

slow poisons. The gourmands will cry out at this anathema, but they need not be afraid that their pleasures of the palate will be curtailed. Let them tell their cooks to use salt and other condiments in always decreasing quantities. The palate will gradually lose its craving for spices and return to its natural purity of taste, as I know by experience. When I dine at other people's tables, the dishes seem to have lost their characteristic taste; they all taste to me like brine. I can record a great increase of health and appetite, since I abstained from all condiments, and what is most remarkable and extraordinary,—decrease of thirst.

Sugar has produced the same ill-effects on animals which salt did, only in a less degree. It is converted into acid in the stomach, and when taken in quantities is productive of much acidity in the blood. It seems hardly necessary to point out the relation between sugar and many diseases, which are at present martyring mankind, like gout and rheumatism, which arise chiefly from abundance of acidity in the system. I have just pointed to the mischief done by salt-butter; I now warn Vegetarian cooks against the too frequent use of jams and preserves. Apart from the adulterations practised on these articles of food, sugar itself is to be avoided, or at least ought to be used sparingly. Food Reformers should be careful to use as little as possible, provisions which are preserved by means of salt, sugar, or vinegar, and use all their efforts and inventive powers towards finding out newer and better methods of drying fruits and vegetables. The German housewives are far in advance of us there. Scarlet runners and other kinds of beans are dried, either cut into very fine pieces or whole. Green peas, mushrooms, and other edible fungi, bilberries and cherries are dried and thus preserved, without any unhealthy means. Why cannot we do the same in England? We would thus avoid the preserving in sugar, salt, and vinegar, and also the use of tinned fruit and vegetables, which has a serious disadvantage. The tins used for preserving are not made of pure tin; they are alloyed with lead—in the best of cases they are soldered with lead. The fruit or vegetable acid attacks this lead, and parts of it are thus brought into the system, having always slow but nevertheless poisoning effects. The same is the case with condensed milk, and those who use this, must at least take the precaution of not using the milk which is close to the soldering and to the tin itself.

Most medical men advise their patients to take meat and alcohol in order to get strong; but all hygienic Vegetarians testify that their health and strength has increased prodigiously when they discontinued meat and alcohol. Science and experiment have proved that spices are productive of weakness and disease. Will not the Food Reformers, anxious to ascertain which food is the best, eschew these kitchen poisons, and after having given the spice-less regime a *fair trial*, register in this Journal the results? What we want are *facts*.

B. BOECKER.

ON CERTAIN FALLACIES.

IN a former number of the *Food Reform Magazine* I attempted to expose the fallacies involved in the seven commonest objections to Vegetarianism, which then suggested themselves to my mind. In the present supplementary paper I wish to draw attention to five other arguments of a similar kind, on which I had not time then to dwell, but which are also very frequently advanced by our adversaries. We shall then have in all a dozen fallacies, which, with apologies to the shade of Sydney Smith, I shall venture finally to collect and exhibit in what I will call "The Flesh-eater's oration."

VIII.—The fallacy derived from "*the necessity of taking life*." Many people seem to think it a sufficient refutation of Vegetarian principles to point out that it is absolutely necessary in some cases to take the lives of animals. They delight in showing that we are obliged to kill wild animals, to keep down vermin, and to destroy domestic animals when old and diseased; or that we incidentally take life even in such innocent acts as cooking a cabbage or drinking a glass of water. The fallacy consists partly in wrongly assuming that the object of Vegetarianism is "not to take *any* life;" whereas it is really "not to take life *unnecessarily*" (the last word, conveniently omitted by our opponents, containing in fact the whole essence of the Vegetarian creed), and partly in the strange idea that because it is *sometimes* necessary to take life, it must be *always* allowable. Vegetarians are not so foolish as to deny the necessity of sometimes destroying animals, both intentionally and by accident; but that is no reason for killing more animals than is really necessary, but rather the reverse. It is quite true that we must in self-defence keep down vermin; but it does not follow that it is advisable to eat their carcasses. It is quite true that we cannot

avoid accidentally taking life; but that can scarcely justify us in purposely breeding animals for the slaughter-house. To assert that because we accidentally tread on a beetle, we are justified in deliberately slaughtering an ox; or that because we chance to swallow a fly, we are right in bleeding a calf to death and enjoying our veal, is an argument which must equally justify homicide and murder of every description. A murderer might argue in like manner, that he found he was always treading on spiders, and therefore it was obviously necessary "to take life."

ix.—"*Vegetarianism is a mere crotchet.*" This is a statement which often does much injury to the cause of Food Reform, by representing it as a fanciful whim, amiable enough and praiseworthy in intention, but undeserving of the consideration of practical men. When there is so much real work to be done in this world, it is childish—so argues the earnest and philanthropic flesh-eater—to waste time on theories which are the mere dreams of humanitarian sentimentalists and fanatical crotchet-mongers. This is an argument which, in the mouth of an unscrupulous opponent, is always sure of a considerable amount of success; for there is no charge of which Englishmen stand in such mortal and unreasoning terror as the very vague accusation of "sentimentalism." Men who are naturally gentle and kind-hearted, will obstinately close their ears to anything which can expose them to the least suspicion of "sentiment," and will sanction any cruelty rather than run the risk of being ridiculed as "humanitarians." Again, there is a natural disinclination among honest and hard-working men to attend to any new doctrines or speculations which may distract their thoughts from the leading object of their lives, and this disinclination is strengthened tenfold when they are told that the theories in question are visionary and unpractical. Now this is exactly what is constantly being asserted by the opponents of all reforms, not least of Food Reform. Yet, how can Vegetarianism be truthfully described as a mere craze and oddity? It can hardly be denied that it is practicable; for it is seen to be practised by many who owe to it increased health and happiness. Its indubitable economy cannot wisely be disregarded, in a country where poverty is as prevalent as in ours. If we were not blinded by prejudice and custom, we should see that the most truly practical man is he who can live most simply, healthily, and contentedly; while the term "crotchet-monger" is to none more fitly applicable than to him who fondly

imagines that he cannot live a useful life without costly and unnecessary food. But, alas! this is one of the commonest of all fallacies, to make ourselves believe that those people are "unpractical" who advocate a course of life which we ourselves do not wish to practise.

x.—"*We ought to eat meat for the sake of others.*" Selfishness is the next crime with which the Vegetarian is charged. His relatives are anxious about him, for he is delicate by nature, and the doctor has been heard to mutter words of ominous import; the neighbours are beginning to talk; the servants too are puzzled and annoyed; the cook grumbles at having to prepare new dishes, and the butcher's tenderest feelings are shocked and violated. Would it not be far nobler and more unselfish on the part of the author of all this trouble, if he would set aside his own personal feelings, and eat meat for the sake of others? This, which may be termed "the family fallacy," is of much the same nature as the last; the only difference being that there it was the fear of sentimentalism, here it is the fear of selfishness that is used as a powerful lever to warp the reasoning powers of the unwary. The fallacy lies in representing Vegetarianism as a mere idle whim and personal predilection, such as it would indeed be selfish to practise, where it caused trouble or anxiety to others. But all true Food Reformers know that it is much more than this; a man who has once understood the full meaning and value of Food Reform cannot return to a flesh-diet, for any motive, however specious, without wronging and ruining the whole spirit of his life. In a case where one feels as strongly as this, it is no question of selfishness or unselfishness; it is a sheer absurdity for a man to give up what he feels to be true and right. No person in the world is justified in demanding such a sacrifice as this, and no Vegetarian is justified in granting it if demanded.

xi.—"*The Scriptural argument.*" I have often been met by the remark that any system which condemns flesh-eating must be wrong, because it was sanctioned by the usage of the Jews, and is mentioned without disapproval in the New Testament. Having no wish to enter on any religious controversy, I will very briefly state why I consider such reasoning fallacious. It is only in late ages that Vegetarianism has been seriously studied and adopted as a principle; only lately has its deeper import been widely and

systematically recognised. It follows, therefore, that it is unreasonable to look to the New Testament for teaching on this subject, which was quite unknown to the Jews of that day, and was reserved for the consideration of a future generation. Why need we fear to admit that morality, or rather the knowledge of morality, is progressive, and that what is allowable in one age is not necessarily so in another? For instance, the habit of slavery was sanctioned in the Old Testament, and not condemned in the New; yet it is not now denied that the abolition of slavery marked an advance in moral knowledge. So, too, it will be in the question of Food Reform.

XII.—Finally, when all other objections are exhausted, we have usually to defend ourselves against this last spiteful thrust, the arrow which our Parthian-like antagonist discharges as he turns in flight, worsted in the argumentative combat. “*If you use milk and eggs, you are not a ‘Vegetarian’ at all.*” I have included this among our so-called “fallacies” because, though of course it is verbally true that milk and eggs are “animal” products, yet the sense in which the objection is made is in most cases entirely misleading and fallacious. It has always surprised me that some Food Reformers have allowed themselves to be troubled by this captious objection to the name “Vegetarian,” and have tried, with singular lack of success, to provide themselves with some other title; for the popular name “Vegetarian” is probably the best one that could be found, and I confess I utterly fail to see why it is inapplicable to those who live mainly on a vegetable diet. The immediate object that “Vegetarians” aim at is not so much the disuse of “animal” substances in general, as the abolition of flesh-meat in particular. If they can drive their opponents to make the very important admission that actual flesh-food is unnecessary, they can surely afford to smile at the very trivial retort that “animal” substance is still used in eggs and milk. And, as a matter of fact, all Food Reformers know well that even milk and eggs are quite unnecessary to those who eat no flesh, though many “Vegetarians” use them as being at present cheap and plentiful, and as affording a *modus vivendi* to those who might otherwise be altogether excluded by dietetic differences from the society of their friends. Under a more natural system of diet we should soon dispense with them altogether, but in the mean time we hold ourselves free to use them

without renouncing the name “Vegetarian,” at the risk of shocking the verbal precision of our carnivorous friends.

And now, having finished our survey of these twelve fallacies, let us conclude with the pleasant task of remoulding them in a dramatic form, in which character I hope they may be useful both to Flesh-eaters and Vegetarians alike.

THE FLESH-EATER'S ORATION.

“In answer to the various specious arguments advanced by the last speaker in favour of what I must be allowed to call the pernicious theory of Vegetarianism, I beg to offer the following observations:—

“First—I confidently assert that, whatever may be the case elsewhere, it is impossible to live in our cold English climate without animal food. Secondly—I warn you one and all (and this is a point on which I can speak with absolute certainty) that though it may be possible for those who are brought up as Vegetarians to do without meat, it would be quite impossible for you or me to dispense with it. On the other hand it is equally indisputable that though you and I might perhaps live without animal food having had the advantage of good flesh-meat in our youth, it would be madness to attempt to rear children on a Vegetarian diet. Consider, again, what trouble such a diet must entail; what everlasting thinking about one's food! What endless perplexity and anxiety to earnest hard-working men like ourselves, who have little leisure to think of our food.” (*Hear, Hear*). “And now I come to a most important point. What should we do without leather? Think what it would be to find ourselves suddenly, in a moment, bereft of boots, harness, and all the innumerable appliances of civilization? I say to you, very seriously, that a nation in such a condition would be a nation of savages. (*Great applause.*) And I say this from no selfish motive; far from it; for I am myself a sincere lover of animals, and I am thinking of their interests quite as much as our own. This being so, I ask you to consider what would become of the animals themselves if the habit of flesh-eating were discontinued? Would they not lie dying about our streets and fields, perishing of hunger and disease, and looking wistfully for the merciful knife of the butcher? Let us not forget, too, that if we breed fewer animals, we shall diminish the sum of animal happiness; and it is probably better for the animals them-

selves to enjoy a short life and be cut off by a speedy death than not to live at all. All this animal happiness, the placid content of pasturing cattle, the lightsome gambols of lambs, would vanish from the world under a dull and joyless Vegetarian regime. And even if we had no kindly thought for the poor beasts themselves, how should we dare to violate that stern and holy law of nature, that great law of self-sacrifice, which prompts the stronger animal ever to prey on the weaker? (*Loud applause*). Consider too that however disinclined we may feel to take life, and I confess it is repugnant to all my feelings, it is at times absolutely necessary that we should do so. Do we not accidentally tread on the beetle that crosses our path? Must we not kill the hares and rabbits that eat our crops? What will the Vegetarian say to that? (*Cheers and laughter*). Alas! it is only too evident that this Vegetarianism is a mere crotchet, the whimsical hallucination of certain well-meaning but very impractical humanitarians, who forget that *we*; at any rate, have real work to occupy us. How selfish they are, too, in causing such anxiety to their relatives, such annoyance to their physician, such trouble to their cook, such mortification to their butcher! I candidly own that my own private predilections are all in favour of a Vegetarian diet, but I long ago sacrificed them to the wishes of my friends. (*Loud cheers*). But why need I speak further? For there is one insuperable objection to Vegetarian doctrine, which we as Christian men are bound to respect. They are contrary to the teaching of Scripture. We must not listen to them for a moment. (*Great sensation*). And, lastly, before I sit down, let me point out that these so-called Vegetarians are of all people the most inconsistent, and have no right even to the name they profess; for they use eggs and milk as articles of food, and eggs and milk are both animal substances, and having eaten these animal substances they have the impudence to come here and call themselves Vegetarians." (*Loud laughter and applause*).

H. S. SALT.

TWO CHRISTMAS DINNERS.

THE snow was falling in thick flakes, and, save where the feet of the passers-by had trodden it down, it lay on the ground two or three inches in depth. The glare of the gas-lights shone out from the gaudily-decked shops, and although the past year had

not been a prosperous one for trade, the people seemed to have as much to spend as ever. For it was Christmas-eve, and the crowds of people were busy purchasing their dinners for the following day. What a crowd of eager faces there was! And no wonder, for many and many a one was spending that night what they had been struggling for the last four or five months to save out of their hard-earned wages. How the money rattled about to be sure! And at every few shops there was a larger crowd than at the others, and a more flourishing trade was being done, and larger sums were flying into the tills. The grocers managed very comfortably to serve their customers, even the fruiterers had time to stop and take breath; *but the butchers!* Well, the entrance to the "pit" at "old Drury," on Boxing-night, could not compare with the rush there was to get served. And what a number of butchers there were too! "Pork butchers," "family butchers," fishmongers, poulterers, "ham and beef" shops; all choke-full, and all doing a "roaring trade." Amongst the crowd round one of these shops, there might have been seen a working man with his wife, examining some large geese which were laid out in a row on the board. They were not long in deciding what to purchase, for before three minutes had passed John Chester found himself in possession of an immensely fat goose (which anyone who had a knowledge of the anserine constitution would have declared to have died of heart disease), and was conscious that his purse contained just thirteen shillings and sixpence less than it had five minutes ago. After purchasing a bottle of wine and a piece of pickled pork, which reduced his fund to a further extent, together with a few penny-worth of vegetables, he and his wife made the best of their way home. The children, who, as it was Christmas-time, had been allowed to stay up later, were now put to bed, and, after having carefully stowed away the goose in a safe till the morning, John Chester and his wife themselves retired to rest.

At last the morning came, a clear frosty Christmas morn, but it seemed a long morning to the children. Certainly the interesting operation of basting the goose seemed to make it pass a little quicker. Pass, at last it did, however, and then the cloth was laid and the knives and forks, and the bottle of wine was uncorked, and the pickled pork taken out of the oven. Then came the *chef d'oeuvre* in the form of the goose! The largest dish that could be found was pressed into service, and a large dish-cover, that had not been