

# TO THE LIBERAL PUBLIC.

---

Having been a Student of the problems involved in Human Life for many years, and a Practicing Physician for over a quarter of a century, I have been called upon to write and lecture upon most of the practical questions of the day. The following Lectures were prepared with care and have been delivered in many parts of the country, and I have consented to put them in pamphlet form in order that they may reach those who cannot hear them.

---

THE EVOLUTION OF LIFE IN EARTH AND SPIRIT  
CONDITIONS.

---

*THE INDUSTRIAL AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS.*

---

LIFE AND HEALTH, OR HOW TO LIVE  
A CENTURY.

---

Philosophy of Disease and How to Cure the Sick Without Drugs.

---

Religious, Political and Social Freedom.

---

I will send them, post-paid, the five for 60 cents. Single, 15 cents apiece.

Address, DR. JULIET H. SEVERANCE,  
219 Grand Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.

A LECTURE

—ON—

LIFE AND HEALTH,

—OR—

HOW TO LIVE

—A—

→CENTURY,←

—BY—

JULIET H. SEVERANCE, M. D.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN.

---

MILWAUKEE:  
GODFREY & CRANDALL, PRINTERS,  
114 MICHIGAN STREET.  
1881.



# LIFE AND HEALTH,

—) OR (—

## How to Live a Century

---

GENTLEMEN AND LADIES:

**C**OME with me friends, to the apartment I have just left, where sits a young mother by the inanimate form of her child in which was centered so much of love, of hope, of expectation. "Dead, my darling dead," said she in low piteous tones, "have I not sacrificed every thing for him, nursed him with tenderest care, given my life, almost, and would willingly have surrendered it entirely for his dear sake. The relentless hand of fate is upon me; my cup of joy dashed from my lips just tasted, all hope fled; every anticipation ended thus. Would I had never been born." This is only one of the heart wails going out upon the air, all over the land. Our little ones dead. Like fruit buds bitten by the early frosts, they fall all around us, and few seem to feel it can be otherwise. The time once was when for a child to die was cause of universal mourning so seldom it occurred. How is it to-day? Our little ones gone; our brothers and sisters sacrificed in the bloom of youth and beauty; our husbands and wives torn from us in the glory of manhood and womanhood leaving shattered hearts, tearful eyes and desolated fire-

sides. Few indeed among us live to a ripe, rich, glorious old age. In view of all our sorrows, is it not worth while to stop and inquire into natural laws by which life is governed. Is it not worth while to question the authorities though they be grey with age and heavy with respectability, to ascertain if there is not something better than they can give or have given, something not recognized by our teachers or doctors, some new methods by which to guide and mould our lives?

Many once accepted facts have been buried in oblivion by the discoveries of skeptic minds.

The earth was once major to the sun, which rolled around it once a day as its servant to light and heat it; but it has now sunk into insignificance in comparison with the mightier worlds for which sun shines and heats, and which turn their every part to receive his blessing with regularity. So with many other things which were once authorities. They have gone through the transformation scene; and what is now true is diametrically opposed to what was so once. But in the methods and customs of life we travel on in the same old ruts in which the fathers of the centuries trod, endeavoring to effect reforms within the ruts rather than by cutting new and better paths. We bear our young, we eat and drink and die, after the established fashion.

I propose to call in question, established habits, and show that they need reformation, that they are antagonistic to health, and a proper length of life; to do this, so thoroughly that none can doubt. What I shall say, may conflict with almost all your practices; perhaps with some deemed sacred, but if it be true, it is duty to utter it though it shock you through and through, and strike your idols from their pedestals in your lives and households.

The great end to be gained, is to secure the best health and the longest life for all. These are worthy objects and being so, none can deny that whatever tends to gain them is right. Ergo, none can deny that to be wrong which militates against

them. But the necessary means must be employed though they revolutionize existing things.

With this utter abandonment to their fate of the things that *are*, and of consecration to those that *ought to be* I enter upon my work.

The basis of all improvement in the race is the best beginning for life. The best men and women can grow only from the best children, and the best children come from best conditions. This is a logical necessity to which all will give assent. But to what does this assent conduct us? To the very beginning of life! Nay, behind the creative agencies in which it has its origin to those who reproduce. Are we fit to reproduce? This is the question! How many fathers and mothers ever think of, much less seriously consider, this question? They see puny, sickly, half-made-up children born to them, living out a few years of miserable existence and then, with streaming eyes and lacerated hearts, they place their little forms around which cluster so many tender memories and loving associations, beneath the sod and call it a dispensation of Providence. It should rather be said that every child who dies, *had better never* have been born. Aye more: Those who live to grow up filled with disease and pain, a constant burden to themselves and all around them, *should* never have been born and *would* never, had their parents been instructed in the grand law of parentage. All such lives are contributions to human misery, which a due regard for both children and humanity, should discountenance. Yet, how can it, when one of the most cherished institutions is at once their patron and excuse? If a cherished institution has its evils, shall it be abandoned or shall the evils be endured?

There is no use in attacking an evil in the abstract when we can do so fatally in the concrete; in deploring an existing ill which we have the power to cure; in desiring better men and women when we neglect the methods by which they can be produced; no use in looking for a Christ to save the world

from sin when we continue the practices by which it is developed.

Nor are moral evils, less the result of improper parentage than are physical and mental. Vital statistics show that crime is an inheritance as much as is disease; indeed, crime is a moral disease. The liar, thief or murderer is sick morally, as he who has scrofula, is sick physically. He is born with the capacity to commit the crime, else it would not be developed when the circumstances are brought to bear upon it. His organization was furnished him; he did not create it. One person commits a crime under circumstances that could not induce another to do it, simply because of difference in organization. The strongest faculties must of necessity control the weaker; and the person born with strong active moral faculties will be able to control the propensities, while, where the reverse is the case, the result will be immorality and crime. It is quite time, that the responsibility for these things be placed just where it belongs, and no longer whipped at over the back of something of which it is impossible to have a logical conception.

Now what is the first prerequisite for proper parentage?

Woman should exercise the right entrusted to her by virtue of her functions, to determine when, and under what circumstances she will, and under what she will not become a mother, and it is her right and sacred duty to do this inexorably. When she shall come to know the fearful results that may follow a failure to exercise this right, and to perform this duty, there will be no excuse for evading them. No one can, more than I do, deplore the obstacles that lie in the way of woman's proper performance of the duties of motherhood; but since these obstacles are not of her procuring, she is in a measure, to be excused; or, she should only share with society in the responsibility. In marriage as organized and enforced by society woman belongs to, and is the property of man. He has not only the right to claim legal damages for any interference with this property, but he usually enforces his legal right upon it

with as much freedom as upon any other kind; and not uncommonly with the most absoluteness in just those particulars in which woman should not be constrained at all, save by her intelligently guided wishes. Woman can not escape this ownership without committing social suicide. The result is that burdened down with other cares, she is compelled by constant child-bearing to still more rapidly wear out her life; or is driven to artificial means for relief which is equally ruinous.

It may be said : This is not a fault of the institution, but those who enter it.

But the institution protects man in this use of the property it has confided to him. How then can the institution escape the responsibility ? Woman would never bear children against her will and under improper conditions if some power were not brought to bear upon her, No ! No ! Let not the people hug this delusion to their hearts as an excuse for the "institution." but let them acknowledge that man alone, of all the animals, takes from the female the control of her person and compels her to maternity, and that he has invented and maintains laws to perpetuate this usurpation. Woman wants the control of her person and the right to exercise her maternal instincts under her own direction. These our present marriage system takes away. Can anything be plainer than this ? To secure proper parentage, these rights should be restored to woman. If it can be done by marriage, let it ; but if not, restore the rights regardless of the institution, and your eyes will no longer be abused or hearts distressed by the death of one half your children before they reach the age of five years or three-fourths before maturity.

Think of this fathers and mothers; and see if it should not have some weight. No such mortality, occurs among the lower animals. The reason is because the rights to which I referred, remain in the possession of her in whom they are vested by nature; and because their lives are natural. What must be the verdict then ? Either that those who die young ought never to have been born, or else that, being born properly,



hey have been killed by improper care or living. When these questions shall have the consideration to which they are entitled, society will be compelled to provide better conditions for women as mothers and for children as progeny than are now assured them by marriage. I say this simply in its relation to improper parentage without touching upon any other of the many objections against it upon less momentous grounds, which might be urged; and because such conditions will be better for women and children, and far better for man as well.

Legal marriage has been a necessary step in the evolution of society; but not a final one. Evidences are not wanting to show that it has done its work; and that it may, nay that it will, be succeeded in the near future by the next step in social evolution in which woman will have her natural rights restored and be protected in their possession and exercise beyond the power of usurpation. Then her innate virtue will shine, radiantly, far beyond the possibility of the present in which, behind the false security of the law, she is at the mercy of abnormally stimulated and oftentimes ungovernable passions.

But I am here, to speak of the means by which health and long life, may be secured: and not against our marriage system, save as it militates against them.

Parentage is a too momentous a trust to be exercised with common abandon; or to be left to chance as it is now almost universally.

Those who cannot ask themselves the question: Are we fit to reproduce? Are not proper persons to exercise this trust? Surely man should pay as much attention to the breeding of his children as to cattle! No sensible farmer would have his prospective horse sired by a stallion known to be affected by a transmittable disease; or by one of vicious habits. He would say: "my horse would be like him." But habitual tipplers, inveterate chewers and smokers and constitutional knaves and blockheads sire children everywhere, and never think that *their* habits or lack of sense will be reproduced in them.

Children born of such fathers, unless redeemed by the excellence of mothers, are additions to the world's miseries. When women shall come to feel all this; she who is pure and virtuous will not permit her maternal functions to be thus prostituted.

Every woman should ask of him, who seeks to associate himself with her: Are you free from taint, or disease that possessed would entail evil upon our children. Do you use alcoholic stimulants, or tobacco? Are you as pure and free from the effects of social vice as you expect me to be. Next, she should question herself: Is the attachment between us worthy to be called love? and will it secure the transmission of our best instead of worst qualities; is either of us induced to this association for any reason, other than that of love? Is either of us seeking any selfish gratification incompatible with proper parentage? Do I seek a home, position, fortune or any other thing more than a father for my children and a lover for myself; and thus place myself upon a level with the professional prostitute who sells herself, only oftener, for the same kind of a consideration?

And if, after marriage, there should come a change in the love that sanctified it, and made it proper; should love change to indifference or hate, all sexual relations should be abandoned whether the legal tie be sundered or otherwise. There is no justification for motherhood where there is not love between the married. Love being that which justifies, when gone the justification ceases. The legal tie has nothing to do in giving or maintaining the conditions under which maternity is proper, or that militate against them.

These exist, or not, in individuals irrespective of the law. The law, not giving, can not take. Therefore proper parentage is not a question of legality.

The world is waiting for better children, and the time will come when it will be said: down with whatever stands in the way; in which it will be said: give us the best children of whom woman is capable, for from them we may hope for improvement! In which it will be said: Give more attention

to interior, if you pay less to the exterior, conditions—more respect to proper parentage if less to legal form. If we can have the former with the latter, well; if not, let us have the former in any event.

If there were none save proper children born, and if these were reared in the best possible manner, life might be extended almost indefinitely. In thy hands, oh woman, is the possibility of the conditions which shall lead up to this. Assert and maintain the rights of thy womanhood, and free thyself from the curse that has made thee subject and held thee slave. Do this and exercise thy functions under the inspiration of thy native purity and the blessings of unborn generations as they come and go, shall gather about thy head a coronet so chaste, so pure, so bright, that it will make thee resplendent with the glory of thy highest mission, *motherhood*, as the world moves onward into the infinity beyond.

## PART SECOND.

But let us take things as they are and see if the unfavorable circumstances of birth, habit and education may not be, to some extent, overcome, and a better degree of health, and greater length of life secured.

The tendency of life is toward the better, not the worse. Whatever follows the latter course is thrust there by abnormal conditions. So one filled with the germs of death may, if he will, overcome their tendencies. There are instances in which persons who never had good health until they changed their modes of living, have lived long and useful lives; and where aggregations of individuals enjoying a low degree of health have, by changes, attained a high degree, securing greater strength and endurance, better physical developments, keener intellectual perception and more perfect control of the passions and appetites. Any change that promotes the health elevates in every other way. It follows, therefore, that habits which tend to depreciate the health are detrimental mentally and morally. Ministers would do a thousand times more good if

they would teach the doctrines of proper living than they do by making a specialty of moral things, as if to be moral is to cover up all other deformities! As if it were possible to be moral when degraded physically! It is true they require the drunkard to desert his cups before they will grant salvation; but it is also true that there are many other equally bad habits about which the minister never speaks and in some of which he, himself, indulges. The evils that come from these habits, are a mass of misery compared with which those of drunkenness are as nothing. Many ministers chew; more smoke and nearly all drink tea and coffee. Now, it is a question which of these habits is really the most harmful. The use of tea and coffee is almost universal; and of tobacco an approximation to it. The habitual tea and coffee guzzler is as much a slave as is the whisky drinker. While the effects upon the nervous and digestive systems of the total quantity of the tea and coffee drank are more detrimental than are those of the total quantity of alcoholic stimulants. Spirituous drinks were once in almost universal use, but they have mostly disappeared among the clergy. Sometime, for similar reasons, tea and coffee will also disappear from the table of all public teachers.

But the evil treatment of the stomach is by no means confined to drinks. As much disease arises from improper eating as from improper drinking. The proof of this is in the relative influences which improper food and drink have upon each other. Habitual drinkers find it difficult to leave off their toddies and the confirmed chewers and smokers to stop tobacco; but if they would first reform their diet, the desire for these stimulants would gradually disappear.

Charles Napier, an English scientist, prescribes a vegetable diet, as a cure for intemperance. The relinquishment of meat for six or seven months, he asserts, will destroy a desire for alcohol in the most aggravated cases.

This could not be the case if improper diet was not more deleterious than improper drink. The greater evil furnishes the basis for the lesser. Remove the basis and that which

stands upon it, falls. But this is no apology for stimulating. It shows the importance of a subject about which there is next to nothing known and still less said, among the masses.

Every reasonable person who prefers health, happiness and length of life to momentary gratification and a short period of existence, will inquire into the means by which these blessings may be attained; and will adopt the habits of the thinking few rather than continue those of the unthinking many. There are not many, however, who can be induced to this. People are unwilling to be saved, unless it can be done in spite of habit. Such is human nature; and such the obstacles with which those who seek to remedy an evil, have generally to contend.

Improved health and prolonged life from better mode of living are no chimeras.

There are many instances of those who have lived one hundred years and upwards in perfect health.

Ages ago, people lived many times as long as they do now. The line of the decrease can be traced in history. There has not been a great decrease in the *average of all lives*, in the last thousand years; but there has been a *marked decrease*, in the NUMBER of those who have lived to great age.

With all the improvement in living; with the decrease of slaughter by war; of death by pestilence, the scientific discoveries by which the length of life ought to be increased, and the spread of intelligence among the masses, no reaction from the present average life is taking place. On the contrary the increase of physicians according to the number of population, declares the standard of health is being rapidly lowered. It has been shrewdly observed that this is because there are so many more physicians now than formerly. If there was a time in which man lived a thousand years. It seems reasonable, that, if the same habits by which they lived were now adopted, the same length of life might still be gained; or at least, if the average of life was ever a hundred years, that, had there been no deterioration in the habits of the people there would have

been no decrease in the average length of life. There has been no such shortening of life among the lower animals. The horse, ox, lion, and bear live as many years now as they ever did, and live the same as they always lived.

What is to be inferred from this? Evidently that there has been some change in man so unnatural that health and life have fallen to the present standard. Nor is this the worst, since, if the average of life has decreased from a hundred years to a mere fraction of a hundred, then in the course of time this fraction even may be wiped out. An average thirty-three and one-third, years cannot bear much reduction. The average age of those who marry is twenty-six years, so that a fall in the average length of life of seven years would carry it below the point at which reproduction begins. If continued there, the race would soon die out. There is another question still. How much below the present can the average life be reduced and maintain the present population?

It is true that, with all the decrease the total population has, so far, increased. But this may be accounted for by the age at which marriage has been consummated. This has decreased rapidly within a few hundred years. The race matures earlier now, that once did and reproduction beginning earlier, has, thus far, more than overcome the loss from decrease of length of life. A time must come, if life continue to decrease and health deteriorate, when their effects upon the population will overcome the gain by earlier marriages.

Of these are legitimate conclusions the questions of proper length of life are of inightiest import.

Now in what respect do the present lives of the masses differ from those who have lived a hundred years or more? Ascertain this, and other things equal, the same age may be now secured. In every instance of great length of life with continuous health to which I have had access, two facts are prominent: First, an abstemious diet of which flesh formed no part. Second, the absence of all stimulating drinks.

In Moses' description of the creation, though every variety



of animals, birds and fish had been created, the diet prescribed for man was this: "Behold I have given you every herb bearing seed which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree in the land which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed, to you it shall be for meat." Flesh and the juice of the vine were not indulged in until long afterward. But I do not base my convictions on this. There are sufficient facts and authority outside the Bible upon which to have convictions. Pythagoras, 500 years before the Christian era, a man of immense earnings and power, was the first person whose works are now extant to advocate a vegetable diet. He abstained from meat and required his disciples to do the same. Socrates, Plutarch, Zeno and other ancients—great, wise and good men, were celebrated for their health and length of life. They were rigid adherents to the Pythagorean diet. Many of the still more ancient orders of priests as the Kahans, Brahmins, Magi and Druids abstained from flesh. So did Triptolemas, the founders of the celebrated Eleusinian mysteries. Homer attributed great virtue and longevity to an abstinence from flesh, singing them in many poems. Lord Bacon in his treatise on Life and Death, says: "It seems to be proved by experience that a spare and almost Pythagorean diet—such as is prescribed by the strictest monastic life, or by the hermits—is most favorable to long life." Shelley also, and Lord Byron, were rigid abstainers from flesh, and the former an able advocate of vegetable diet. The immortal Newton and our own as immortal Franklin, said: "A vegetable diet promotes clearness of ideas, quickness of perception, and is much to be preferred by those who labor with the mind."

But to turn from authorities to illustrations, Henry Judkins, an Englishman, lived 169 years and Henry Perr 152 years, both used an exclusively vegetable diet and were never sick, dying of old age without a struggle. Ephraim Pratt, of Shutesborough, died in 1804, aged 116. At seventy, on account of his health, he was induced to change his diet to vegetables. The result was an addition of forty years to his life accompanied

by perfect health. His son adopted a like diet and lived 103 years. John Maxwell was still living at Kingston, Eng., in 1805, aged 104. At seventy he married a third wife, who bore him seven children, and lived sixteen years. At ninety-five he married again. He was an athletic man, and could walk sixty miles in nine hours. His diet was farinaceous and he drank only water. Francois Cailton, a Frenchman, when 100 years of age, often walked a league a day. His hair, teeth, sight, and memory, were all good. His diet was rye bread and water. In 1757, J. Effingham died in Cornwall, aged 144 years. He never tasted spirits, and ate very abstemiously. To his hundredth year he was never sick, and eight days before his death he walked a league. The celebrated Jean Jaques Rousseau was a strenuous advocate of a vegetable diet. He cites one Patrick O'Neill, born in 1647, who, at the age of 113, married for the seventh time. He served in the army to the age of ninety-five. He never drank stimulants nor ate flesh. At this age, 113, he was never idle a moment, walked erect and without a cane. He was never ill in his life.

Nor are the instances of long and healthful lives on a vegetable diet and without stimulating drinks, better proofs of the merits of such living than are the instances of strength and vitality, which are popularly conceived as impossible from such food.

Cyrus the Great, of Persia, the most celebrated of Persian monarchs, subsisted from his childhood, by the advice of the Persian Magi, on vegetables and water. His army, with which he conquered the then known world, he fed as he did himself. It was able to endure greater hardships, make longer marches, and fight more heroically, than his adversaries who lived differently.

In the heroic days of the Grecian army, its food was the plain produce of the soil. The immortal Spartans of Thermopylæ were, from infancy, nourished on the plainest vegetables—a diet instituted by the great Lyncurgus. So also was



the Roman army fed on vegetables in the days of its greatest valor and achievements.

The Polish soldiers under Bonaparte would march forty miles a day and fight a pitched battle, and the next morning be fresh and vigorous for further duties. They lived on oat meal bread and potatoes. The vigor and strength of the Irish and Scotch peasants are proverbial. They subsist upon a similar diet.

Judge Woodruff, of Connecticut, agent of the N. G. Commission for the relief of the Greeks, says that the Greek boatmen are extremely powerful and active, and carry loads of from 400 to 800 pounds. They live on coarse bread, figs and grapes. A merchant of Smyrna—an American—pointed out to me, continues Judge W., a boatman who, he assured me, had carried from the wharf to his store—twenty-nine rods—a barrel of sugar weighing 400 pounds and two sacks of coffee weighing 200 pounds; and that after taking a few steps, he requested that another sack of coffee might be added to the load.

Mr. Jackson, a distinguished surgeon in the English army, says: "My health has been tried in all ways in all climates. I have worn out two armies and can wear out another before old age will come upon me. I eat no animal food and drink no spirits of any kind. I wear no flannel at any season of the year, and regard neither wind, rain, heat nor cold."

Thos. Jackson, of Nantucket, Island, says Mr. Macy never ate flesh, had never been sick or felt any ache or pain, and never experienced any weariness from labor. He would labor in the field all day and in the oil mill all night, and again in the field the next day, and yet feel no exhaustion. Said he: "I have several brothers who eat flesh and I am worth the whole of them to endure labor, privation or exposure."

Dr. Lamb, in his own case says: "Under a change from a mixed to a vegetable diet, my pulse became full, calm, strong and regular, where before it was the opposite."

And if we investigate the Therapeutic effects of a fruit and farinaceous diet, we shall find the fruits equally in its favor

and against flesh. Some years ago Dr. L. North, a distinguished practitioner of Hartford, Conn., published in the Boston Medical and Surgical Journal, and in the American Journal of Medical Science of Philadelphia, a letter asking for the experience of medical men in vegetable diet. In the answers he elicited not a fact was brought, nor an experience given, to prove any injury arose from a change from a mixed to a vegetable diet; but on the contrary, the evidence was entirely in its favor. Now here was an appeal through the journals, the supposed champions of a mixed diet, to physicians who certainly are so, who would, if they could, have given overwhelming testimony in opposition, but those who had had any experience in such a diet were compelled to speak in its favor.

Dr. Parmely, of New York City, said he and several friends, male and female, each afflicted by some chronic malady, adopted a diet entirely free from fish, flesh or fowl, and drank milk and water. In each case the disease disappeared. Among the earliest results were an increase of flesh, strength, vitality and capacity for mental exertion; and every sense of the body was made more vigorous and pleasurable."

Dr. N. J. Knight, of Truro, N. J., suffered from dyspepsia and rheumatism. He adopted a fruit and vegetable diet and attained better health than he had ever known before. To satisfy himself that the cause of this was the diet he several times returned to eating meat and each time was obliged to abandon it. He said finally, "I am now satisfied that man would live longer, and enjoy more perfectly the sane mind in a sound body should he never taste flesh," and Drs. Cook, Ball and other medical men give similar testimony.

Dr. Caleb Bannister, Dr. A. P. Buchan and Dr. Lamb, concur that in pulmonary consumption there is no remedy equal to a diet of fruits, grains and vegetables. / 2

Dr. Buchan's life had been despaired of, having had consumption symptoms for many years. He abandoned a meat diet and has been in perfect health for twenty-four years. 2

Dr. Porter, of Brookfield, Maryland, says: "I was called

3 to a patient having chronic inflammation of the right leg, with ulcers on the thighs and hips, who was sinking rapidly. I discontinued all medicines and local applications, ordering a simple vegetable diet. In *three days* the dark purple appearance of the leg had subsided, the red and angry appearance at the base of the ulcers were gone. In six days he was working in his garden. In two weeks the leg was well and the ulcers healed."

3 The following appeared in the London Lancet: "A three years old child of Mr. Fielding, of Stockport, at 18 months, was covered with ulcers; head, face, neck, arms, body, legs, being a mass of discharging sores. For a year he had been blind. Eight of the most prominent medical men had pronounced the case incurable. When Dr. Rowbotham was induced to prescribe a diet of ripe fruit. This was Sept. 13th and the 16th, the sores on his back began to disappear; on the 29th one half of his face was clear, and by Jan. 1st, not an ulcer remained, the skin was clear and fair and his sight had returned. Each of these series might have been multiplied *ad infinitum*, but time forbids.

There are many things about a mixed diet accepted as established truths, which, analyzed, melt to nothing. We have seen how little truth there is in the assumption that strength, and endurance can be best obtained from flesh. The evidence is overwhelmingly against it. So fully am I convinced by twenty-five years experience and the testimony of others, that I deem it impossible that there can be one instance in any country, clime or race, from the equator to the poles north or south in which a diet of grains, fruits and vegetables, with water for drink, is not immeasurably superior to any other.

The evidence, I repeat, is overwhelming, that it ensures health, strength, vigor and endurance; gives brilliancy and profundity to the intellect; buoyancy to the spirits; exquisiteness to the special senses; tone and depth to the moral faculties, and greater humanity to the man throughout. A thousand well known facts might be produced in support of this,

but if what has been said do not fix the attention upon this great subject, more would not suffice.

Admitting what has been said as approximately true, what would be the result of rearing a generation of children by the principles that underlie it? born though it should be under the present unfavorable circumstances. Can it be supposed even, that one-half of such children would die before reaching the age of five years? Impossible! Then where lies the fault? In the customs and practices of modern society.

If none save natural habits were indulged, there would be no sickness at any time in life. All would live to advanced ages, dying at the natural end of life a calm peaceful death.

Is not this enough to call out the utmost capacity of every lover of his kind? A whole nation free from disease and pain! Who can contemplate such a prospect without feeling called upon to contribute his possibility toward its consumation without adopting better habits of living, without laying aside all customs that create perverted appetites, so that he may become natural and healthful, which is but another way of saying virtuous and noble.

If good results obtain from a vegetable diet with the certainty that indicates them to be the rule and not the exception, there must be laws that govern them which can be adduced *apriori* to show they are natural.

It may be said there are many instances of good health and long life of those who have lived on a mixed diet. But this proves nothing more than that such persons had uncommonly good constitutions and could bear much bad treatment, who, had they lived otherwise, might have attained to still greater ages.

Drunkards have been known to live long lives. But can this be used as an argument for intemperance. No! Then why use the other when cases cited on the opposite side are principally of persons compelled to a reform in diet so that they might live at all, gaining thereby, health for disease and many years of life for almost certain speedy death.

But there are reasons assumed for flesh to form a part of diet which require attention. Unless they can be effectually disposed of I have no right to say the subject is really decided. Attempt to argue with a learned advocate of flesh as food, and he will say: "No argument is necessary. The structure of the man and the conformation of his organs have already decided the matter against you." Ah, have they? I am not inclined to accept this *ipsi dixit* of the professors any more than was Copernicus to believe the authorities of his time when they said the sun revolved around the earth.

Anatomists and physiologists assert that the organs and functions connected with the alimentary processes of man indicate that he is an omnivorous animal and that he can feed indiscriminately with impunity upon any kind of diet. Since, if this were not so, there would have been no such organs or functions provided. If this premise is correct the conclusion is unavoidable. But are there any indications in the organs for digestion, that indicate flesh as a natural part of diet? No!

Man, it is true, may, and does submit upon a diet composed largely of animal food. Shall it therefore be concluded that flesh is necessary? No one disputes that flesh is the natural food of the tiger. His teeth, stomach and intestines say so unmistakably. But is man like a tiger in any of these respects. Not in any one! A tiger can be fed on a diet from which flesh is excluded and have tolerable health; but he will lose the ferocious habits of his native state. A tiger's whelp raised upon vegetables, is a domesticated animal, and this is true of all carnivorous beasts.

This does not, however, prove, meat is not the natural food of the carnivora.

If man could subsist upon flesh exclusively, neither would that prove flesh to be a natural diet.

The tiger never eats anything but flesh when he can get enough of it to satisfy his hunger. Man chooses many things to compose his diet flesh being only one of them.

But while the tiger can live upon a diet of which flesh form



no part, man cannot live upon flesh alone. Therefore the tiger which nobody thinks to be other than a carnivorous animal, comes more nearly to being herbivorous than man who is declared to be omnivorous, comes to being carnivorous.

Herbivorous animals when compelled to eat flesh become ferocious and intractable, but they can be subsisted on it for a time. Does this indicate that flesh should form a part of their food?

Nobody would pretend it. But it may be said that their teeth and alimentary canal determine their natural food to be herbs, and so they do. But, opposed to them, carnivorous animals have the canine, cuspid—or eye-teeth—largely developed; and these indicate they are to tear and cut their food; and their stomachs are constructed to digest coarse bits of flesh. They also have a peculiar construction of the inferior maxillary—or lower jaw bone—at its articulation with the zygomatic process of the temporal bone, which gives the cutting or direct motion of the jaw and exclude the lateral or grinding motion, which is the principle one in man and in the herbivora. "Since man has both the cutting and the grinding movement, his natural diet should be a mixture of both the carnivora and herbivora," so say the professors. But why not make the same claim for all other animals with the same movements of the jaw, or have the advocates of a mixed diet for man never thought of this?

There is, then, no more reason for claiming flesh as a proper food for man, because he has a cutting movement of the jaw, as has the tiger, than there would be to do the same for the horse or other animals that are admitted to be herbivorous.

The organs for the alimentary processes in all animals indicate their natural food. About the carnivora and herbivora, a question has never been raised. Their habits are in perfect accord with these indications.

The habits of man, however, are artificial and do not in-

dicate what is best for him; so we cannot judge him in regard to his diet as we can the lower animals.

Man can live *a time* on flesh, but he can live *a life* on fruits or grains, or vegetables. It would be reasonable to infer from this that flesh forms no part of his natural diet. It is doubtful whether there are any animals formed for feeding indiscriminately, or without preference upon both animal and vegetable diet. Those that approach nearest to this, by the indications of their organs are the bear, the opossum, and the hog; but these, when in a state of nature, and where food is abundant, invariably choose fruits, roots, grains and vegetables.

The digestive organs of the hog are very similar to those of man; but his teeth are widely different, his cuspids and bi-cuspids assimilate to those of the carnivora. His incisors bear no resemblance to those of man. The true molars alone resemble his, and those of other animals that live on vegetable. This comparison, therefore, proves man still farther removed from the carnivorous animals than is the hog; hence, if flesh be not a natural diet for the hog—which it is not—it cannot be for man.

“The masticating and digestive organs of the Orang-outang,” says Prof. Lawrence may be easily mistaken for human. The differences are that the canine teeth are longer and more pointed and have intervals in the jaws to receive them when the jaws are closed, and the valvular folds of the stomach are wanting. But the Orang-outang is the true type by which to compare man to ascertain his dietetic character. Now what are the facts about the Orang-outang? When left free to choose his food, he is wholly frugivorous. Therefore both comparative anatomy and the rules of diet adopted by my opponents, prove man to be not a flesh eating animal, and point to a disregard of the intentions of nature as the cause of the disease and early decay which have reduced the living age

of man to the present standard; and filled this brief span with pain and misery.

There are many other reasons also, for discarding flesh as food, among them are the facts that it is a very costly diet; contains a very small quantity of nutriment, and few of the necessary properties to sustain the animal economy.

Beef, the best of all flesh, contains but 25 per cent. of nutriment. Potatoes even have 28 per cent., but wheat, oats, peas, beans, barley, corn, rye, rice and sago contain from 82 to 92 per cent. An average person, feeding on wheat, consumes one and one-half pounds daily.

To obtain the same nutrition exclusively from beef, six pounds would be required. 560 pounds or nine bushels of wheat would feed a man a year. At twenty-seven bushels per acre. One-third of an acre, produces this quantity. Of beef, he would consume, to obtain the same nutriment, 2190 pounds; and to produce this, twelve acres are required. Therefore, in respect to land, beef at the same price per pound, is thirty-six times more costly than wheat; but while beef costs from ten to thirty-five cents per pound, wheat can be obtained for two; or six times less than beef, which raises the difference in its costness 216 times. If the comparison were with potatoes it would rise 648 times. That is to say: what it costs to feed one person on beef a year, will feed 216 persons on wheat, or 648 on potatoes.

There are three general divisions of elements required by the human system—the nitrates that form flesh; the carbonates that form fat and heat, and the phosphates that supply the waste of nerve and bone. Twenty-five per cent. of the first, sixty-two per cent. of the second, and three per cent. of the last are required.

Now the twenty-five per cent. of nutriment contained in beef, is wholly flesh-forming. The carbonates and phosphates which constitutes nearly three-fourths of the requisite nutriment are wanting. Beef supplies no heat, no fat, no nerve; but one pound of wheat not only contains as much flesh-form-



ing matter as a pound of beef, but also has sixty-two per cent. of heat and fat-forming principles, and three per cent. of nutriment to build up nerve and bone ; and the same is true approximately of all the cereals.

Meat-eaters must consume large quantities of flesh and take much exercise ; the first to furnish material for the waste in tissues broken down by the exercise ; and second, must take the exercise by which the tissues may be broken down to supply the materials which, combined with oxygen, maintain the normal heat of the body and supply the motor power for the vital functions. This is the only way in which the flesh of animals can furnish caloric ; and even if this process be so conducted that a seeming balance is preserved, the system is still liable to bilious diseases.

A vegetable-eating person is never sick on account of his diet. Flesh-eaters are disposed to all kinds of maladies ; take contagious diseases, and succumb to epidemics readily. The reason is, they take into their systems the decayed and broken down tissues of the animal, always present in the economy passing to the excretory organs, and the tissues of their own body change with great rapidity, and are less substantial than those of a vegetable-eating person. Hence the flesh-eater contains a large per cent. of substances in a state of decomposition which renders him liable to disease from the slightest exciting causes.

The heat and vital functions of the vegetable-eater are maintained directly from his food ; but the flesh-eater relies upon the decomposition of his own flesh ; hence decay is predominant with him.

Nor can the flesh-eater be mentally superior. His food furnishes no nutriment for the brain. One might as well hope to labor with his muscles, who uses fine flour which contains no muscle forming material, exclusively, as another might to do so with his brain, who lives on meat.

But says the hard-working, flesh-eating man : " I must have my meat or else abandon labor." So says the whisky

drinker: "I must have my dram or else stop work." Meat and whisky are both stimulants. When one accustomed to the use of either fails to get it, a loss of force is felt. This feeling is not a demand for nourishment, but an abnormal condition produced by the continued use of stimulants, by diet and drinks that keep the system under a high pressure process, without properly nourishing it.

We have seen that one whose wastes are fed by flesh, becomes exhausted sooner than he who depends upon vegetables.

The action of the whole alimentary canal is more rapid; all the vital functions run at a high rate of speed; the pulse is quicker and the liver and kidneys act with greater force to carry any the decomposing matter before it shall produce disease; and finally wear out by over-action.

The nitiates and phosphates of the food of cattle, are used by them for the same purposes for which they are required by man. How then can he expect to supply his bones and brain from animal food? It is impossible. The source from which to get these elements, as well as all others needed, is the same as that from which the animal receives them; from the vegetable kingdom.

It has been shown by chemical analysis that wheat contains all necessary elements and very nearly in their proper relative proportions, and the same is true of any small variety of vegetable food. Now can it be said, that beside such food, man also requires the flesh of animals? If he use wheat or any variety of vegetable products, where is the necessity?

The use of all improper foods or drinks create a habit that is abnormal. A good rule by which to regulate diet is to exclude everything to which you become enslaved, so that you can not substitute something else therefor without discomfort.

If the coffee drinker goes without his coffee for a morning he suffers from exhaustion or headache; and the same is true of tea condiments and other stimulants.

Many think that the use of salt is necessary. Its constituent elements are, which are Chlorine and Sodium. A person

weighing 154 pounds should have two ounces and 115 grains of Chlorine and two ounces and forty-seven grains of Sodium ; but not in the form of salt. Now Chlorine and Sodium are found in many proper articles of diet, and form no exception to the common rule. We do not need go to inorganic elements, although all those upon which we subsist are found among them. The province of the vegetable kingdom is to transform these inorganic elements into protoplasm or living organic matter. This kingdom, therefore, stands between us and the mineral kingdom and prepares its elements for our use.

A stimulating diet arouses the animal propensities to abnormal action, which, being unnatural, is not capable of the exquisite enjoyment that follows normal and unstimulated activity. Besides, under stimulants these capacities are speedily exhausted and their subjects become worthless or impotent. The pleasures of life are appreciated through the nervous organism. This action of the nerves causes an expenditure of force and this force is furnished by the phosphates of our food. Now, if our diet contains no phosphates, how can we expect a high degree of pleasure, physical or mental.

Stimulants excite the organs through which sensations are received to great activity ; but they do not furnish the nerves with power to convey the extra impressions to the brain ; nor to the brain the faculty to enjoy them. A system run upon this high pressure plan, is like a locomotive carrying great fire but little water, whose boilers soon burn out or burst. Thousands of people, young and middle aged, (following this simile of the locomotive) have their boilers so badly burned that they dare not get up much steam for fear of bursting altogether.

The world is full of pain and misery because it will persist in being blind when the sun is shining. How long shall it shine in vain ?

Why not try the light ; test its quality and prove by actual experiment whether it be true or not. I tell you it is true, I stand before you a living illustration of the effects of a proper

course of living. I was born <sup>frail</sup> ~~deceased~~ grew to womanhood frail and sickly ; was finally, after exhausting the skill of both the Allopathic and Homeopathic schools of medicine, given up to die, when I chanced to learn of the better way in both the matter of living and treatment. I commenced in earnest ; lived faithfully in accordance with the new light received, and soon health with all its blessing of joyousness, happiness and aspiration came to abide with me.

For the last twenty years I have had uninterrupted health ; am seldom weary and can perform almost any amount of physical or mental labor. If such a transformation as this can be effected from the conditions in which I was submerged, what may not be hoped for those who have average health, notwithstanding their improper modes of living ! Why, they may become almost Gods and Goddesses.

I shall not, however, stop to plead with you longer. Those who are wedded to their bad habits will continue in them ; those who aspire for better things will seek them. But there is a class for whom I have a right to plead and for whom it is my duty to do so ; since the welfare of the future is more immediately dependant upon them, than upon you who are now matured. Therefore, if my words have no effect upon you let me intercede with you in behalf of children. They are not yet fixed in the habits to which you are enslaved ; they can be easily led into health-giving paths. Few of you who drink alcoholic stimulants will induce your children to do so, but rather do all you can to prevent them. Will you not extend the same parental care a little farther ? Far enough to include with alcohol the stimulating food with which you habitually indulge them ? Will you not guard them from the injurious effects of flesh and flour, and the various condiments with which these twin evils are commonly dished up, from tea and coffee, as you do from the baneful effects of alcohol ? Will you not preserve them from entering upon a hot-house growth which rushes them on to maturity years before they ought to arrive at this important era in their lives. Which

stimulates and develops the amative propensities long before they would otherwise be active. These propensities coming upon them so prematurely, push them into the terrible evils of secret vice, which is sapping the manhood and womanhood of the rising generation, even before it has arrived at youth and maidenhood. In this way the germs of early decay and death are planted in many a promising youth and maiden, and, impelled by the abnormal stimulation of an improper diet, their lives and hopes are wrecked.

Many infants die because of the improper food of their mothers and because they are fed without regard to regularity, which is one of the essentials. After the stomach has received food no more should be taken until sufficient time has elapsed for the food to be digested, and the stomach have time to rest, for that organ as well as the arm, or foot, or any other part of the body, needs rest. If mothers would commence at the birth of infants to feed them just so many times a day and no more under any circumstances, they would lay the foundation for after health, as they do now, by an opposite course, for disease and death. A great amount of the fretfulness of infants is caused by the discomfort arising from improper, irregular and excessive feeding. By regulating these things, mothers might save themselves the weary days and sleepless nights which often makes life almost unendurable, and motherhood which should be an estate to be coveted by every woman as one of unequalled bliss and glory, a thing to be dreaded because of its exhausting cares and labors.

By drawing analogies from things that are, we arrive at conclusions about many things that ought to be. So we may judge about the length of life, man ought to live, by the rule of animal life. In a state of nature, animals live about ten times the number of years that it takes them to mature. Some people do not mature, even under our high pressure system, until the age of from 18 to 25. Suppose that a normal development should mature them at the latter age,



then the natural life for them would be from 200 to 300 years. Persons have been known to live to the latter age. They could not have merely chanced to do so. There must have been some competent cause. If some have so lived, a hundred, a thousand, or all, may, provided they are born and reared and live under the same conditions that those did who attained that great age. Not to admit this is to claim a natural tendency of the race towards extinction; and who believes this to be true? It cannot be true, else there is another and higher order of beings than man yet to inhabit the earth; and how can this be possible since man exhausts all the possibilities of the material universe; possesses the capacities to reduce to use all the physical elements, and grasp, and analyze all the laws that regulate the association of mind and matter.

There is absolutely no room for a higher life than is possible in humanity. Under proper pre-generative and pre-natal conditions, and living properly afterwards, the majority of people might even now live at least an hundred years, which in succeeding generations would be gradually increased until the good old age of which we read in primeval histories would be attained.

To sum up the best conditions for health and long life which all can now attain: First: prospective fathers and mothers should be in perfect health from right living, not only as regards diet, exercise, rest, personal cleanliness cheerfulness and all hygienic conditions, but also in regard to their relations one with the other. The mother should maintain the control of her own person under an intelligent comprehension of sexual science. Second: being prepared she should await the desire to bear a child with a feeling of sacred reverence for the mission. Third: being encient, she should recognize that her duty to the life she has called into existence, is superior to all other duties. She should surround herself with the best possible conditions and be guarded from the approach of everything, that, by its influence upon her, might prejudicially effect the life that is being developed with-

in. The beautiful in nature, art, poetry, music, and in great and good lives, should be her subjects of meditation and conversation. Fourth: the child having been thus born should then be reared as has already been stated, in accord with physiological law in every possible respect. A child thus born and reared would instinctively know the good from bad in physics; the right from wrong in ethics, and have a clear and comprehensive spiritual perception. Every woman who desires to be a worthy mother should set up this life as an ideal after which to form her children. She has the moulding of the mind and shaping of the body wholly in her hands. If she have children in whom there are defects, it is she who is responsible. If all mothers in this country would listen to the voice that calls them to higher performance of the duties and responsibilities of maternity, one generation would be sufficient to reform the people; to empty prisons and asylums for the unfortunate; to clear dram-shops and brothels of all their inmates who are the result of our own ignorance and folly.

Repentant hearts in decaying bodies is not salvation from sin and misery. This must come through motherhood.

Then the need for regeneration would not exist and the occupation of the doctor and minister like Othello's, would be gone.

To thy hands, oh woman, the means have been committed to regenerate, reform, and save the world from the sin, misery and degradation in which it is now enveloped. Then shall health shed a glow as of rosy dawn upon all faces; graceful and perfect forms only tread the earth made beautiful by the absence of misery and crime. The time sung by poets and foretold by seers, for all ages come; and the now bleeding, groaning world be itself transformed into a Paradise.

- 1 Dyspepsia 17
- 2 Consumption 17
- 3 Ulcers 18