

# THE HEALTHIAN.

A Journal of Human Physiology, Diet, and Regimen.

"The Health Law Condition is three-fold—first, a clean conscience; secondly, a clean intellect; thirdly, a clean stomach."

## FLESH DIET.

[The Editor's answer to Barbara's Letter, pp. 31 and 32.]

To find arguments in favour of an old-established practice, however irrational or unloving it may be, is so easy a matter, thousands having already preceded our generation in this task, that we by no means marvel at finding our corresponding Barbara ready with abundant assertions which seemingly oppose the universal command, "Thou shalt not kill." With the thoughtless, such suggestions carry much weight; but it is only fair to state, that just as none of those objections specified in page 32 are now advanced for the first time, so also none of them have escaped refutation. For these points, however, we refer our readers to the works of Trayon, Cheyne, Oswald, Newton, Shelley, and to sundry articles in the Graham Journal. It is probable, moreover, that we also shall touch these objections at a future time, but having graver matter in mind at the present moment, we beg to premise that our fair correspondent has by no means disposed of these preliminary objections "*more nostrô*," and that we defer *our* disposal of them, that we may the more conveniently discuss the important question which Barbara proposes: "Is the practice of eating meat noxious or good for man?" We coincide in believing that here the subject of diet must first be discussed—minor objections may be met afterwards.

We acknowledge that great difficulty is found in meeting this question decisively in our limited space; for it is evident we must discuss the idea universal of health, and then its application to man. The law of co-efficient conditions must also be thoroughly understood; and finally we must unite these laws together, and judge accordingly. The difficulty is great, but briefly we state the argument thus:—

1st. HEALTH is the condition of ease that always follows when the life-power works uninterruptedly in the organism.

Pain or disease is a certain consequence when some obstruction is encountered in the organism by the life-power. The working of life is analogous to electricity, which shatters to pieces a non-conducting substance, but passes healthfully and genially through all elements that offer to its progress no opposition. It is warmth and health to them. So does life make its own warmth and bliss in the organism that kindly receives its ministrations.

2nd. Health is a realisation of the idea which the Creator, by natural laws, attempts to personate in every form. Every object in creation is a more or less perfect personification of a divine idea—a man of the man idea, a vegetable of the vegetable idea, a stone of the stone idea. The man

perfect, or, in other words, a perfect personation of the universal man idea, is nowhere to be found; yet the idea struggles in our hearts for utterance, and in our consciences for realization. It battles with us—we admit it perceptively, yet not vitally. It is not to us an electricity, that carries its warmth into our arteries, our nerves, our moral substance, but rather by the law previously pointed out, that which should be to us the source of health, becomes the tormentor and inflicter of disease. Thus are we all out of health; and that life-order which would work for us all our bliss, in consequence of the many obstructions to it, produces anxiety, remorse, disease.

3rd. A man is a personation of the man idea, viz., goodness, truth, and utility. The idea is triple, as every one knows who has analyzed his own nature, and is triply personified; as we commonly say, that man is moral, intellectual, and physical—the first personifying goodness, the second truth, and the third utility.

4th. Bearing in mind the distinction between life and the organism of life, we propose that conditions are good which are in harmony with the life-power in its creative, sustentative, and vivifying processes. And now let us ask whether flesh is such a condition. How coincide together the following terms?—

1. Flesh, morality, and goodness.
2. Flesh, intellectuality, and truth.
3. Flesh, physics, and utility.

On the third particular, the controversy has been made to hinge almost exclusively, unless we except some few, such as OSWALD, SWEDENBORG, and others, who have argued for a fruit and vegetable diet on the ground of sentimental morality. And here it seems to us, that, physiologically and practically, an answer must be returned most decisively negating a flesh diet. Physiological authority is abundant, which it would be tedious to repeat; but HERDER, whose name, we believe, has never yet been brought into this controversy, says distinctly that man is not originally organized for flesh eating.

Again, authority is decidedly in favour of vegetables and fruit being more nutritious than flesh, were there not abundant living experimental proof of the fact. Gross darkness, indeed, rests upon the subject of nutrition—what it is, is not clear; and ridiculously absurd are the chemical experiments made respecting it; yet in spite of vagueness of theory and its specious delusions, we have incontestible practical corroborations of the general truism, that vegetable diet is by far the more sustentative. So decidedly are the health facts on the side of the frugiverous portion of the people in this country and clime, that did we not acknowledge a possibility of such superiority, arising from other causes in addition, we would not trouble ourselves to theorize, and say that it must so be, but we would say at once it is. To tell a man, who is in the stocks for a given fault, that he cannot be so confined for such an offence, is ridiculous enough; but not more so than to tell a healthy vegetarian that his diet is very uncongenial with the wants of his nature, and contrary to reason.

An important fact connected with this subject is, that flesh enters upon the putrid stage of fermentation very soon after its reception into the stomach, but vegetables undergo a trifle fermentation, viz. the vinous, the acetous, and the putrid. This fact may account for the slowness of the digestion of vegetables, and, at the same time, furnishes the opponents of a

fruit diet with an argument which they are not slow to use against such a mode of dieting; for they urge, that vegetables are altogether unsuitable to persons of a weakened digestion. They adopt, moreover, Barbara's hint, that a lighter digestion allows the vital force to be expended on other functions. To this we reply, first, that there is no proof that a quick digestion is desirable; on the contrary, analogy is in favour of slow operations. What nature does gradually she does well, and for a permanency. The oak, offspring of a hundred summers, is formed in nature's tardy processes, but it is hardy and majestic; while the mushroom, that springs up in a night, perishes with the evening sun. Secondly, it is an advantage to the constitution to call forth the sturdy vigour of the life-power. It has been treated too delicately. Based as it is on an antecedency that is infinite, its springs and energy are not soon exhausted. But in cases where the digestion is already dangerously diseased, the remedy is to be found, not in ministering to its vitiated feebleness, but in strong exercise, pure air, water drinking, hunger, and small quantities of food. And, thirdly, the time occupied in the triple fermentation of vegetables, gives the opportunity for the life-power to eliminate three orders of substances, and that in the most perfect manner. For if there is any ailment to be extracted from wine and vinegar as well as putrescency, then assuredly the vegetables present over flesh a twofold advantage. And it may be suggested as probable, from analogy, that the vinous process is contributive of sweetness to the moral organism, the acetous of pungency, aptitude, and wit to the intellectual, and the putrescent of activity to the corporeal. At any rate, there is generally with vegetarians, and especially fruit eaters, a calmness and even sweetness of temper, and we believe also a clearness of reason, that are highly desirable for humanity, and for health. We esteem this fact of the triple fermentation of vegetables of high importance, and one that, though caught at immediately by the advocate of the old *regime*, is of great and irresistible weight in the vegetarian advocacy.

(To be continued.)

### THE TEETH.

The teeth, in their number, structure, and shape, in their relative size and positional arrangement, in their perfect adaptation to ends, useful and ornamental, in the unequivocal prophetic announcement, unseen to the superficial observer, because veiled by the covering of flesh, that the few tender, childish teeth will be inadequate to the service of the adult, by the anticipatory preparation and growth of a second set, larger, stronger, and more numerous, ultimately destined to eject and supplant the temporary set, and to become actually, if properly nourished and treated, what they are usually called, permanent—offer a text to the writers of Bridgewater Treatises not inferior to any they have chosen.

It is not my intention to enter so very minutely into anatomical details as such writers might do, but to give a general description of the formation and progress of the teeth and their appendages, the sockets, covering membranes, and gums.

Each tooth is nominally divided into the body or crown, covered with enamel, and visible above the gums, and the fang or root, fixed in the bony socket. The neck is the line between the two, where the enamel is discontinued.

# THE HEALTHIAN.

A Journal of Human Physiology, Diet, and Regimen.

"The merciful man regardeth the life of his beast."—Proverbs, ch. xii, v. 10.

## SIMPLICITY AND TRUTH.

The man who on all occasions means to adhere to the simple truth, is never deficient in eloquence. Words are seldom wanting to him who has only the straightforward truth to utter. And why is this? Because the mind being simple and single, the body is not allowed to cloud, by disorderly exhalations, the reflective, perceptive, or manifestative powers; but the stores of acquired knowledge and the source of intuitive wisdom being always open, the truth shines forth in native brilliancy. "If thine eye be single, thy whole body is full of light."

Upon no subject does the public mind more urgently require to be enlightened than upon that of simple fare. So many prejudices have been interwoven into society, nay, they seem almost intergenerated in the very being, that the attempt to diffuse a little sound knowledge seems scarcely possible. In some families we shall find on inquiry that it is an established axiom, that whatever is costly is good. Many shopkeepers are aware of this idiosyncrasy, and sell one article at two different prices to suit the money estimate of two buyers. Thus, wine must be preferable to beer, because it is more costly; beer must be better than coffee, because it costs twice as much; and water must be abominable, because it costs nothing. These persons think it would be a very chilly reception to their friends, unless they made some extraordinary expense when they visit them, and of course they effectually shut the door against their sincerest and most truthful and simple-minded friends. These can see that the host does not rely upon the innate love in his heart to furnish a warm reception, and to impart a genial glow to the circle, they therefore forbear, if he be rich, to encourage his ostentation, or if he be poor, to tax his scanty resources. Such, therefore, must be continually severing themselves from the advantageous communion of the simple-minded.

Of a piece with this idea of a superiority in mere costliness, is the preference given by many to the colour or texture of food. White bread must be better than brown merely because it is whiter. If there is any better reason, it is because once it was more costly; if that be a *better* reason. Now that millers and bakers know how to manage the colour, the white bread eater is supplied at the same price as the other, but the idea still remains. A pudding complicated of half a dozen incongruous ingredients must, in the eyes of such reasoners, necessarily be superior to one composed of some single farinaceous substance and water.

The complex and insincere mind is manifested in complex and insincere conduct, and loves complex and sophisticated food. Observation warrants our assertion that nature spontaneously and unconsciously declares this fact.

LONDON, 1842.—PUBLISHED BY STRANGE, PATERNOSTER ROW,  
AND PAVEY, HOLYWELL STREET, STRAND.

—"Cold  
ick?"—  
of Capt.  
ing and  
sided, if  
l to our  
y do to

STLE.  
of 'The  
uniam in

ers.

Its which

into such  
nplish its  
with the  
te future

it as the  
s pupils

parts, in  
cts from  
Germany,

without

the pro-

respect

ERMAN,  
s, PHY-  
cluding  
ONOMY,

terly in  
, unless  
ss, diet,  
charge

ng; no  
means,

ich the  
zation,

Inter-

s made

House,

Just in proportion as the human being wanders from child-like truth-telling does it depart from the simple fruit diet, in which children find their greatest delight. Through all the various stages and degrees in competitive life, from the honest shopkeeper who takes his hot broiled steak per day, up to the wretched gamester, who can scarcely exist a moment without the intensest excitements, both fluid and solid, we shall find the increment imbibed from without keep pace with the interior march of contention, artifice, deceit, duplicity, chicanery, and spoliation.

The man who has alone in hand an honest, truthful work, demands no stimulant to keep him to his business. Having a higher stimulus within, which could only be soiled by his contact with any meaner one without, he is no more prone to touch such things than he is to commit robbery or suicide. By this mark, then, we may know the simple-minded man. We are not judging and condemning the man who is otherwise, but we may warn him that his ignorance of this law in his nature invalidates it not. The great difficulty experienced in the effort to come back to simple diet, lies not with any indisposition on the part of the body to be satisfied with whatever may be put into it; but the mind, the will, is in-disposed to simple fare. For many, the long continued habit, education, generation, all which make up what is called pre-judice, or are, at least, the threefold basis of it, may be charitably brought to account for this irrational and self-will departure from the direct road to happiness.

#### FLESH DIET.

*(Concluded from page 35.)*

We resume our subject of last month; and in doing so, we aver our strong conviction, that flesh diet, being only a remnant of barbarous ages, and a practice of barbarous natures, will, like other habits, fall off and die, in the proportion in which the blood-loving ferocity passes away, to which it owes its developement.

Evil in nature is developed as criminality in act, and increases its forcefulness by all such displays of its power. Exercise is the means wherein strength, exerting itself, acquires fresh stamina for its organism. The truth is analogous with respect to spiritual substance. No sturdy vigour of moral organism is manifested without exercise. The propensities also, and the natures, whether brutal or human, acknowledge the law of active conditions. The doings of a man, therefore, are the symbols of his being; and the practices of a nation or of an age are explicative of the principles therein embodied.

Modern reformers, dissatisfied with the present, and unwilling to model themselves and society on the past, yet obliged by the progress law, which instigates them to act, are fain to justify their universal condemnation of what has been, by declaring that irrationality has characterized all personal, domestic, and social proceedings up to the present time. Natures irrational have generated irrational institutions. The truth is, that the animal-human has been, during the six thousand years of mundane existence, in process of development. Hence, force and fraud have held that place in policy which intellectual wit and discernment are gradually assuming. But may we not fairly ask whether the universal assertion of man's irrationality does not bear as forcibly upon the subject which we are

discussing as upon any other? If he is irrational in his commercial arrangements, and associative conventionalities, equally so is he in his clothing, and certainly not less so in his alimentation. If the nature irrational originates always irrational act (which is incontrovertible), an absolute necessity is discovered, upon these premises, for a condemnation of the slaying of animals for food.

We do not, then, in the present case, commit ourselves to any assertion which would indicate an inconsistency between the dietary practices of men and the general features of their conduct in other respects. On the contrary, we remark on obvious consistency—the consistency of irrationality. It is irrational to fight for gain in the fraudulent matches of the prize-ring; but it is equally and consistently irrational to educate oneself for the contest by the stimulating diet of flesh *half* cooked. The exterminating wars of savage islanders are irrational, but their cannibalism is no inconsistent development of the same semi-created humanity. But we say, these practices have been, because men have been what they are. The development of purer natures will be accompanied with purer habits—the general incarnation of goodness in the soul will originate good-will in man, and peace on earth.

There is, however, a strong presentiment in human bosoms of the possibility of realizing a much higher and purer state than that of physical, or even of intellectual antagonism. While the past and the present are legibly inscribed upon the brow of man, the future is enfolded in his heart, struggling for birth. In all ages, even in the very midst of the lowest massal degradation, individuals have appeared who, while they acknowledged, by the lineaments of their countenances, and their social affections, and their often dwarfed sentiments, the kindredship in which they were allied with their fellows, yet felt natures astir within them more god-like and of purer origin than that of earth. Nay, are not we ourselves conscious of the same impresence? Do we not, while we perceive how markedly our lower attributes and faculties have been unfolded, perceive also that an incipient evolution of higher sensibilities, of a more god-like nature, may be distinctly noticed? And as a Pythagoras prophesied in the midst of corrupt nations of the simplicity and innocence congenial with his own nature, so also it is true that in the distortion of our much-abused constitutions, there is the Brahmin existence demanding the conditions that can further its development and formal activity.

Every instinct demands its own food—requires a liberty to energise in its own way. To the nature Pythagoric, unfolding in the heart, the Pythagoric habits are essential, or else it cannot be displayed in act: and so also the nature cannibal shall never be externally evidenced, unless its practices are licensed. It is, therefore, a question with us now, whether, in the order of progress, it is not well that the Brahmin nature shall be developed, even though it supersede for a time the practices introduced and cherished by the animalic existence of more barbarous times. We confess our natures more intimately sympathise with the manna of heaven, and the fruits of earth, than with the high-spiced flesh-pots of idolatrous Egypt.

There is no error more fatal than that which initiates practices tending to subvert or impede man's developing destiny. Whether we regard ourselves as ruins of the past, or as the germs of the future, we are compelled to recognize, inwrought in our very beings, the idea of majesty and greatness. We are to be kings—the outward is the sphere for our domination. The Creation shall be united with us in Love. The ruler exists in the affections

-telling  
reatest  
e life,  
, up to  
intens.  
nhibited  
rtiface,

nds no  
within,  
ut, he  
ery or  
We  
warn  
great  
t with  
r may  
For  
ke up  
ay be  
ature

r our  
ages,  
die,  
hich

s its  
eans  
ism.  
urdy  
pen-  
edge  
the  
ex-

odel  
hich  
r of  
per-  
ares  
the  
ist-  
hat  
im-  
u's  
are

of his subjects, but we stand severed from our inheritance by the antagonism which must ever subsist between tyranny and the apprehensiveness of its cruelty. The animals fly from us, contend with us, or turn their murderous powers upon us, because they love us not:—they love us not because we have not yet manifested any love to them. Creation thus is too strong for man. Yet the idea imprinted in his being suffers him not to rest—his destiny will press him on to its accomplishment. But he has made for himself impediments insurmountable; and both the inward impulsive power and the outward thwarting obstacles press upon him with force irresistible, and he becomes a wreck, battered, engulfed, and at last disappears for ever.

All that initiates or tends to preserve the antagonism between man and his destiny is, therefore, a moral wrong, and results in his ill-being; and we add, that animal murder is eminently exposed to this imputation.

Our limits will not allow us to multiply arguments in this paper, but we believe enough has been said to show that animal food is not a condition best suited for the development of that idea which is called man. New society, originated by new beings, from new sympathies, and on new principles, will have its new practices, and we are pretty confident one of its first reforms will be a revision of its BILL OF FARE.

#### EVENING CONVERSATION.

G. After the labours and fatigues of a busy day, I am glad to meet you again, Sir.

A. A busy day it has been to me, as most days are, but I cannot complain of fatigue.

G. Well now I am a little tired, I must confess, though I have not suffered myself to want anything, I assure you. I am not yet drawn over to your plans.

A. I have taken care to live lightly, which perhaps prevents my feeling any depression of the sort you speak of. Not having so heavy a load to carry about as most others, I ought not to be so tired.

G. You are pleased to be facetious. Why a pound extra would not be much of a load to carry.

A. That depends upon where it is carried. A pound of food in my pocket will not weigh much, but an ounce of flesh in my stomach may entirely depress me. I suppose you would rather carry a gallon of brandy on your shoulder than drink a pint.

G. You are always flying to extremes. I declare my abhorrence of all intoxicating liquors, but I cannot see that the use of meat, in moderation, is liable to any rational objection. I do not approve of excess in any one, and am moderate myself.

A. According to the best direct evidence which can be obtained, I never yet knew an excessive person.

G. No? Is there not Mr. ———, who goes to the parish dinners, where they run up a bill to the extent of a guinea a head? Is there not Mr. ———?

A. Gently, friend; the court never admits secondary evidence when primary is to be had.

G. But look at these people yourself; it is obvious to all that they are excessively self-indulgent.

A. Call the best evidence.