

# LECTURE ON VEGETARIANISM;

DELIVERED AT

THE FRIENDS' INSTITUTE, MANCHESTER,

20th OCTOBER, 1872

BY

PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN.

*P. 358*

*And Reprinted from the "Dietetic Reformer" of March, 1872.*

---

LONDON: F. PITMAN, PATERNOSTER ROW.  
MANCHESTER: JOHN HEYWOOD, DEANSGATE.

1872.

Price One Penny; or Five Shillings per Hundred.

# LECTURE ON VEGETARIANISM ;

DELIVERED AT THE FRIENDS' INSTITUTE, MANCHESTER,

20th OCTOBER, 1871.

By PROFESSOR F. W. NEWMAN.

---

WHEN the name and practice of Vegetarianism is brought casually before an English man or woman, it is very generally regarded as fanciful and ridiculous. I will not deny that while I knew it myself only from a distance, I thought it a strange, perhaps even a silly fancy ; hence I cannot be surprised that others, equally uninformed as I then was, so regard it. I have often heard the rather scornful question, made in a peculiarly decisive tone : "What *is* the use of it ?"—of course the questioner implies the true and obvious answer to be, "Absolutely none whatever." Now, by way of reply, I will take the liberty of asking some questions in return. Did you ever hear of such a thing as Cattle Murrain ? Did you ever hear of Diseased Meat in the Market ? or of Contagious Disease spreading among fowl eaters ? or are you at all aware of butcher's meat becoming very dear ? inconveniently dear for most, ruinously dear to hand-workers. Well, if these matters are familiarly known to you, I have one more question—Did you ever reflect on the *causes* of these things ? for you can hardly believe that they come without a cause. It is possible that many present have never inquired into the causes, and my first attempt will be to aid in the research, by recalling many obvious and notorious facts.

The easiest question to answer is—What is the cause of the high price of butcher's meat ? The reply is—An enormous increase of demand. The whole series of events is in the easy memory of those who are no longer young, yet may need to be shortly recapitulated to the new generation. I will first remark, that any great murrain in cattle (however caused), would naturally be followed by an increased price of meat. I do not overlook this, when I refer to the increase of demand as the main and steady cause of the rise in price. In fact it was distinctly predicted by far-seeing economists in 1846 and the previous years, during the contest for the abolition of the old Corn-Laws. The late General Ferronet Thompson illustrated popularly his economic prediction, by saying : "When, through the cheapening of bread, a man finds he has an unexpected sixpence in his pocket, he is very apt to want a mutton-chop." On this ground he foretold that the abolition of the Corn Laws would make the artizans eat, not more bread, but more butchers' meat, and that the price of such meat would rise. Accordingly, he and Colonel Torrens prophesied that the farmers would become enriched by the sale of agricultural *luxuries*, in pro-

portion as the one agricultural *necessary* (bread) became cheaper: for most persons expected that bread would permanently be reduced in price. In fact, it has only been saved from great fluctuations, and its indefinite rise hindered. Higher wages and steadier work, rather than cheaper bread, have made our artizans able to demand flesh meat; and this increased demand was a marked fact already in 1848. Importation of foreign cattle for immediate consumption has been on the increase thenceforward. With the development of the railway system the prices have become more equalized, not by a fall in the towns, but by a rise in the more secluded rural districts. At length it became worth while to turn Irish arable land into grazing, for the production of more cattle. This must be the tendency everywhere, at a certain point of price, if butcher's meat go up, or bread go down; for land is husbanded, not for the cultivator's mouth, but for his purse (or what here amounts to the same, for the landlord's purse); hence unless our present career be checked, we have a very dreary prospect before us.

In approaching a second question, What are the causes of Cattle Murrain? I may seem to you ambitious and imprudent in attempting an answer. Of course there are many possible causes of epidemic disease, few of them visible to us; but if *some* circumstances, which we familiarly know to exist, must tend to cause such disease, and *others* to spread it, mere prudence commands us to avoid such a combination of facts, if we look on the disease as alarming. And first, all conveyance of cattle on a great scale to distant markets entails disease. We have left far behind us the habits of the Irish pig-driver, who so prized every pig of his herd, that he proportioned their marches to the strength of the weakest, watched over their wants tenderly; while he knew every yard of his ground, and devoted every thought to bring his property to market in prime condition. "The masters' eye makes the horse fat," is, I believe, an old saying. The pig-driver was the pig-master, and called every single pig his "honey." The case is different, if men have to drive cattle, not their own, and are bound to arrive at a certain moment. The poor brutes, transferred from their pleasant pastures, know not whither they are going, and have no relish for a chalky or stony or muddy highway, for the streets of a town, for entrance or exit of a steamboat. Many a wild scamper down a wrong street is taken, to the anger of the driver. Much beating, much terrifying, much fatigue is caused to some. Time is lost, and all must be hurried. In the streets of London, and still worse, in old Smithfield market, we used to see how cattle were beaten about the head by impatient drivers, perhaps ignorant lads; but the thing is inevitable, when a whole army of them is to be marshalled in a short time. One may see on Scotch steamers how very roughly sheep must be treated to hand them up and down steep inclines. If animals travel on their feet, they have, besides the fatigue of walking, many such untoward events as I have denoted. On board of steamers, or in railway cars, they are crammed together, often most painfully, some of them in fatiguing postures. Many of them on the railway are tied by the horns, and often struggle against their bonds. In the great murrain year, I was told by a grazier who was accompanying cattle

on a rail, that the cars vacated by one set were occupied by another without cleansing, and he, for one, did not know how the cattle escaped disease so well. It is all but universal with English reasoners (whether peculiar to us as a nation, I do not know), to disbelieve the possibility that contagious disease is engendered by ourselves. The guilt of it is always laid on the *foreigner*. Unlucky foreigners, how do they get it? Is it a heaven-sent curse, uncaused by themselves? If it spring from their neglects and bad habits, and we indulge the same neglects and the same bad habits, will not they entail on us the same murrains, of every class? I have seen the railway cattle-cars, and shuddered at them, while our legislators could see no danger but from *imported* cattle. No doubt the imported cattle must often be in cruel plight. The jolting which they endure in a luggage train is bad enough. But think what is meant by a storm at sea, with cattle on board. It is hard to know whether they are worse on deck or in the hold, tossed about, banged against one another. Sometimes the partitions giving way, an awful chaos results; but in every case the terror of the poor animals in so new and unintelligible a position is liable to be extreme. To give them food or water, or keep the place clean, is impossible; and in the slighter cases of bad weather, if to tie them down be bad, to leave them untied is worse. When an artizan, on finding an unexpected shilling in his pocket, resolves on getting an additional mutton-chop or beefsteak—permit me to exercise an Oriental fancy, and suppose him to be addressed by the Genius of the cattle, who might speak as follows:—"You desire butchers' meat, not understanding how alone it is to be got. Your England is no longer the England of Henry the Eighth, containing five million persons. You have four times that number, and the native cattle no longer suffice for you. But you have every species of corn in vast abundance; you have native crops of potatoes and pulse, also of fruit and of vegetables far beyond anything here known in past ages; and from richer climes you have ample supplies of rice, of sago, of maize and its products, of arrowroot, and numerous kinds of dry fruit, on any or all of which you can feed and banquet more cheaply than on butchers' meat, and be as robust as your father and grandfather were; yet, it seems, nothing will please you but beef and mutton. Understand then at what price you are to gratify this arbitrary taste of your palate. First, you use up your slender means, so that you are not a bit the better for higher wages. Money, which might have given you healthier apartments, and saved yourself or family from illness; or if you are already well lodged, might have conduced to save your wife from drudgery, or give refinement and cultivation to your children, this money you spend day by day on the selfish gratification of appetite. Next, your flesh meat will be imported at the expense of great suffering to remote herds of cattle, of whom I am the Genius. I warn you, that many of these innocent sufferers will fall into a fevered state, will become victims of disease, will spread disease to others, will some of them be eaten, perhaps by you, will at anyrate revenge themselves on the poorer flesheaters, if even the richer, who can pay indefinitely high prices, escape." I am trying to shew you how Vegetarianism is related to the Cattle Murrain. In short it stands thus:—In lessening their

Vegetarianism, the mass of the English workmen have powerfully tended to create disease in cattle, by hoisting up the prices of meat, and thereby causing a demand of the English market on remote pastures. Yet this is only one side of the question. Strong health resists disease, escapes often even in spite of bad habits, much more resists infection from without. But weak constitutions fall easily. In a weakly herd any epidemic is likely to spread with tenfold rapidity; who will doubt it? Now I further assert, that our great increase of demand for meat has tended to make our cattle of weaker constitution. This is not my discovery; do not suppose that I am very knowing in these matters; but when I read it in the letter of a cattle-breeder, I at once saw that what he states as fact is inevitable. Namely, the high price of meat, contingent on the increased demand, sets the graziers to breed the cattle as fast as they can; and in consequence great numbers are born *from immature parents*. The animals thus born are not necessarily unhealthy; but they are delicate, not robust; and if exposed, as cattle must be exposed, they are far more liable to catch any or every disease that may be abroad, than those unforced. Indeed, the whole system of stall-feeding, and confinement, and cramming, being essentially artificial, tends further to weaken the whole cow species, weakened probably already by our excessive demand for milk. Thus, you will now understand, when asked, what is the use of Vegetarianism? One reply is, it is useful to arrest a scourge which has punished us increasingly since 1848, and is likely to punish us more, Contagious Disease in cattle and in men. But I have not sufficiently insisted on the continuity of the evil. In certain years we have special alarm about cattle murrain or small-pox. It must not be supposed that in other years we are free. I will not here insist on the frightful statements made by curious inquirers concerning the parasitical worms infesting pork, and in spite of cookery (it is said) propagating themselves in pork-eaters. To speak frankly, I think there must be exaggeration here, else we should be in a far more wretched plight than we are. Nevertheless, that much unhealthy pork is eaten by the poor, I fear, cannot be doubted; and it was from the extreme danger of this, that ancient Oriental legislators were severe against pork-flesh. It is not the wild swine which are feared. The modern Arabs have no horror of the flesh of the wild boar. It is the artificially nurtured pig, which is feared; the pig fed upon offal, or picking up around the habitations of men whatever he can get. So the swine which feed in the forests of thinly peopled countries, may be as sound as the wholly wild animal. We are no longer in that position. But in all our great cities, it is necessary to take public precautions for excluding diseased meat from the markets, not in special dangerous years, but every year, every week. The competition of trade forces every tradesman to count on a moderate percentage; he might as well not enter the trade at all, as not get his requisite profit. Competition beats down the estimate, so that he has no great margin for loss; hence it must be with the utmost reluctance that he consents to regard an animal as unsound and unsalable. What are the agreements between the real proprietors and the agents or drovers, does not signify; for it is clear that the subordinates must try to reduce the proprietors' loss and their own

responsibility to the lowest point. As a fact, the pressure of bad meat into the market has to be resisted by the most stringent efforts, and punished severely. Thousands of tons are condemned, and all know that vast quantities which cannot be condemned are suspicious. Much meat is sold at a greatly reduced price, certainly because the salesmen are peculiarly eager to get rid of it. Who after this can wonder that small-pox has increased upon us in the last 20 years? Who can doubt that the mass of our town population habitually eats a portion of its flesh-supply in an unwholesome state? No increased stringency of supervision can much abate the evil, while a people is striving to eat more sound meat than has come to market; for it is striving virtually for the impossible. The only cure is to be found in lessening the demand; in persuading the masses of workmen that their competition for flesh meat is a folly, impoverishing and perhaps infecting them.

It may be replied, that the working classes are wilful and besotted, and will of course grasp at every luxury in their power. Sec, it will be said, how recklessly they spend their money on beer or gin, or if not on drink, then on tobacco-smoking, or perhaps on both. There are many exceptions. Nevertheless, I concede, they are a minority. I admit and press, that so long as all who are rich enough to get an article insist on getting it, the poorer will covet it, will count it a luxury, and will often ruin their finance by eagerness for it. But what then? Why, then, this is precisely the reason why the richer should set them a different example. "I will eat no meat while the world standeth," said the great Paul, "if it make my brother to offend." If there is not enough sound flesh meat for all, and it be not necessary for our welfare, why should we, who are richer, rush in to clutch at it?

But I turn to another side of the subject, hardly less important. Just alarm is widely spread concerning a fact too broad to be denied, the growth of our towns, and the disproportionate emptiness of our country. This is everywhere the symptom of progressive national decay. The Roman poet Horace saw it already before his eyes in Italy. Small freeholds had become rare. On the great estates were beautiful villas, splendid parks cultivated for elegance, not for service. The fruit tree was "evicted" (to use his phrase) by the barren tree. The towns were full, and the country empty. Grazing superseded agriculture; cattle took the place of robust freemen, and were tended by a sparse population of slaves. A Gaulish chieftain, soon after, in urging his countrymen to revolt against Rome, used the argument, "Italy is poor in men;" and Pliny echoed it in the utterance, "Broad estates have ruined Italy." In modern Turkey we have the same deplorable phenomenon, from widely different causes, well filled towns and empty country. The historian Sismondi attests that it characterized every land, which was in its turn ruined by the Roman empire. No impartial and well-informed person can look on Great Britain without discerning the same alarming phenomenon in contrasting our rural districts to our towns. The country places do not support their own births; the rustic population flock to the towns. Now I am not about to say, that this is directly caused by flesh-eating; it undoubtedly depends

on circumstances of landed tenure, which cannot here be treated. Nevertheless, the evils are aggravated by the demand of the wealthy towns for cattle and their products; this fact alone makes it worth a landlord's while to keep arable in pasture. If the towns renounced flesh-eating, we should see in a single generation, even without improved land tenure, a tide of migration set the other way, from towns into the country. Rustic industry would be immensely developed. All motive for expatriation of our robustest youth, would, for a long time yet, be removed, and the country might be enormously enriched, not in an upper stratum of great fortunes, but (if national morality kept pace with wealth), down to the bottom of the community. Our strength is proportioned to the number of our industrious and loyal citizens. The country would then bear a great increase of population without effort; for it is certain that ordinary arable land will produce easily four times as much human food, as the same land devoted to grazing. Of course there is land where the soil barely covers the rock,—where a plough cannot be driven, or where mere steepness forbids—on which nevertheless grass can grow. No one wishes to get rid of all grazing land. But where the soil has moderate depth, cultivation improves it; if there be but enough labourers. The area for which twenty men suffice to tend oxen grazing on it, might need the labour of a thousand (including rustic artizans) if it were duly laid out for crops. I do not forget or dissemble that a large part of cattle food, especially the winter supply, is provided by cultivation, as beans and oats for horses, turnips and other roots for sheep and oxen. Still, the movement towards Vegetarianism would be a movement for native cultivation and rustic industry.

I count confidently on your sympathy, when I say, that it is a depraving tendency,—sadly common with English lads,—to desire to kill a beautiful animal the moment they see it. That the first thought on discovering a new creature should be "Is it nice to eat?" is to me shocking and debasing. What is called the love of sport has become a love of killing for the display of skill; and converts man into the tyrant of all other animals; yet it rose out of a desire of eating their flesh,—a desire which cannot be blamed in that state of barbarism in which little other food was to be had. But when with the growth of civilization other food is casier to get,—when bread has won upon flesh meat—it is evil to struggle for the more barbarous state. Does not the love of flesh inflame the love of killing? teach disregard for animal suffering, and prepare men for ferocity against men? I think so. It is possible to carry too far the reluctance of the Turk and the Brahmin to take brute life; yet how can any humane person deny that they can read the English nation some valuable lessons? I find it good to rejoice in the grandeur of a stag, and the beauty of a pheasant. Any good girl would be more delighted that the stag should come to eat out of her hand, than that she should be promised a piece of venison to eat. Surely the reciprocation of kind feeling between man and the wild animal is a very pure delight; and it is so universal to children, that I certainly cannot claim any merit in feeling it. Mr Charles Darwin tells that when ships of his expedition (I mean some

35 years ago or more) touched at the Galipago Islands, he found nearly all the birds and beasts tame, from their unacquaintance with human violence. A hawk would not stir till pushed off the branch of a tree. The birds settled on the edges of buckets to drink the water which the sailors were carrying. A boy sat by the side of a spring with a stick in his hand, and with it killed the little birds which came to drink without fear of him, until he had enough of them for his dinner. How cruel and shocking that sounds? Who of us would not regard such an island a little Paradise? Who would not willingly give up the eating of birds, if he could thereby purchase the universal confidence of the feathered race, and live in the midst of them as their friend? Barbarous man, struggling for existence, must be harsh, cruel, treacherous to beasts; but is it not high time to throw off the sentiments of barbarous ages? or, rather, to forbid those traditional habits from depraving the tenderer wisdom which our children so often display. What uncorrupted child on seeing a beautiful bird, or a lamb, or a calf, would wish it killed to enjoy dining on it? Undoubtedly the beauty of the creature, with the delight of seeing it alive, is the main reason for pity, in the thought of its death; yet we may be certain, that the principle here involved cannot be halved, for the benefit of the beautiful, and to the neglect of the uglier. None of us will grieve, if fewer swine are alive to day than yesterday; yet as long as men feed even on swine, they will feed on every creature which yields healthy food. The beautiful animals, whose trust in us might be a daily delight, will justly dread and shun us. Our hearts are so hardened against them, that we endure their being mangled by steel traps and lingering in excruciating agony. English sport is likely to continue, and Christendom to be still called by Orientals "The Hell of Animals," unless wholly new principles are adopted. You are, no doubt, aware into what a monstrosity the love of sport has developed itself, in what are called shooting grounds, especially in Scotland. All human inhabitants are removed from a wide area of land, on which none but gamekeepers are ordinarily allowed to tread; it is reserved for game—for deer principally, and grouse. Why is this? In order to let it out for rent in the shooting season to some rich man of the south—say, a Manchester or Birmingham manufacturer—who, for the pleasure of shooting two or three months in the year, will pay a higher rent than the landlord calculates he can get from human inhabitants. I do not stop to argue the question of law and right, between man and man, between landlords and the nation, here involved; but I insist, that if we were a Vegetarian nation, the whole thing would be impossible. It is true that cockney sportsmen shoot at sparrows and seagulls, and anything else that they dare, to try their skill; but this could not be attempted on any great scale, without causing a violent revulsion of feeling. Indeed, already we have laws for the partial protection of sea-birds, which are not human food. Nothing but the fact that deer and grouse are eaten, makes shooting-grounds, as a system, at all endurable to the conscience of the nation.

There is another topic which I would bring to your notice. The young son of a friend of mine, in a recent summer, took a walking tour in North Germany, in the beautiful country (I think) called Thuringia. On his return

he was asked, what had most struck him as unlike England. He replied, the great abundance of fruit trees, and of fruit growing on the roadside and along the open paths, no one seeming to fear that it would be stolen. Of course I am not able to account this a triumph of Vegetarianism as a principle, yet it has something to do with Vegetarianism as a practice. The small German freeholders, like the English and Irish peasants, though in no respect averse to flesh-eating, in fact live chiefly on farinaceous food, pulse, and jams. I believe that the abundance of fruit, and the abstinence from theft, depends largely on the system of small freeholds. It is worth men's while to plant fruit trees, when the planter or his children enjoy the fruit. When property in fruit is widely diffused, the mass of the nation respects it; and children early learn from their parents a reverence for the neighbour's fruit; at the same time its abundance and cheapness hinders any excess of coveting. I do not believe that we can attain that state of things without vast changes, both in Land Tenure and in public opinion concerning Rights in Land. But I believe that Vegetarian sentiment will add healthy impetus to wise and just views on the whole subject. How few of us now grieve that only barren trees are planted on soil and in situations where fruit trees would grow as easily! A wealthy squire wants shelter for his house; what does he plant? Anything rather than fruit trees. Scrubby oak, larch, fir. He does not think of apples, pears, cherries; he plants beech, or ash, or elm, rather than walnuts or mulberries; horse-chesnuts rather than sweet chesnuts. And why? because if he dared to plant fruit, his hedges and walls would be broken to steal it, and he would have no end of trouble. Thus through the immorality of the poor the market is starved, and the poor themselves are the chief sufferers. Their habit of pilfering has risen out of a sense that a landlord's legal rights are excessive and unjust. To get out of this evil tangle is very difficult. But every Vegetarian desires a little garden of his own, and fruit bushes or fruit trees of his own; and every proprietor, however small, imbibes respect for his own form of property. Every Vegetarian believes that orchards ought to abound over the land; that whole fields should be devoted to apples and pears, and that the price of such fruit might be indefinitely reduced. We certainly do not yet know the capacity of our climate. There is little chance, while large market gardeners have every thing in their hands, that they will cultivate even vegetables which are not already universally known, however prized by individuals. Vegetables introduced by German residents of Manchester, which flourish excellently in our climate, the great caterers for the market will not grow, fearing the risk of the public not liking them. Even the German pea, with a tender eatable pod, no one can buy in the English market. There is certainly a great work for some one to do, in teaching the English nation what is good, in new fruits and new vegetables; I do not mean good in flavour merely, but every way beneficial as diet. Yet apparently, while this craving after flesh continues, there is little chance that the wealth of the soil will be developed, or the millions earn that independence and dignity of labour which is possible.

Thus far I have pressed on you the dangers of disease from butchers' meat, the waste of humble men's resources in the effort to get it, the evil

of converting arable land into grazing, the debasing tendency of loving to kill game, and the neglect of fruits and vegetables, for which our climate and soil are suited. But it may occur to you that I have said nothing of fish. It is true that the economic objections to butcher's meat do not apply against fish from the sea; nor is the moral objection to killing them equal to that against killing birds. Fish do not displace crops on the soil, and are a real addition to the food of a nation. But except on the sea coast, fish on the average is dearer than mutton; I believe I may say, by far dearer; and has less nourishment, pound for pound. Flabby fish which is very unnutritious, and will not bear transport, is not coveted, and may remain cheap. But the really solid kinds are not cheap any where, I believe,\* and are in general enormously dear, as turbot and salmon. Salmon, I know, recently in Clifton, where I live, was selling at 3s. 6d. a pound, and 2s. 6d. is a common price. I do not know that a pound of salmon gives more nourishment than a pound of mutton, even to those who are able to digest it; hence until the price of fish is enormously reduced, it is difficult to say much in their favour from the economic side, except so far as they are used as condiment, like anchovy, herring, sardines, or even sprats. Vegetarians, being desirous of attesting that their strength is not supported on fish, any more than on beasts and fowls, think it right to abstain even from these condiments; but it is not likely that they will devote any large portion of their zeal to dissuade people from them. Rather, they will take for granted, that those who on the whole see reasons for abstinence from flesh, will think it wiser, in the present state of opinion, when the example of every abstainer tells for something, to aim at that completeness in a broad principle, which all alike are sure to understand.

Perhaps some of you are disappointed, that I have not entered into any proofs, that farinaceous food suffices for strength and health. Indeed, doctrine so opposite is sedulously preached by men who ought to know, that I think it rather better to refer you to those who can speak with authority on this question; else I must perhaps have devoted the entire lecture to it. But as our society has printed a four page tract of testimonies from celebrated physiologists,—few of them Vegetarians,—who assert that farinaceous food and pulse, suffice abundantly for strength; and tend eminently to health and long life,—I have requested a supply of these to be provided at hand, so that all of you may be able to read the testimonies at leisure.

I therefore content myself with saying, that the inhabitants of county Kerry and county Cork are by impartial testimony singularly beautiful and strong, though nourished on potatoes with, at most, buttermilk; that the Scotch, living on oatmeal, are on the whole stronger and healthier than the English; that the porters and boatmen of Turkey equal the strongest *navvies* of the English railways; and that I am persuaded, a general survey of the broad facts of the human race show it to be a delusion, that flesh meat ever gives to men who labour with body or mind any advantage whatever.

\* Perhaps I ought to except *Skate*. I have always wondered that so solid and nourishing a fish, so palatable when thoroughly dressed, is so cheap in the London market. The rich seem to despise it for its cheapness.

In conclusion, I beg to state the pleasure with which I have delivered this lecture within a Friends' Institute. The Friends from their origin have emphatically taken as their motto,—Be not conformed to this world. Accordingly they have espoused the most unpopular causes for the sake of truth and justice, defying dominant opinion, prevalent practices, fashions, and power. They have been foremost against that greatest of iniquities which is now dying out, Chattel Slavery. They have championed the rights of Woman, and nearly every form of mercy. I will not call them our forlorn hope, but in apparently the most hopeless assaults on evil, they have been leaders. No foreign victims of evil so call on them now as the most wretched of our own population, who cannot indeed be raised by any one form of action, but only by many combined. Yet I boldly assert, that it is simply impossible to lift them out of their misery and rottenness, unless they are trained to avoid ensnaring drink and expensive eating. Though I cannot claim a first-rank for Vegetarianism in elevating the people, yet it is only secondary to abstinence from alcoholic liquors. It directly promotes that gentleness of heart which abhors bloodshed, and indirectly that hatred of war for which the Friends have always been eminent.

## THE VEGETARIAN SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED A.D. 1847.

*President.*—James Haughton, Esq., J.P., Dublin.

*Vice-Presidents.*

William Hoyle, Esq. Tottington, Bury.	Isaac Pitman, Esq., Bath.
Prof. F. W. Newman, Clifton, Bristol.	Graf Von Viettinghoff, M.D., London
George Dornbusch, Esq. F.S.S. London.	W. Gibson Ward, Esq., Ross.

*Treasurer.*—John Davie, Esq., Dunfermline.

*Honorary Secretaries.*—Rev. James Clark, 6, Park Place, Cross Lane, Salford.  
Mr T. H. Barker, 41, John Dalton Street, Manchester.

*Secretary.*—Mr R. Bailey Walker, F.S.S., 24, Cathedral Yard, Manchester.

**T**HE OBJECTS of the Society are, to induce habits of abstinence from the Flesh of Animals as Food, by the dissemination of information upon the subject, by means of tracts, essays, and lectures, proving the many advantages of a physical, intellectual, and moral character, resulting from *Vegetarian habits of Diet*; and thus, to secure, through the association, example, and efforts of its members, the adoption of a principle which will tend essentially to true civilisation, to universal brotherhood, and to the increase of human happiness generally.

The Subscription is Two Shillings and Sixpence per year, which entitles a member to a copy of the *Dietetic Reformer*, monthly, post free.

All enquiries, and applications for information, should be addressed to the SECRETARY of the VEGETARIAN SOCIETY, 24, Cathedral Yard, Manchester, who will furnish a list of the Publications of the Society.

\* \* THE DIETETIC REFORMER, Price Twopence Monthly. (London: F. PITMAN.) A Single Copy will be sent, post free, to any address, for one year, for half-a-crown, Two Copies for Four Shillings; Four Copies for Seven-and-Sixpence; or Six for Half-a-guinea.