

# Qualitative Inquiry

<http://qix.sagepub.com/>

---

## Boundaries, Entities, and Modern Vegetarianism : Examining the Emergence of the First Vegetarian Organization

Hsin-Yi Yeh

*Qualitative Inquiry* 2013 19: 298  
DOI: 10.1177/1077800412471516

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://qix.sagepub.com/content/19/4/298>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Qualitative Inquiry* can be found at:

**Email Alerts:** <http://qix.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://qix.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>


**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations:** <http://qix.sagepub.com/content/19/4/298.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Feb 28, 2013

[What is This?](#)

# Boundaries, Entities, and Modern Vegetarianism: Examining the Emergence of the First Vegetarian Organization

Qualitative Inquiry  
19(4) 298–309  
© The Author(s) 2013  
Reprints and permission:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1077800412471516  
http://qix.sagepub.com  


Hsin-Yi Yeh<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Taking the emergence of the first vegetarian organization in Victorian England as a case, this article argues that “what vegetarianism is” is an ongoing social process that is determined by how social actors link its boundaries. Although in hindsight, people tend to take what an idea is for granted and treat it as a constant, what an idea was, is, and will be in fact depends heavily on what ideas can penetrate the boundaries of the specific idea and vice versa. Adopting Abbott’s alternative approach that boundaries come before entities, the case study of the emergence of modern vegetarianism serves to further illustrate the complexity between boundaries and entities and the emergent aspect of the process of “boundaries-into-entities.” A connection is also made to align Abbott’s suggested approach with Star and Griesemer’s ecological approach.

## Keywords

vegetarianism, identity construction, emergent aspect, things of boundaries, ecological approach

## Introduction

Regarding the conventional methods of understanding the social world as problematic, Andrew Abbott argued that “it is wrong to look for boundaries between preexisting social entities” and suggested that researchers start with “things of boundaries” (Abbott, 1995, p. 857). That is, when considering the relationship between entities and boundaries, Abbott asserted that “social entities come into existence when social actors tie social boundaries in certain ways” (p. 858): Boundaries indeed come before entities. Proposing such an alternative way to investigate the social world, Abbott nevertheless claimed that the applicability of his new paradigm needs more empirical research for validation.

By tracing the emergence of vegetarianism and exploring the story behind the rising idea of not eating meat, on the one hand, this article illuminates what Abbott called “the process of boundaries-into-entities” (Abbott, 1995, p. 865) and claims that Abbott’s alternative approach to a great extent is consistent with the ecological approach that Star and Griesemer (1989, pp. 387-420) urged. On the other hand, this article demonstrates that Abbott’s approach goes beyond traditional nonemergent circumscription (Pickering, 1995, p. 217) by unraveling the performative history and highlighting the temporal emergent aspect of practices (Pickering, 1993, pp. 559-589).<sup>1</sup> Considering the complexity of the historical development of vegetarian ideology and the long-term history of not eating meat in many cultures

and places,<sup>2</sup> this article targets the establishment of the first “secular” vegetarian organization in mid-19th-century northern Britain. The formation of the Vegetarian Society in the United Kingdom in 1847 represented the emergence of the modern idea of vegetarianism (Amato & Partridge, 1989; Gregory, 2007; Preece, 2008).

Adopting a boundaries-come-first-then-the-entities perspective to investigate the emergence of the first vegetarian society, first, this article affirms Abbott’s statements that the ecologies an entity-to-be situates are crucial and that social actors tie up boundaries to determine the characteristics of an entity. Starting with “things of boundaries” instead of “boundaries of things” leads us to see the dynamic involved in forming an entity. In the case of the emergence of vegetarianism, instead of regarding “what vegetarianism is” as something given when the first secular vegetarian organization was established, by examining how social actors tied up boundaries and therefore formatted “vegetarianism,” the dynamic process is illustrated. Second, I suggest that the analysis of the emergence of vegetarianism indicates that pulling together a set of boundaries into a social entity is inevitably a long-term and ongoing process or, in Andrew

<sup>1</sup>Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

### Corresponding Author:

Yeh, Hsin-Yi, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, 26 Nichol Avenue, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA  
Email: hyeh@sociology.rutgers.edu

Pickering's (2002) words, a process of "open-ended ongoing becoming" (p. 430). Third, I argue that the traits of boundaries may have distinct effects on entities at different developmental stages. In vegetarianism's case, while a porous boundary benefited the emergence of vegetarianism, it also created the risk of decline in later stages. That is, whereas the intersectional nature between different social worlds (the ecologies of an entity-to-be) may create advantages at the early stages due to ambiguity, boundary tensions that exist in the interfaces between social worlds may create difficulties when standardization (claiming an entity-in-itself) is the priority at the later stages (Star & Griesemer, 1989, pp. 408, 413-414).

## Research Data and Method

Several resources facilitated my delineation of the birth of modern vegetarianism: the website of the Vegetarian Society UK (<http://www.vegsoc.org/index.html>),<sup>3</sup> the website of the International Vegetarian Union (<http://www.ivu.org/>),<sup>4</sup> the website of the Francis William Newman Society (<http://www.fwnewman.org/>),<sup>5</sup> and existing research and articles that relate to the Victorian vegetarian movement. Content analysis was used to analyze different types of materials. Some of these materials provide objective descriptions of the history of early vegetarianism, and some of them lead to insiders' subjective narrations about the development of the first vegetarian society. I compare available materials to confirm the validity of specific arguments so as to represent the story as accurately as possible.

### *The Establishment of the Vegetarian Society*

On September 30, 1847, the Vegetarian Society was formed as a result of a meeting held at a vegetarian hospital in Ramsgate (Antrobus, 1998, 1999; Gregory, 2007) and attempted to organize a vegetarian movement in the United Kingdom. Although the term "vegetarian" was first used in late 1830s, according to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, the general use of this word appears to have been largely due to the formation of the Vegetarian Society (Preece, 2008).

The core members who contributed to the formation of the Vegetarian Society were often called "Cowherdites"<sup>6</sup> since most of them were Bible Christians and purchased the main doctrines of the Bible Christian Church. The religious belief led them not only to the idea that "eating patterns as manifesting a deeper moral relationship" but also faith that "meat-eating as symbolic of man's Fall" (Twigg, 1981). However, both the religious origin and the charismatic personalities of the founder of the Bible Christian Church<sup>7</sup> fail to provide us a satisfactory explanation of why the Vegetarian Society was formed in 1847 in northern Britain. Moreover, during the early stage of its establishment, the Vegetarian Society was so intertwined with the Bible

Christian Church (Forward, 1897), it was formed as the first "secular" vegetarian organization instead of being established as another religious institution (Amato & Partridge, 1989). In order to resolve these questions, we need to embed the emergence of modern vegetarianism into its historical background.

The 19th century is a period during which people witnessed rapid social changes: the age of Enlightenment followed by the industrialization and urbanization; the rising of liberalism, humanitarianism, and individualism; and the advancement of science and technology, to name a few. All of these historical developments served as soil for the emergence of modern vegetarianism (Ashworth, 1987; Harrison, 1971; Haskell, 1985). Among others, the efficiency of food production was greatly enhanced by industrialization, which indicates the sufficiency of food (at least in the urban/industrial areas). Thus, the adoption of the vegetarian diet in Victorian Britain was based on people's personal choices instead of their not having enough meat to eat (say, practical/forced vegetarians). Also, some students suggest that the industrial revolution led some people to a more romantic view of animals and nature (Antrobus, 1998; Haskell, 1985). In terms of the effects of urbanization, it threw people of like-minded together, and the dense population in urban area made the networking of the movement and dissemination of ideas easier and faster.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, the rise of individualism and liberalism encouraged people to express their own feelings through several ways and to realize that they did have different choices of life. The Victorians saw the opportunity not to conform to existing norms; no wonder students describe the Victorian era as an age during which numerous organizations were formed to promote different ideas (Amato & Partridge, 1989).

The worship of science, technology, and rationality played a significant role in the birth of "modern" vegetarianism. In her study of the vegetarian ideology, Julia Twigg states,

The Bible Christians formed part of what has been termed the proletarian enlightenment, and this was reflected in their strong interest in medicine, science and education. . . . The Bible Christians put great emphasis on independent of mind. . . . Their vaunting of reason and their popular scientism makes them at times appear very like the deists. (1981, sec. 5c, para. 6)

The founders of the Vegetarian Society not only heavily relied on scientific evidence for their propaganda of the vegetarian diet (Vegetarian Society, 2002a, 2002b, 2000c, 2000d) but also decided to establish a "secular" vegetarian organization (Davis, 2006). Indeed, one of the reasons that the sermon of William Cowherd (the founding father of the Bible Christian Church) always attracted crowds was that

“he didn’t just talk of the word of God but of the Rights of Man, of democracy and liberty” (Antrobus, 1998).

Once embedding the emergence of modern vegetarianism into history, it is hardly surprising that Manchester was not only the first industrial city but also the first city where vegetarianism was systematically promoted (Lee, 1997; Teuteberg, 1975). Derek Antrobus (1998) went even further to argue that William Cowherd was just “in the right place at the right time” to make vegetarianism into a popular movement. Upon spiritual and material grounds mentioned above, a series of coincidental personal ties led to the proposal for a vegetarian society (Antrobus, 2002; Forward, 1897; Gregory, 2007). These people are the driving force behind the Vegetarian Society; after all, even the most fertile soil needs the farmers to plant the seed. Three main vegetarian groups in England—the Bible Christians, Alcott House, and Northwood Villa—worked together to establish the Vegetarian Society in 1847. People of these three groups wrote letters to the focal magazine *Truth-Tester* to propose a gathering of all vegetarians and the formation of a society (*Letters proposing a vegetarian society*, 1847), and these efforts delivered the first modern vegetarian society.

Whereas most students who are interested in the vegetarian movement in the 19th century tended to marginalize the role of Alcott House and Northwood Villa, John Davis correctly claimed that the Bible Christians’ cooperation and networking with people from Alcott House and Northwood Villa was critical:

There can be no doubt that the inspiration for establishing the Vegetarian Society . . . came from the dynamic enthusiasm of Alcott House and Northwood Villa. Without them the Bible Christians would have simply continued as they had for the previous 40 years, content to run their Church. (Davis, 2006, para. 26)

The effects of interaction among the vegetarian groups were twofold. On one hand, new repertoires were introduced to the Bible Christians, such as the option of forming a secular organization, which was devoted to the propaganda of vegetarian diet, and making use of the existing journals and magazines as platforms to appeal attention and support from others.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, the Bible Christians felt that they needed to compete with the two groups for the leading role in the vegetarian movement. When the Vegetarian Society was formed on September 30, 1847, James Simpson, a Bible Christian, was elected as its first President; William Oldham of Alcott House was elected as Treasurer; and William Horsell of Northwood Villa was elected as Secretary (Physiological Conference, 1847). It is obvious that these three vegetarian groups at first shared the leading power in the Vegetarian Society. Intriguingly enough, the influence of Alcott House and Northwood Villa

in the Vegetarian Society “faded away within a few years” due to the decline of institutions, the death of leading figures, and the successful strategies of the Bible Christians.<sup>10</sup> Thus, it was the Bible Christians who ensured the survival and prosperity of the Vegetarian Society (Davis, 2006; Twigg, 1981).

### *The Emergence of a Modern Vegetarianism (I): Official Goals and Membership*

The objects of the Vegetarian Society were as follows:

The 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 efforts of its members, the adoption of a principle which will tend essentially to the increase of human happiness generally. (Physiological/Vegetarian Conference, 1847 1848, p. 41)

One can readily notice that it is an organization established to devote to the habits of vegetarian diet (Address to Vegetarians, and Adjourned Conference, 1848). Differing from the traditional and/or religious vegetarians, who solely defined vegetables as “spiritual food” that can purify a person’s soul (Twigg, 1981), the Vegetarian Society suggested that the vegetarian diet also contributes to the betterment of people’s body. Whereas at first glance, this transition (from emphasizing advantages to the soul to highlighting benefits for the body) was trivial, Davis’ observation facilitates our understanding of its significance. According to Davis, before the advent of modern vegetarianism, people’s abstinence from flesh-eating was a form of “self-denial”; people avoided meat because they believed it was good (Davis, 2006). The Bible Christians developed a distinct idea and they avoided eating flesh because it was regarded as bad.<sup>11</sup> For advocates of modern vegetarianism, physical betterment and the compassion for animals are also convincing reasons to convert people to vegetarianism. Furthermore, the Vegetarian Society sought to disseminate the vegetarian ideology by trying every means. Not only were the leading figures but also each member of the Vegetarian Society were expected to engage in the propaganda of vegetarianism. Methods and discourse were developed to maintain insiders’ zeal and to remove outsiders’ hostility (Gammage, 1857). The core mission of the Vegetarian Society was “to convert all possible to the vegetarian diet” (Fox, 1999). Before the establishment of the Vegetarian Society, there was no such effort to systematically and actively promote the vegetarian ideology. In short, there were some new elements in the modern vegetarianism.

An organization has to set a rule to include proper people as its members (and in the meantime, exclude other people as outsiders), and the Vegetarian Society was no exception. Every person who desired to become a member of the Society had to make the following declaration:

I hereby declare that I have abstained from the flesh of animals as food, for the space of one month and upwards, and that I desire to become a member of the Vegetarian Society, and to co-operate with that body in promulgating the knowledge of the advantages of a vegetarian diet. (Physiological/Vegetarian Conference, 1847, p. 41)

It seems reasonable that the threshold for becoming a member of the Vegetarian Society was low, whereas the Physiological Conference<sup>12</sup> on July 8, 1847, successfully attracted about 130 participants; there were some people who had abstained from flesh for more than 30 years (Forward, 1897, p. 14): “Among the visitors to the festival, there were some who had not arrived to the ultimatum of entire abstinence from a flesh diet, and others who were in various stages of enquiry and conviction” (Physiological Conference, 1847, p. 140). More important, since the new idea was forming (and so did the way to put it into practice), even some of the founders of the Vegetarian Society were fresh practitioners of the modern vegetarianism (Forward, 1897). At the initial stage of the organization’s formation, in order to appeal to more people to enroll in the Society and become seeds of the modern vegetarianism, the founders of the Vegetarian Society had to lower the standard for membership.

Collecting membership data from several issues of the *Vegetarian Messenger*,<sup>13</sup> Twigg found the social base of the Vegetarian Society before 1858:

It is clear that although groups like physicians and merchants were quite well represented, by far the bulk of the membership, well over two-thirds, was drawn from “tradesmen, mechanics and labourers”. . . The society drew in particular from the new industrial cities of the north . . . the focus of the society was strongly northern and working-class. (1981, sec. 5d (i), para. 2)

That is, during the first few decades, urban workers were the main adherents of vegetarianism. However, compared with subsequent periods, the working-class social base of vegetarianism was an atypical situation (Twigg, 1981). According to Preece, the bourgeois have been the main supporters of vegetarianism from as early as the 1870s in England (Preece, 2008). Three reasons explain the disparity of the social base across time. First, since the membership of the Bible Christian Church was predominantly working

class, students like Antrobus (1998) supposed that it was reasonable that the membership of the Vegetarian Society be predominantly working class during the first decades. After all, while trying to disseminate ideas through lecture tours and congregations, it was easier for the Bible Christians to access people who occupied similar social positions. Second, due to the Bible Christians’ emphasis on persuading people by reason and education of the masses, which was seen as the essential stepping stone, pioneers of the modern vegetarianism promoted ideas through educational programs such as Sunday Schools (Vegetarian Society, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d). The educational and charity programs of the Bible Christian Church turned out to be especially attractive to urban workers; thus, the initial strategies of vegetarian diet propaganda influenced membership during the first few decades. Third, some students believe that the function to facilitate the work discipline was another factor that contributed to the predominant membership of working class. As Twigg argued,

One of the central problems posed in the early years of the industrial revolution was the training and adaptation of the work force to the new patterns dictated by the revolution in production, and most especially by the coming of the factory system. (1981, sec. 5d (iii), para. 6)

The vegetarian propaganda claimed that a vegetarian regime could not only offer ways to cope with the unhealthy conditions in factories<sup>14</sup> but also serve the means to overcome the difficulties in following factory disciplines. In other words, the Vegetarian Society drew heavily of its membership from the working class due to the advent of new circumstances of the factory system and management. Once the influences of these three reasons decreased and other social factors entered, the social base of the modern vegetarianism shifted.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, leaders of the vegetarian movement actively attempted to extend its social reach and more propaganda strategies were employed.

The investigation of official objects, formal rules of recruitment, and membership merely provide a rough sketch of the Vegetarian Society. The examination of the relations among different reform organizations on one hand and the social networks of leading figures on the other may reveal more information about its specific characteristics.

### *The Emergence of a Modern Vegetarianism (II): The Porous Boundary*

The fertile soil mentioned above nurtured numerous new ideas, and the vegetarian movement was by no means the only reform in 19th-century Britain (Forward, 1897; Gregory, 2007; Harrison, 1971). Among others, the close association with other temperance movements such

as teetotalism and the self-help movement (Twigg, 1981) played an important role in shaping the characteristics of modern vegetarianism and the Vegetarian Society. The temperance movement that emerged in the early 19th century aimed at altering public attitudes toward diet (it was also called “Dietary Reform”). Early temperance leaders mainly targeted people’s drinking behaviors due to specific historical events,<sup>16</sup> and food became the focal point of the reform in the 1830s.<sup>17</sup> Given that both were dedicated to the alteration of dietary patterns, it is hardly surprising that the teetotalers and vegetarians were often in alliance with each other while trying to conduct their nation-wide educational campaigns (Harrison, 1971). For the teetotalers and vegetarians, the dietary reform brought the “cleanliness in body” and orderliness to one’s life style. Twigg concisely described the great influence of teetotalism on the vegetarianism:

Nearly all vegetarians at this time were active abstainers from alcohol, and they often termed vegetarianism “the higher phase of temperance.” They believed there was an organic link and that meat stimulated the desire for alcohol. The vegetarians have close links with the tee-total movement, and share many of its social characteristics. Many also abstained from tea, coffee and tobacco, which like meat and alcohol were regarded as stimulants. Salt, pepper and spices were disapproved by many, again through their being seen as stimulants, including of sexual desire, and the majority at this time believed in the virtues of a bland, unspiced diet. (1981, sec. 5d (ii), para. 3)

Regarding themselves as one part of the temperance movement, nearly all of the modern vegetarians subscribed to the ideas of the teetotal movement. Moreover, under the influence of the self-help movement, vegetarians were inclined to ally with several treatments that emphasized the “self-help attitude” (Gregory, 2007). For instance, in addition to the avoidance of eating meat, the Alcott House and Northwood Villa (two vegetarian groups that contributed to the formation of the Vegetarian Society) devoted themselves to hydropathy (Davis, 2006).<sup>18</sup> According to Gregory, the overlap between vegetarianism and alternative “pathies” is important because it actually facilitated the conversions of many prominent pioneers of alternative treatments to the vegetarian diet and vice versa. In fact, it does not go too far to claim that it is through the networking with other reforms that modern vegetarianism recruited its founding figures and adherents.

The leaders of vegetarianism were, indeed, progressive and radical reformers in 19th-century Britain: Many of them were also leaders of other movements and reformers (Antrobus, 1998). In *Fifty Years of Food Reform* (Forward, 1897), Forward had a similar observation:

One of the most noticeable features of the Vegetarian movement is the fact that so large a proportion of those who have been associated with it were advocates—and, in many cases, very active advocates—of other moral and social reform. (p. 62)

Forward provided more information about the features’ multiple affiliations:

More Vegetarians are abstainers from alcoholic drinks and tobacco; many have been hydropathists and homoeopaths; not a few—John Smith, of Malton, James Burns, editors of the *Medium and Daybreak*, Dr. T. L. Nichols, Mr. A. Glendinning, Mr. and Mrs. Sandys Britton, Mr. and Mrs. Wallace, etc., have been spiritualists; theosophy has had its adherents in Mrs. Kingsford, Mrs. Besant, Mr. Herbert Burrows, Mr. E. Maitland, Lieut. Col. Wintle, etc.; the agitations against compulsory vaccination and inoculation of every kind have been well supported by Vegetarians, and it would be difficult to find a Vegetarian of many years standing who was not opposed to vivisection, cruel sports of every kind, and such legislation as the Contagious Diseases Acts (1866), or in favour of arbitration as a means of settling international disputes. (1897, p. 62)

While the list surely cannot exhaust the tight relations among the vegetarian movement and other reforms, it sheds light on the fact that many of the vegetarians in Victorian England were “anti-everythingarians” (Gregory, 2007). The term “anti-everythingism” vividly describes the tendency for many vegetarians to oppose many conventional or state-enforced activities. More important, it indicates the strong association between the modern vegetarianism and other “isms”:

As a matter of fact, vegetarianism does seem somehow or other to be correlated to all sorts of strange isms, and it is seldom that a vegetable solus eater is content to be in other things like the general run of his fellow-creatures; and is pretty sure to hold new and strange views. (*To-day* 1887, Vol. 1, p. 31, quoted in Gregory, 2007, p. 115)

More so, the idea of adopting a vegetarian diet usually went hand in hand with ideas such as egalitarian, democratic, individualistic, humanitarian, and libertarian (Antrobus, 1998). Hence, many of the leaders of the vegetarian movement supported women’s liberation and opposed capital punishment. No matter whether the overlapping social network of advocates can provide us a satisfactory explanation of why there were such affinities between modern vegetarianism and other “isms,” we can be sure that the

correlation of several reforms and movements did influence the characteristics of the Vegetarian Society: a porous boundary of the vegetarianism.

To some extent, we can say that the avoidance of flesh-eating was closely related to various emerging ideas (“isms”) from the early 19th century; these ideas/“isms” were packaged. A person who advocated one of these ideas tended to buy into other ideas. Therefore, as a younger temperance movement, the vegetarian movement was influenced by other ideas. As a result, when the adherents of the vegetarian diet established a specific organization to promote vegetarianism in 1847, even though the formal rules set a (organizational) boundary for vegetarianism, it was highly permeable. For most of the leading figures, there was no clear (conceptual) boundary for a vegetarian diet. On one hand, it was taken for granted that vegetarianism was bundled with other ideas. On the other, compared with other movements and ideas, modern vegetarianism was a smaller reform and a rather marginalized movement; tight relations with other movements were a strategy to increase propaganda and the vegetarian discourse.

An investigation of letters that proposed a vegetarian society and meetings to discuss the establishment of the Vegetarian Society also reveals that modern vegetarianism was heavily mixed with other ideas. As mentioned before, in early 1847, several pioneers of modern vegetarianism wrote letters to the *Truth-Tester* and claimed that the vegetarians should be better organized (*Letters proposing a vegetarian society*, 1847, p. 112). Despite the content of proposing letters, the place where the leaders submitted their letters did matter. Before 1846, the *Truth-Tester* “had been purely a temperance—anti-alcohol—magazine” (Davis, 2006). On one hand, leaders of the vegetarianism strategically determined to employ the *Truth-Tester* as platform to disseminate their messages<sup>19</sup>; on the other, due to the affinity of ideas,<sup>20</sup> the given audiences of the *Truth-Tester* served as a ready niche to recruit people who were more likely to be sympathetic to vegetarian diet.

Furthermore, in carrying out the suggestion to establish a society, advocates called a meeting to discuss the details, that is, the Physiological Conference held on July 8, 1847. The Physiological Conference was held

for the purpose of collecting and diffusing information on the subject of human physiology in general, and of abstinence from the consumption of animal food in particular. (*Physiological Conference*, 1847 [*Healthian Journal*, 1847, Vol. 1, p. 140])

In other words, the formation of a society for the modern vegetarianism was not the only reason to hold a conference, other issues such as health reforms and alternative therapies were also discussed. That is, even in the meeting that facilitated the forming of the Vegetarian Society, other

ideas/“isms” naturally mixed with the idea of vegetarian diet.

In short, the consequence of the porous boundary was that modern vegetarianism (at least in the Victorian England) was more often than not propagandized with other packaged ideas, such as antialcohol, prowater treatment, and women’s liberation (Gregory, 2007; Twigg, 1981).

### *The Emergence of a Modern Vegetarianism (III): Plights and the Decline*

The Vegetarian Society faced several plights in its very early stage, namely, being confined to the urban areas, the fight with the images of masculinity/manhood, and a lack of organizational funds. The leaders of the vegetarianism soon concluded that the propaganda of the vegetarian diet in the rural areas failed after several trials of lecture tours (Gregory, 2007). As mentioned, the urban areas in Victorian England provided fertile soil for the emergence of modern vegetarianism, and the rural areas were still governed by traditional patterns of life. Not only did rural life allow little room for free choice (and the vegetarianism represented the exercise of choice) but also the peasants believed that they needed strength to work and that flesh was indispensable as source of energy. Twigg argued that the vegetarianism indeed was (unwittingly) promoting “a new slim physique” and this kind of image was not compatible with the rural values:

Vegetarianism does not of itself produce slimness, though it has persistent, perhaps symbolic, associations with it. . . . The old ideal of John Bull, the beef-eating, beer-quaffing, fine-figure-of-a-man had been slow to give way . . . industrial society . . . was now calling for alertness rather than strength. The sharpness and quickness of industrial workers . . . in contrast to what seemed the heavy slowness of rural people. (Twigg, 1981, sec. 5d (iii), para. 4)

This leads us to the second plight of the promotion of the vegetarian diet in general: the long-term fight with the impression of manhood (Forward, 1897; Lee, 1997). The Vegetarian Society faced a need to prove that the vegetarian diet was nutritious enough for people (especially for males) and that it would not undermine people’s health. Forward claimed,

In the earlier days of Vegetarian propaganda it was difficult to convince an audience of the possibility of any feats of physical strength or endurance being performed without the consumption of butcher’s meat. (1897, p. 152)

Thus, in 1888 the Vegetarian Cycling and Athletic Club was set up (Forward, 1897). The main goal of this club was

to show that “vegetarians could equal meateaters in their sporting performances” (Lee, 1997).

The last plight was a critical one for the practical operation of the Vegetarian Society: the lack of funding and too much reliance on a specific personal fund. The driving force behind the Vegetarian Society was James Simpson (the first president of the Vegetarian Society): Both the establishment of the Vegetarian Society and its activities relied heavily on his personal funds. The unexpected death of James Simpson in 1859 not only indicated the inevitable financial crisis but also brought the activity of the Society to a halt (Twigg, 1981). Gregory had the same observation:

With James Simpson’s death in 1859 most remaining branches became dormant and the survival of the Society itself was uncertain. (2007, p. 51)

While it is undeniable that these three plights in general and the financial crisis in particular contributed to the decline of the vegetarian movement in 1850s, the decline of Vegetarianism was also related to its porous boundary by certain leading figures.

#### *The Emergence of a Modern Vegetarianism (IV): Calls for Setting a Clear-Cut Boundary*

Facing the decline of vegetarianism, F. W. Newman<sup>21</sup> suggested two ways to revive it: One was to accepting associate members (Forward, 1897), and the other one was to refuse to accept associating vegetarianism with anything else (Gregory, 2007; Vegetarian Society, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d). Whereas Newman’s first proposal aimed at recruiting more members to the Vegetarian Society by loosening the threshold of membership,<sup>22</sup> his second proposal called for setting a clear-cut (conceptual) boundary for vegetarianism by refusing for it to be packaged with other ideas/reforms. That is, Newman suggested that the Vegetarian Society take a revolutionary step: to be more inclusive “enrollmently,” yet more exclusive “conceptually.”

In terms of his first suggestion, Newman proposed an “associate” grade and believed that accepting friendly people into the Society could not only widen the influence of vegetarianism but also get more funds:

It occurs to me to ask whether certain grades of profession might not be allowed within our Society, which would give to it far greater material support, enable it to circulate its literature, and at the same time retain the instructive spectacle of a select band of stricter feeders. . . . Yet, as our Society is at present (1871) constituted, all those friendly are shut out. . . . But if they entered as Associates in the lowest grade

. . . they might be drawn on gradually, and would swell our funds, without which we can do nothing. (quoted in Forward, 1897, pp. 73-74)

Many leading figures of the vegetarian movement opposed the idea of including friendly people as associates: For them, it indicated a compromise or even “dallying with evils” (Forward, 1897). However, the results showed that Newman’s decision was right: The comparison of the numbers of members, associates, and income before and after the “departure” clearly showed significant progress of the Vegetarian Society.<sup>23</sup> The new rule allowed more people to enroll in the Society (as associates), and there was a revival of vegetarianism in the late 1870s. Some students even regard this period as the golden age for the vegetarian movement (Gregory, 2007).

In addition to include more people in the Vegetarian Society and widen the pool of (potential) conversions, Newman tended to exclude other “isms” from vegetarianism as well. As mentioned, the idea of avoiding meat consumption had been bundled with other ideas, and people usually took for granted the mixing of ideas/movements. In the introductory article *History of Vegetarianism*, the Vegetarian Society (2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2000d) also mentioned that “Until then, many had combined vegetarianism with a campaign against alcohol and smoking.” The decline of vegetarianism in late 1850s served as a chance to examine the porous boundary of vegetarianism. One of the reasons that the vegetarian movement declined was that people felt “there were other priorities” (Gregory, 2007, p. 50). In other words, the porous boundary between vegetarianism and other “isms”/movements might have functioned to facilitate the Vegetarian Society and the vegetarian movement in the 1840s; it ironically also functioned to “drain off” the same energy that had advocated the promotion of the vegetarian diet in the late 1850s.

In fearing of being overshadowed by other ancillary interests, several leading figures in the vegetarian movement cried out for setting a clear-cut boundary for vegetarianism. Among others, Newman was the first one who publicly warned that

by wandering into such topics as War and Teetotalism, and Capital Punishment, and Women’s Suffrage, they exceedingly weaken the effect of their advice. (1868, quoted in Gregory, 2007, p. 122)

Moreover, J. A. Thornberry denied that vegetarianism necessarily meant

anti-vaccination, teetotalism, radicalism, or any other “ism.” One “ism” at a time is enough. (1886, quoted in Gregory, 2007, p. 122)



Franklin Doremus explicitly related the decline in late 1850s to the mixing with other ideas. He said that in the 1850s there had been

many other reforms mixed with it [Food Reform], and not until outside issues were dropped did vegetarians make progress. (1889, quoted in Gregory, 2007, p. 122)

For these people, departure from the “anti-everything-ism” can benefit the promotion of vegetarianism. Nevertheless, cries for setting a clear-cut boundary for vegetarianism only appeared sporadically, and it was difficult to find materials that contained a more substantial discussion on this issue. Three reasons explain why calling for a clear-cut boundary was usually marginalized or at best a silent process in the late-19th-century vegetarian movement. First, in comparison with accepting associates who explicitly and rapidly proved positive effects, the effect of setting a clear-cut boundary was harder to observe. It is difficult for people to judge whether dropping other issues/ideas contributed to the revival of vegetarianism. Second, setting a clear-cut boundary means a process of avoidance, which usually takes a long time to develop. Due to reasons mentioned before, a porous (conceptual) boundary was established for vegetarianism from the initial stage; thus, leading figures who found the necessity to have a clear-cut boundary had to continuously avoid mixing with any other reforms. To some extent, this was never-ending, daily work. Third, advocates were used to the repertoire that the promotion of vegetarianism had to be packaged with other reforms (both in terms of strategically and conceptually), and it was harder for them to think of other repertoires. Once people took the porous boundary of vegetarianism for granted, it was difficult to convince them that a clear-cut boundary was a desirable option. For instance, Arnold Hill, who was the president of the Vegetarian Society in late 1890s, still welcomed other reforms/ideas to mix with vegetarianism (Forward, 1897).

### *The New Vegetarianism: A More Exclusive Boundary and the Enjoyment of Cookery*

The revival of vegetarianism in the 1960s indicated the advent of the “new vegetarianism” (Amato & Patridge, 1989). It is impossible for this article to thoroughly compare the differences between “old” and “new” vegetarianism; among others, two significant changes were the more exclusive boundary and the enjoyment of cookery in new vegetarianism. An examination of the new vegetarianism reveals that it was no longer closely associated with ideas such as antialcoholism, antismoking, and teetotalism (Preece, 2008); vegetarianism became an ideology for its

own sake instead of part of a greater movement (i.e., the temperance movement).

The exclusion of veganism<sup>24</sup> from vegetarianism in the 1940s is a good example of a more exclusive boundary of the new vegetarianism.<sup>25</sup> Whereas in the early phase of the development of vegetarianism, there were different types of “vegetarian diet” that coexisted under the flag of “vegetarianism,”<sup>26</sup> the Vegetarian Society refused to publicize vegans’ viewpoints in the journal. The vegans then decided to break away from the Vegetarian Society and establish their own organization in 1944 to promote veganism (Marcus, 1998; Twigg, 1981). The emergence of veganism implies that its idea was incompatible with vegetarianism, at least in the 1940s,<sup>27</sup> and that mixing with veganism was intolerable for “lacto-vegetarians.” In short, instead of accepting veganism as something that could coexist in the brand “vegetarianism” and strengthen the influence of the vegetarian diet, the Vegetarian Society excluded veganism. Compared with the “old” vegetarianism, which welcomed the close relations with many ideas/reforms, the “new” vegetarianism even refused to intermingle with veganism. A stricter boundary of vegetarianism gradually formed.

Another critical change in the new vegetarianism was the enjoyment of cookery. When reviewing the 100-year history of the Vegetarian Society and its magazine in 1994, Humphreys mentioned “The articles in *the Vegetarian Messenger* a century ago were fairly evenly divided between health and moral issues (with more religious comment than is usual today), but one thing is missing completely is a cookery feature” (Humphreys & Fox, 1994, 1994-1995). Humphreys went on to say that

were our predecessors simply not interested in this aspect of vegetarianism, preferring to put all their energies into campaigning for good health and compassion? The December 1894 issue (of *the Vegetarian Messenger*) doesn’t contain a single word about Christmas festivities but has a long article about the duty of sharing one’s sustenance with the poor. (Humphreys & Fox, 1994-1995)

“Old” vegetarianism rarely mentioned the aspect of cookery because the vegetarian movement in the 19th century was packaged with other temperance reforms. As an advanced stage of temperance reform (or say, as one part of the temperance movement), vegetarianism in the 19th century encouraged a plant-based diet mainly because “meat is bad,” and it was thought that consuming animal flesh could lead to man’s fall. One core value of “old” vegetarianism was avoiding luxury; thus, in his essays on diet, Newman explicitly argued that people should not enjoy cookery (Newman, 1883). For the leaders of “old” vegetarianism, to some extent, the enjoyment of cookery indicates another unchecked desire.

On the contrary, today's vegetarian magazines are rife with recipes, and a heavy emphasis is put on the pleasure of cooking vegetarian dishes; special editions are issued in order to give readers more ideas on holiday meals. In addition, the new Vegetarianism is no longer tightly associated with other temperance reforms, and one more conceptual shift facilitates our understanding of the enjoyment of cookery: from "meat is bad" to "vegetable is good."<sup>28</sup> Whereas the Bible Christians adopted the vegetarian diet because they believed that "flesh is bad" rather than "flesh is good" (Davis, 2006), the idea of "vegetable is good" had not yet explicitly appeared. It is the development of the discourse that vegetables are good (and delicious) that resulted in the inundation of recipes in vegetarian magazines.

## Discussion

Abbott's (1995) article suggesting an alternative way to investigate the relationship between boundaries and entities remains insightful and provocative, but the relationships in reality can be far more sophisticated than anticipated and still need close investigation. The examination of the emergence of vegetarianism in Victorian England serves as a case study to reveal the relationships between boundaries and entities. Several findings are summarized in what follows.

*First, Abbott's boundaries-come-first-then-the-entities perspective indeed can be aligned with Star and Griesemer's (1989, p. 388) suggested ecological approach.* For Star and Griesemer, a more ecological approach provides the opportunity to enhance our ability to determine how actors can cooperate in diverse intersecting social worlds despite their heterogeneity. The diverse social worlds should be regarded as the ecology an entity-to-be situates, and the heterogeneous ecologies entail the potentials of available boundaries that social actors can pull together to format the entity.

*Second, after adopting Abbott's alternative approach, embedded historical context and the historical trajectory of the development of an entity-to-be become more significant than ever before.* Corresponding to Pickering's (1995, p. 242) argument, as an approach that highlights the temporal emergent aspect of the social world—in addition to illuminating the general pattern between boundaries and entities—Abbott's boundaries-come-first-then-the-entities perspective encourages us to notice cultural specificity. For instance, in the case of the emergence of vegetarianism, the investigation of its historical background reveals the available boundaries that social actors can tie up and the actual boundaries that social actors did pull together. Being tightly packaged with other ideas/reforms, the vegetarian movement in Victorian England (while establishing its own organization) had a porous boundary. Thus, during the early phases, vegetarianism was all too often propagandized with other ideas/reforms. That is, the specific historical

background provided fertile soil for the growth of modern vegetarianism in addition to shaping the characteristics of vegetarianism.

*Third, a porous boundary might create distinct effects on entities at different stages.* As Abbott (1995) argued, "Social entities come into existence when social actors tie social boundaries in certain ways" (p. 858). Thus, a permeable boundary of vegetarianism in Victorian England to some extent implied the unstable existence of vegetarianism. For some leaders of the vegetarian movement, one reason for the decline of vegetarianism in the late 1850s was its porous boundaries; energies that were devoted to vegetarianism during certain time periods could be drained off by other ideas/reforms. Thus, the porous boundary that facilitated the emergence of vegetarianism also endangered vegetarianism in later stages. Star and Griesemer arrived at a similar observation when analyzing the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology using an ecological approach: Actors from different social worlds can deal with their heterogeneity by negotiation and ambiguity and sometimes even benefit from the intersectional nature at the initial stages. However, as the museum matures, actors from different social worlds have to make efforts to standardize by coupling boundary tensions in a more direct fashion and devising a new kind of joint endeavor that goes beyond the unjoined world boundaries (Star & Griesemer, 1989, pp. 387-420).

*Fourth, the process of "boundaries-into-entities" is long and can be endless.* The case of the emergence of vegetarianism leads us to realize that the boundaries of ideas are established not only gradually<sup>29</sup> but also continuously. Whereas the decline of vegetarianism in the late 1850s served as an opportunity to call for a clear-cut boundary, its formation took a long time for a variety of reasons. In addition, setting a clear-cut boundary can be an endless effort. For example, although the new vegetarianism has a more exclusive boundary (it dropped many issues), it is closely associated with the Animal Liberation Movement. That is, pulling together boundaries is a dual process: When certain boundaries are tied together to form an entity, other possibilities are excluded. The process of avoiding a mix with other ideas goes on and on: It goes against the nonemergent assumption in the traditional approach and demonstrates "the process of open-ended becoming" (Pickering, 2002, pp. 413-437).

*Fifth, the affinities between ideas tie up boundaries and embody the entities.* A rough comparison between "old" and "new" vegetarianism indicates that ideas may have an affinity with distinct counterparts in different time periods. Thus, the vegetarian movement was tightly associated with ideas such as women's liberation, teetotalism, and alternative therapies, whereas new vegetarianism is closely affiliated with animal rights. Factory farming, a focal issue for many vegetarians today, was never an issue in the 19th century. The substantial practice and discourse regarding an idea are

deeply influenced by affinities between ideas. In hindsight, we tend to take “what vegetarianism is” for granted and treat it as a constant; however, what vegetarianism was, is, and will be in the future in fact depends on what ideas penetrate the boundaries of vegetarianism and vice versa. Redrawing boundaries equals reshaping entities. When actors tie up different boundaries (in this case, when people connect vegetarianism with different ideas/“isms”), we observe a distinct entity.

Further empirical research is needed to resolve questions generated by observing the emergence of vegetarianism in Victorian England. For instance, the reasons why “ancillary interests” were eventually dropped from vegetarianism should be clarified, and the emergence of other ideas should be taken into consideration to determine whether the emergence of vegetarianism is a typical case. In addition, the development of vegetarianism in other countries should be investigated for the sake of comparison. Moreover, further research that reconsiders the relationship between boundaries and entities may shed light on theoretical issues such as whether a porous boundary is necessary for every idea to emerge, whether a totally exclusive boundary for an idea is possible, and how to trace the trajectory of the affinities between ideas. In addition, future research could guide us to develop a new synthetic approach to consider the social world in a fundamentally different way.

### Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Paul McLean, Yu-Sheng Lin, and the editor Norman K. Denzin for their comments on drafts of this article. The article is entirely the responsibility of the author.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Notes

1. Which Pickering (2002) believed could bring the “fundamental shift in how we think about what being in the world is like” (p. 414).

2. The practice of “not-eating-meat” can be traced back to 3200 B.C. (Vegetarian Society, 2002a, 2002b, 2000c, 2000d). However, we have to distinguish between people who do not eat meat because there is insufficient meat to consume and people who avoid eating meat although there is sufficient meat. In the former case, people adopt a practical, plant-based diet not because of a belief that not eating meat is a better thing but due to practical conditions. What makes the story even harder to tell is that, in the latter case, some people follow the plant-based diet only because

it is one part of their religious beliefs, whereas others choose to avoid eating meat for its own sake. Therefore, in this article, I try to prevent these pitfalls by narrating the story of the emergence of vegetarianism and focusing on the emergence of “modern” and “organized” vegetarianism.

3. As mentioned above, the website of Vegetarian Society UK collects historical data of its own development. Also, people can find articles that were written in mid-19th century from *Vegetarian Messenger* and *Vegetarian Advocates* (journals that were published by Vegetarian Society to propagandize the vegetarian ideology).

4. The International Vegetarian Union (IVU) was founded in 1908 to promote the vegetarian movement on a global scale. IVU’s website not only contains rich data for timelines of vegetarian history but also collects related academic materials.

5. Professor Francis William Newman was president of the Vegetarian Society from 1873 to 1884. This website contains letters, lectures, and articles of F. W. Newman, some of which touched on the issue of vegetarianism.

6. It was named after the founder (of the Bible Christian Church) William Cowherd. Cowherd opened his own chapel in 1807, and his congregation had to take a vow not to eat meat. For more discussion on the Bible Christian Church and William Cowherd, see Williams (1883), Twigg (1981), and Antrobus (1998).

7. In his lecture, Antrobus (1998) described William Cowherd as “that area’s most charismatic preacher.”

8. The emergence of modern vegetarianism is seen as an urban phenomenon by students such as Julia Twigg, Derek Antrobus (2002), and so on. The reason is that while the vegetarian movement appealed to some members in urban areas, efforts to promote the vegetarian diet in rural areas failed (Twigg, 1981; Vegetarian Society, 2002a, 2002b, 2000c, 2000d). I will discuss this in following sections.

9. These existing journals should be regarded as “boundary objects,” which are “a sort of arrangement that allow[s] different groups to work together without consensus” (Star, 2010, p. 602). People from different participating worlds may flexibly interpret and use these “boundary objects” to satisfy their own needs and, in the meantime, cooperate with the heterogeneous others through allowing ambiguity. Here, the existing journals were used to disseminate various messages and ideas through bypassing the boundary tensions.

10. Although frictions among vegetarian groups and figures were rarely mentioned, strategies such as publishing in journals and occupying positions in the Society were employed to compete for the power in the vegetarian movement (Forward, 1897; Twigg, 1981).

11. Members of the Vegetarian Society framed their discourse to encourage the adoption of the vegetarian diet and revealed that flesh was regarded as something polluted, dangerous, and bad: “When we take into account of the number of diseased animals sold in the market for human food, some of which actually die

under their disorders, it is not an improbable calculation that a tenth part of these diseases and deaths occur through the use of flesh as food" (Gammage, 1857, p. 5).

12. This conference (while was named "Physiological" Conference) was held not only to gather the vegetarians but also to discuss the formation of a vegetarian society (*Letters proposing a vegetarian society*, 1847).

13. The journal published by the Vegetarian Society.

14. In the *Vegetarian Messenger*, personal testimonies were provided to prove that a vegetarian diet can enable people to survive in the unhealthy working conditions (Twigg, 1981).

15. Antrobus (1998) maintained that the growth of socialism also took away the vegetarianism's working-class support.

16. For more discussion on the historical background of the teetotal movement see Harrison (1971).

17. Vegetarianism and teetotalism were established as movements within two decades of each other, and the former was a young movement compared with the latter (Gregory, 2007).

18. "The therapy's radicalism derived from the rejection of traditional allopathic treatment in favor of less traumatic healing through bathing, showering and drinking water" (Gregory, 2007, p. 73).

19. Among others, William Horsell (one of the leading figures of the modern vegetarianism) played an important role to "steer" the *Truth-Tester* toward promoting the Vegetarian Diet as well. As a result, the *Truth-Tester* soon became the focal point for vegetarians. For more discussion, see Davis (2006).

20. Here we see a "circle" of affinity of these packaged ideas: The more people regarded these ideas/"isms" as closely related, the tighter these ideas/"isms" were bundled together.

21. Professor Francis William Newman was president of the Vegetarian Society from 1873 to 1884, and he was a controversial person.

22. Although the threshold of becoming a member of the Vegetarian Society was not high, due to the decline of the vegetarian movement in late 1850s, the existing threshold of membership was regarded as not low enough.

23. Forward (1897) provided a table to show the increase in members, associates, and income after adopting the associate grade (p. 75).

24. Veganism refers to a lifestyle whose adherents seek to exclude the use or consumption of animal products of any kind (Marcus, 1998).

25. In the new vegetarianism, there still are affinities between ideas/reforms; for instance, many adherents of vegetarianism today are also supporters of animal liberation (Amato & Partridge, 1989). Issues such as factory farming are in the foreground. However, even so, we see a more exclusive boundary of the new vegetarianism than before; after all, it is not uncommon for vegetarians to claim that they adopt the vegetarian diet solely for their own health.

26. Newman pointed out that although outsiders usually regard a vegetarian diet as equal to an "egg-diet," various foodways coexisted under "vegetarianism." For example, some people only eat

raw food and other people only consume fruits. Moreover, at the early phase of vegetarianism, while some adherents avoided eating flesh of land animals and birds, they ate fish (Newman, 1874).

27. At least in the 1940s, there were conflicts and tensions between the vegans and the vegetarians. The relationships between them are now better; most lacto-vegetarians accept the logic of veganism, and many treat it as the ideal (Twigg, 1981).

28. Both discourses ("meat is bad" and "vegetable is good") now coexist in vegetarianism.

29. Therefore, although vegetarianism in Victorian England had a porous boundary, it had already excluded many ideas such as flesh-eating and smoking and chose to be affiliated with ideas such as teetotalism and antialcoholism.

## References

- Abbott, A. (1995). Things of boundaries: Defining the boundaries of social inquiry. *Social Research*, 62, 857-882.
- Address to vegetarians, and adjourned conference. (1848). *Healthian Journal*, 1, 19. Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/1847/conference2.html>
- Amato, P. R., & Partridge, S. A. (1989). *The new vegetarians: Promoting health and protecting life*. New York, NY: Plenum.
- Antrobus, D. (1998). *Roots of vegetarianism* (Talk to the Salford Local History Society). Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/history/england19a/roots.html>
- Antrobus, D. (1999). *Salford's first MP*. Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/history/england19a/salford.html>
- Antrobus, D. (2002). *Vegetarianism: Neither Phoenix nor fad*. Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/history/societies/vegsoc-origins.html>
- Ashworth, J. (1987). The relationship between capitalism and humanitarianism. *The American Historical Review*, 92, 813-828.
- Davis, J. (2006). *The origins of "vegetarians."* Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/history/societies/vegsoc-origins.html>
- Forward, C. W. (1897). *Fifty years of food reform: A history of the vegetarian movement in England*. London: The Ideal Publishing Union.
- Fox, T. (1999). *Marketing the message: The changing face of vegetarianism in the United Kingdom*. Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/congress/thai99/texts/market.html>
- Gammage, R. G. (1857). On the best methods of promoting stability and zeal in the vegetarian movement: With suggestions for removing hostility to the practice of vegetarianism. *Cowen Tracts*, pp. 3-18.
- Gregory, J. (2007). *Of Victorians and vegetarians: The vegetarian movement in nineteenth-century Britain*. New York, NY: Tauris Academic Studies.
- Harrison, B. (1971). *Drink and the Victorians: The temperance question in England 1815-1872*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Haskell, T. L. (1985). Capitalism and the origins of the humanitarian sensibility, part 1. *The American Historical Review*, 90, 339-361.

- Humphreys, B., & Fox, T. (1994). 100 years ago. *The Vegetarian*. Retrieved from [http://www.vegsoc.org/members/history/100ago\\_1.html](http://www.vegsoc.org/members/history/100ago_1.html)
- Humphreys, B., & Fox, T. (1994-1995). 100 years ago. *The Vegetarian*. Retrieved from [http://www.vegsoc.org/members/history/100ago\\_2.html](http://www.vegsoc.org/members/history/100ago_2.html)
- Lee, M. G. (1997). *150 years of vegetarianism*. Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/congress/euro97/150-years.html>
- Letters proposing a vegetarian society, Surrey/Kent, England, 1847: "Useful suggestions," from the *Truth-Tester* (1847, Vol. 1, p. 112) and "Physiological Conference," from the *Truth-Tester* (1847, Vol. 1, p. 121). (1847). Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/congress/1847/letters.html>
- Marcus, E. (1998). *Vegan: The new ethics of eating*. New York, NY: McBooks Press.
- Newman, F. W. (1874, October). Lectures and addresses. *Westminster Review*, 46, 500-514.
- Newman, F. W. (1883). *Essays on diet*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, & Co.
- Physiological Conference, July 1847, Surrey, England: "Physiological Conference", from the *Healthian Journal* (1847, Vol. 1, p. 140) and "The Late Conference," from the *Healthian Journal* (1848, Vol. 2, p. 8—actually from 1847). Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/congress/1847/conference1.html>
- Physiological/Vegetarian Conference, Surrey/Kent, England, 1847: "The Vegetarian Society" (objects of the society and rules of the society). (1847). *Healthian Journal*, 2, 41. Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/congress/1847/rules.html>
- Pickering, A. (1993). The mangle of practice: Agency and emergence in the sociology of science. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 99, 559-589.
- Pickering, A. (1995). *The mangle of practice: Time, agency, & science*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pickering, A. (2002). Cybernetics and the mangle: Ashby, Beer, and Pask. *Social Studies of Science*, 32, 413-437.
- Preece, R. (2008). *Sins of the flesh: A history of ethical vegetarian thought*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.
- Star, S. L. (2010). This is not a boundary object: Reflections on the origin of a concept. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 35, 601-617.
- Star, S. L., & Griesemer, J. R. (1989). Institutional ecology, "translations" and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39. *Social Studies of Science*, 19, 387-420.
- Teuteberg, H. J. (1975). The general relationship between diet and industrialization. In E. Foster & R. Forster (Eds.), *European diet from pre-industrial to modern times* (pp. 61-108). New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks.
- Twigg, J. (1981). *The vegetarian movement in England, 1847-1981: A study in the structure of its ideology* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/history/thesis/index.html>
- Vegetarian Society. (2002a). *Through the ages: General history of vegetarianism*. Retrieved from <http://www.vegsoc.org/news/2000/21cv/ages.html>
- Vegetarian Society. (2002b). *Society history: The origins of the Vegetarian Society*. Retrieved from <http://www.vegsoc.org/news/2000/21cv/history.html>
- Vegetarian Society. (2002c). *Read all about it: The story of the Vegetarian Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.vegsoc.org/news/2000/21cv/read.html>
- Vegetarian Society. (2002d). *History of vegetarianism*. Retrieved from <http://www.vegsoc.org/info/developm.html>
- Williams, H. (1883). *The ethics of diet*. Retrieved from <http://www.ivu.org/history/williams/index.html>

## Bio

**Hsin-Yi Yeh** is a PhD candidate of sociology at Rutgers University (New Brunswick). She is interested in political sociology, social movement, nationalism, cultural sociology, cognitive sociology, and collective memory.