



STANDARD THEATRE.

"Monte Carlo to Japan" was played for the last time on Wednesday night and last (Thursday) night after this issue had gone to press. John Tiller and his company produced for the first time in Johannesburg a delightful musical comedy entitled "The Girls of Granada," a show that has caused sensation after sensation in the old country. A very original plot runs through the piece. All the scenes are laid in Spain, and the scenery and dresses which are all new are of delightful and exquisite design. "The Sunshine Girls" "Merry Mites" and Len Wallis precede this delightful entertainment in new songs and dances, as performed at the Palace Theatre, London. The parts are said to be well suited to Miss Beatrice Allen as Don Carlos, Miss Nan Chester as Carmina, Miss Gladys Sybel as Palma, Miss Kitty Storrow as Lola and Miss Georgina Fisher as Ramon, whilst the funny men are Fred Wolgast, Reg London, Eddie Jaye and Billy Rex, the part of the daring Bomboso is reported to be excellently played by Cyril Dowley. Plans are now open at the Standard Theatre.

Johannesburg Hebrew Congregation.

Holiday Seats in Park Synagogue.

The Seating Committee will be in attendance, in the Committee Room of the Park Synagogue, (Smit Street entrance, between Claim and Quartz Streets) for the purpose of allotting Seats for the ensuing High Festivals, on the following days:—

Sundays, the 30th August, 6th and 13th September, from 10.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m.

Monday, the 14th September from 8 to 10 p.m.

Tuesdays, the 25th August, 8th and 15th September, from 8 to 10 p.m.

Wednesday, the 16th September from 8 to 10 p.m.

Thursdays, the 3rd., 10th and 17th September, from 8 to 10 p.m.

Saturday, the 19th September, from 8 to 10 p.m.; and Sunday, the 20th September, all day.

By Order

HERMAN BARANOV.

Secretary.

Read the "South African Jewish Chronicle."

Jewish Method of Slaughtering not Cruel.

By Prof. Louis Ginzburg.*

It gives me great pleasure to extend to the American Humane Association the greetings from the oldest association for the prevention of cruelty to Animals in existence—the Jewish people. Speaking as a Jew and for the Jews, I may well point with pride to the fact that, more than three-thousand years ago, our great Lawgiver, Moses, taught us our duties not only towards God and our fellowmen, but also towards the "little brethren of men." The fourth commandment includes the beast of burden in the humane institution of the Sabbath. A still more characteristic expression of feeling for animals is the Biblical Law that forbids the muzzling of the ox while treading out the grain. But the highest degree of tenderness and sympathy with brute-life is implied in the Biblical injunctions which recognize and guard the relation of the mother-animal to its off-spring; a nest may not be robbed from the dam and the fledgling-birds at one time. A cow or ewe and her young must not be slaughtered on the same day. And three times the Mosaic Law warns against seething a kid in the mother's milk.

The humane attitude towards animals is apparent at all times in the Jewish law, from the Bible down to the emphatic Talmudic prohibition against cruelty to animals. It is true, Judaism knows no such institutions as societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals. But the reason for it is that they were made superfluous by the stringency of the law. The rabbis would not even permit to have pain caused to animals for the purpose of obtaining medical remedies. Except as a measure of self-defence, the chase is unthinkable to the Jewish mind. The rabbis not only developed the laws against cruelty to animals, but also enjoined kindness to them. The principal doctrine of Judaism is described by an author who lived about a century before the rise of Christianity in the following words:

"Keep the commands of the Lord have compassion towards all, no; towards men only, but also towards beasts."

In this spirit it is that the rabbis taught that animals must be first fed before sitting down to a meal. There is little to wonder therefore, at the following entry in the diary of a famous Jewish mystic, of the Sixteenth Century which reads:

"It is man's duty to love everybody whether man or animal."

I hope that these few remarks on the attitude of Jewish Law towards the treatment of animals are not out of place in considering the question of the Jewish methods of slaughtering called Schechita. Whether this divine commandment has its reason in the

prevention of pain to the animals or not, nobody can tell. Obedience to Divine Will is the first requisite of the Jewish religion, irrespective of whether we know the reason for it or not, but, as a working hypothesis, we readily assume the law of Schechita had its reason in the prevention to cruelty to animals. It may well be said, without hesitation, that those who are entitled, on account of their theoretical and practical knowledge to speak authoritatively on this question are of the opinion that Schechita is one of the least painful forms of death. I have just now before me a book in which the opinions of no less than fifty professors of physiology, pathology, hygiene at the leading universities of Germany, France, England, Italy, Holland, Austria and Denmark, and of three-hundred veterinarians are recorded in favour of the Jewish method of slaughtering. If among the authorities favoring Schechita are men like Du Bois-Reymond, Golz, Engleman, Hoppe-Seyler, Forster, Van Pettenkofer, Lister, Virchow, Laborde, Richet, Chauveau Danmann and many others who may be described as the fathers of modern medicine, physiology, pathology and veterinary art, it is difficult to understand how it is still possible to question the humaneness of the Schechita. It is true, in some parts of Germany the agitation against the Schechita is still carried on, but, of course, everybody knows that the power behind this movement is not love for the animals but hatred against the Jews. The German Government whom nobody would accuse of being biased in favor of the Jews, knowing the real source of agitation against the Schechita refused to comply with the wishes of the anti-Semitic agitators. The Director of the Military equipment bureau of the German army, General von Gemmingen, declared at an open sitting of the Diet, that the slaughter houses of the government at Mainz, where the cattle for the use of the army are slaughtered, the Jewish method of killing is in vogue. He gave the following two reasons why the Government preferred the Schechita: First, because the Schechita was declared the least painful mode of slaughtering by the medical board appointed by the government to investigate the different forms of slaughtering which counts among its members men like Virchow, Olshausen, von-Bardeleben, von Leyden, to mention only a few. Secondly, because the soup prepared from the meat of cattle slaughtered according to the Jewish law contains less blood corpuscles than the soup prepared from the meat of cattle slaughtered differently. Yielding to the anti-Semitic outcry against Schechita, the government has discontinued the use of it, but not without declaring officially that it still adheres to the view that the Schechita, even without stunning the animal before it, is not cruel.

I mention these facts because in a pamphlet lately published for the special benefit of the Humane Society of the United States, much space is given to disprove the statement made by the friends of the Schechita that meat for the German army was from animals slaughtered according to the Jewish law. The author might have

*A statement read by Prof. Louis Ginzburg, of the Jewish Theological Seminary, before the American Humane Society, at its thirty-seventh annual meeting held at Rochester, N. Y.