 191.
- Land question, 138.
 Law, *see* Love.
 Leather, use of, 3, 117.
 Life, *see* Ideal Life, Tree of Life.
 Love, 185, 203.
 and law, 8, 9.
- Man, 12, 96, 99, 110, 161, 162, 174-178, 183, 196, 199, 206-208, 217. *See* God, Fourfoldness.
 and free-will, 199.
 as microcosm, 162-164, 207, 208.
 pedigree of, 119, 120, 151, 158.
 Materialism, 213.
 Matter, *see* Spirit and matter.
 Microcosm, *see* Man.
 Moral instincts, *see* Animals, Instinct.
 Moses, 220.
 Mountain, Holy, 192.
- Nature, 98, 110, 179.
- Onus probandi*, 65, 66.
 Ouida, 66, 67, 96.
- Paul, Saint, 45-47, 140-142.
 Pedigree of man, *see* Man.
 Perfection impossible on flesh-food, 38, 40, 41, 65, 157, 183, 185, 192, 198, 202, 203, 209, 224.
 Peter, Saint, 74.
 Philosophers, experimental, 199, 203.
 Priest *v.* Prophet, 191, 192, 197, 219.
 Prometheus, 26, 211.
 Prophet, *see* Priest *v.* Prophet.
 Protection of Animals Acts, 63.
 Punishment, *see* Sin.
 Purity, necessity for, 8, 15, 38, 82, 83, 134, 153, 176, 177, 182, 183, 197, 199, 202, 209, 211, 221, 224.
 Pythagoras, 99, 118.
- Reformation, the necessary, 59, 147, 204, 205, 223.
 Religion and diet, 47.
 and science, 142-144, 191.
 Resurrection, *see* Body.
 Revelation, Divine, 190, 224.
 Ridicule, 148, 149.
 Ruskin, 146.
- Sacrifices, bloody, 41, 77, 213. *See* Bible.
 Salvation, 222. *See* Perfection.
 Science, modern, 184, 186, 187, 190.
 and religion, *see* Religion.
 Sentiment, 98, 99, 109, 110.
 Shelley, 100, 117, 123.
 Sin and punishment, 135.
 Social considerations, 60-63, 87-93, 96, 101-106, 111, 116, 129, 132, 134, 137, 138.
 Solidarity, 119, 150.

- Soul, *see* Animals, Knowledge.
 death of, 189, 190.
 immortality of, 185, 189, 190.
 universal, 24.
- Spirit and matter, 161, 166, 187-189,
 211, 223.
- Spirits, seven, 190, 219.
- Spiritual world, 155, 161, 165, 186.
- Sport, 138, 139. *See* Hunting.
- Strength, 101, 102, 113, 114, 117,
 118, 122.
- Teeth, 113, 114, 129, 130.
- Thought, *see* Free-thought.
- Time, the present, 159, 160.
- Transmigration, 9, 33.
- Transmutation, 221.
- Tree of Life, 217.
- Trinity, 190.
- Utopia, 42, 109.
- Vegetarianism, 13, 14, 64, 65, 143,
 145, 169. *See* Food, History.
 effect of, 14, 15, 16, 21, 44, 57,
 58, 116, 117, 178.
- Vegetarians, *see* Antients.
 notable, 78, 117, 141, 142, 175,
 199.
- Veils, the three, 38.
- Vicarious atonement, 10, 222, 223.
- Vivisection, 4, 13, 14, 17, 36, 44,
 49-51, 63, 97, 98, 171-174,
 223. *See* Inoculation.
- War, *see* Arbitration.
- Woman of scripture, the, 197, 217,
 218.
- Women, 136, 137, 145, 146.

Mr WATKINS' LIST.

- ANDRÉ (G.). **THE TRUE LIGHT; or, The Gospel of Christ in the Light of Spiritual Science.** Cloth, 8vo, 2/6 net; popular edition, 1/- net.
- BARRETT (Sir W. F.). **CREATIVE THOUGHT.** Wrappers, post free, 7d.
- BOEHME (JACOB). **THE THREEFOLD LIFE OF MAN.** Cloth, Roy. 8vo. 12/6 net.
- BOEHME (JACOB). **THE THREE PRINCIPLES OF THE DIVINE ESSENCE.** With an Introduction by Dr PAUL DEUSSEN. Cloth, Roy. 8vo. 15/- net.
- BOEHME (JACOB). **FORTY QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE SOUL.** The Clavis. Cloth, Roy. 8vo. 10/6 net.
- BOEHME (JACOB). **THE WAY TO CHRIST.** Pocket Edition. Cloth, 8vo. 3/6 net.
- BOEHME. **STUDIES IN JACOB BÖHME.** By A. J. PENNY. Cloth, Roy. 8vo. pp. xxviii—475. 6/- net.
- CORDELIER (JOHN). **THE PATH OF THE ETERNAL WISDOM** Cloth, 8vo, 2/- net; leather, 3/6 net.
- DALLAS (H. A.). **THE TREND OF PSYCHICAL RESEARCH.** Wrapper, 8vo. Post free, 7d.
- MEAD (G. R. S.). **SOME MYSTICAL ADVENTURES.** Cloth, 8vo. 6/- net.
- VAUGHAN (THOMAS). **LUMEN DE LUMINE; or, New Magical Light.** Edited by A. E. WAITE. Cloth, 8vo. 5/- net.
- WESTCOTT
(Dr W. W.). **AN INTRODUCTION TO THE KABALAH.** Cloth, 8vo. 3/- net.
- WESTCOTT
(Dr W. W.). **THE SEPHER YETZIRAH, THE BOOK OF FORMATION.** Cloth, 8vo. 2/6 net.

Catalogues free on Application.

JOHN M. WATKINS, 21 Cecil Court, Charing Cross Road, London, W.C.

