

Mrs. Samuel Wertheimer, of Washington, D. C., who enjoyed a most pleasant stay in our city as the guest of her uncle, Mr. G. Oppenheimer, has returned home.

Miss Florence Leopold, of Philadelphia, is having a most pleasant time in our city visiting her friend, Miss Senora Kadden.

Mrs. M. Reinach has left for Baltimore to visit relatives and friends.

Miss Helen Eigenbrun has gone to Tarboro, N. C., to attend the Kaufman-Morris marriage which will take place on the 17th instant.

#### VIRGINIA.

##### Staunton, Va.

Mr. Joseph Barth has recovered from a serious attack of la grippe, and is again at his place of business.

Misses Rosetta and Minnie Cohen, spent the Christmas holidays in Harrisonburg with their aunt, Mrs. Dora Switzer, formerly of this place. They returned home Wednesday.

Mr. Samuel Rosenbaum and Miss Belle Powers, were married in Baltimore on last Tuesday by Rabbi Tobias Schonfarber. Miss Powers became Jewish before entering into the bonds of matrimony.

Miss Lillie Heller, of Harrisonburg, who spent a week with Miss Hart, has returned home much to the regret of her many friends here.

##### Switzerland's Infamy.

In reading over the amendment accepted last August, prohibiting any animal to be slaughtered without being stunned by a sharp blow to deprive it of consciousness, probably only those well versed in the undercurrents of European politics of the hour will suspect the true nature of the movement that led up to its proposal and acceptance. Anti-Semitism is every day taking on new forms, but nowhere has it found a neater chance to give vent to its absurd fanaticism than here. The movement originated in the cantons of Berne and Aargau, where Jewish colonies formerly were permitted to slaughter animals according to the mode prescribed by their religion, by cutting the arteries at the throat and bleeding the animal to death. It seems that this mode of slaughter attracted the attention of the Society for the Protection of Animals—a rather powerful organization throughout Switzerland—which proclaimed it more cruel than methods in vogue among the Christians. The anti-Jewish feeling, already strong, was not slow to accept this idea, and sufficient pleasure was brought to bear upon the cantonal governments of Bern and Aargau to secure the prohibition of the Jewish practice. The Society for the Protection of Animals then endeavored to have similar laws passed in other cantons. The Jews organized themselves and petitioned the Federal Council, claiming that such legislation was unconstitutional, since their mode of slaughter was a part of their religious belief, and Article 50 of the Constitution guaranteed all persons religious liberty. The Federal Council thereupon undertook the examination of the two fundamental questions at issue: (1) Is the Jewish mode of slaughter an integral part of their religion? and (2) if so, does it harmonize with the gene-

ral standard of public good and morals under which the guarantee of religious liberty must be construed? Ample testimony was taken on both points from the ablest specialists. The first point was decided in the affirmative, and the second which covered the question of cruelty was likewise decided in favor of the Jews, with an almost unanimous recommendation for the adoption of the Jewish mode on grounds of public health and expediency. Such authorities as Prof. Virchow, of Berlin, Herzen, Vogt, Guillebeau, and Hess, of Bern, the Director of the Veterinary Institute of Leipsig, the Secretary of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and the majority of a Russian commission of seven specialists, all testified that the Jewish mode was less objectionable than any of the others, though the reflex movements of the muscles, after consciousness has left the animal, are painful to witness, and have thus given rise to the belief that this method is cruel. The Council was, therefore, compelled to report the Jewish petition favorably to the Assembly, and that body sustained it in both houses by a law declaring the cantonal restrictions and prohibitions to be null and void.

The next step for the Anti-Semites was an easy one, viz, to amend the Constitution. They aroused the anti-Jewish feeling, and circulated a petition for a constitutional amendment, which soon received 83,000 signatures of which number the three German cantons, Zurich, Bern, Aargau, furnished over 64,000, and the French-speaking cantons only 2,500. A strong agitation pro and con ensued. In the affirmative was arrayed the Anti-Semitic organizations and the friends of Society for the Protection of Animals; in the negative the leading journals and the most enlightened public sentiment in all those cantons where Jewish colonies were not yet influential enough to arouse jealousy and hatred. Except in these latter cantons, the vote polled on election day was light. As now officially announced, it stands 191,527 for the amendment and 127,101 against. Less than half of the voting strength was brought out, yet not one French speaking canton voted in the affirmative. In view of the fact that the vote of the States or cantons gave only one majority, we may say that the vote in the smallest of the cantons, Zug, which cast only 1,300 votes, and gave an affirmative majority of less than 400 votes, decided this important change in the Swiss Constitution. The whole question, however, has not sufficiently touched the pockets of the people to arouse much indignation at this the first use to be made of the "people's initiative." The time will doubtless come when a sufficiently flagrant abuse of this power will arouse the Swiss nation to a consciousness of its mistake, and lead to a reconstruction period in its constitutional history.—*Samuel M. Lindsay, in The Nation.*

It is stated, and on good authority, that the average pay of all the preachers in the United States is \$500 per year.

The Rev. W. Scott Mason, who ought to know, says that it is right to make the plural of Mussulman, Mussulmans, but that Moslem and Moslems are much better and more correct.

##### Jewish Sensitiveness.

We not infrequently hear the term "the thin-skinned Jew." An English gentleman who spent many years among the Jews of eastern Europe, in a recent address, very aptly compared Jewish nature to the sensitive plant. He said: "You can win a Jew with a look and repel him with a handshake, however paradoxical the latter may seem." This opinion is perfectly true, for the nature of the Jew has been so bruised by centuries of suffering that it quivers with pain at the slightest evidence of ill will and throbs with joy at the merest token of kind feeling on the part of a stranger to his faith.

The Jews may be well described as the people of the wounded hearts. For centuries, in book and in play, in story and in song, they were held up to ridicule, reproach and scorn, with but little chance of self-defence from scurrilous attack. Anti-Jewish prejudices confronted them at almost every stage of their career, which required the force of genius in the individual to overcome. To-day a similar feeling exists toward them in some countries, and is alive in the hearts of individuals in our own fair land. They are sorry students of human nature who assume there is no bitterness in the present social position of a loyal-hearted Hebrew.

It is sometimes asserted that the Jew brings much of the odium of prejudices upon himself. Yet viewing the history of the race dispassionately, and judging as between man and man or nation and nation, this would appear, to a large extent, an unjust criticism. Prejudice between nations is almost universal. It exists between the Chinese and Japanese, between the French and German, and even, sometimes, between the English and Americans. But whereas these latter prejudices inflict a national sting wherefrom much of the poison has been withdrawn in the knowledge of a national independence, prejudice toward the Jew inflicts a sting wherein the poison remains, because the loyal-hearted son of Judah remembers he is an exile from the land of his fathers, and is regarded as an alien in almost every country where he is located.

In one respect this prejudice is especially cruel, as affecting little children. For too often their innocent young hearts are wounded during their school days by the unkind remarks of their fellow scholars, thereby destroying, for the more sensitive, much of the sweetness of childhood. They are often too young to realize the solace derived from a knowledge of their noble ancestry, which comes in latter years to every true-hearted Jew.

Although it is manifest that the Jew is supersensitive in some respects, still we sympathize with his feelings, knowing that they are the outcome of an inheritance of suffering. And we rejoice in the privilege of offering words of brotherly kindness to those who are unduly afflicted and unjustly condemned.—*New York Mail and Express.*

Pious Russians do not eat pigeons because of the sanctity conferred on the dove in the Scriptures.

Subscribe to THE JEWISH SOUTH, only one dollar a year.