

that Mr. WAINWRIGHT, the District Commandant of Police in Jaffa where these Labour demonstrations were to take place, actually obtained leave to absent himself, and went off upon holiday to Gaza, the name of which, by the by, strikes us as somehow redolent of the official attitude that appears to have generally prevailed. When, on the 1st May, it was evident that the "Mopsis" intended to hold a meeting, the authorities determined to prevent their demonstration. They did it by sending an Arab policeman with a verbal decree suppressing the meeting to the "Mopsi" headquarters, a club. He found there fifty to seventy persons assembled, but, for reasons that do not appear, confined his remarks to a well-dressed woman who appeared to him to be the only person in authority present. Whether the well-dressed woman conveyed the prohibition to the fifty or seventy persons who were assembled there, we are not told. Nor are we told why the Arab policeman did not convey his orders to the fifty or seventy people in the club. He evidently, however, concluded that the order was not going to be obeyed, and he therefore took the precaution of actually getting as many as one sergeant, one mounted man, and the enormous force of eleven foot policemen to preserve order. They awaited events and the demonstration, but both had gone "agley." For the demonstration had given the slip to the gigantic police force and were quietly holding their meeting somewhere else! This seems to have perturbed the police because, when these "Mopsi" demonstrators were making their way towards Tel-Aviv and apparently without any disorder, they were fallen upon by the police who actually captured among other things a brush and a pot of red paint, although—let us hasten to add because we do not wish to be unfair to these policemen—these damning "exhibits"—it was *red* paint remember—had been dropped by the demonstrators. The "Mopsi" demonstration, however, seems to have been shepherded by the police right into the path of a regular Labour demonstration which was holding a meeting at the same time by the leave of the authorities, who, however, had at first attempted to impose upon it some very ridiculous restrictions, and when the two demonstrations met they appear to have met somewhat violently. Indeed, there was a collision; and, as the report says, from this time onward it is not easy to follow the precise sequence of events.

But what is easy to follow is that at a psychological moment the Arabs swooped down, and, armed with sticks, began their assault upon the Jews. This, be it noted, was as the report shows, after the dispute between the Jewish Labour Party and the "Mopsis" was at an end. But then everybody seems to have lost his head, and shots were fired by a curious coincidence, by the order of Mr. ATKINS! This seems to have frightened the Arabs even more than the immigration of Jews, and to have exacerbated them infinitely more than the JEWISH CHRONICLE. And so they proceeded to an onslaught upon Jews of the greatest violence. But it is impossible, however, even by closely studying the report, to get any sequential story out of the chaos that became rampant. As we say, everybody seems to have lost his head. The Arab police joined the Arab hooligans. There was no attempt to separate disturbers of the peace from those who were orderly, but only to bundle Arabs on one side, Jews on the other, and sub-divide the latter apparently into regular Labour Party men and "Mopsis"—everybody lost his head, except—let us give credit where credit is due—everyone except the Arab Inspector of Police, and he went home to lunch!

No wonder the Commission confesses that, with few exceptions, the police were half-trained and inefficient, and in many cases indifferent. For our part, it occurs to us that the police, in this matter anyhow, did not palpably misrepresent the Palestine authorities in general. With such a handling of what was initially such a trumpery matter, that the police of any country would have faithfully dealt with it by preventing it, and if they failed in that, would, in a few minutes, have put an end to it, it is really beyond the ridiculous to try and seek elsewhere for the cause of the disaster. But we confess that the attempt to do so is merely consistent with the whole story of the Jaffa riots. That with such a record of incompetence, inefficiency, and muddle as this Report reveals, the Commission should think that any sensible people are going to be blinded to the real origin of the trouble which they were appointed to enquire into, by their altogether superfluous, if not wholly gratuitous observations concerning Jewish sentiment and Zionist aspirations, renders the Report the astonishing document it is.

It is not surprising that Mr. WINSTON CHURCHILL, in acknowledging the Report, commends to the High Commissioner a "revision in the light of the lessons learnt in the cause of the outbreak" of the rules and regulations, together with other measures suggested by Sir HERBERT SAMUEL affecting police and military action in Palestine. There can be little doubt that to this measure has to be attributed the fact that the *emeute* in Jerusalem a few days ago was not in its results nearly serious than it was.

Mr. Montefiore's "Nineteenth Century" Article.

WITHOUT entering into details of the argument which Mr. CHARLES MONTEFIORE employs in the article by him, published in the current issue of the *Nineteenth Century*, we are bound to say it appears to us that our contributor "MENTOR" in his caustic last week made an unanswerable plea in the reference to the subject. He asked, and he is supported by some correspondents who address us this week, that Mr. MONTEFIORE's exposition as to the Jewish attitude towards the Old Testament should not be allowed to go unchallenged. It is quite true that Mr. MONTEFIORE is careful to say that "Orthodox" Jews hold a different view of the Bible from his. But he dismisses these "Orthodox" Jews as if they were some small sect like, say, "Liberal" Jews, and disdainfully remarks that their opinion is of no consequence outside their own circle. Of course, this is ridiculous. It is a conclusion that could be come to only by one who, like Mr. MONTEFIORE, is either obsessed with his own interpretation of Judaism, or looks upon matters religious with blinkers. In any case, he makes it appear as if "Orthodox" Jews are still grovelling in most barbarous beliefs, and still cling to an almost savage idea of Religion in general and of the God-head in particular. And it is undoubted that the words of a man like Mr. MONTEFIORE will be taken—he will pardon us the expression—for gospel outside the community and by the readers of the *Nineteenth Century*, many, if not most, of whom are utterly unacquainted with Jews and Judaism and know little about it, save the too often prejudiced interpretation which is rendered to them. Nor must it be ignored that the particular magazine which Mr. MONTEFIORE chose for his Biblical excursus is one that is largely identified with the High Church, if not the Roman Catholic, section of the country. To ask that Mr. MONTEFIORE's misrepresentation of the Jewish view—for his article amounts to no less than that—should be corrected seems to us but reasonable, and palpably the CHIEF RABBI is for many reasons, but principally because of the office which he holds, the obvious person upon whom devolves the duty of answering Mr. MONTEFIORE in the pages of the review in which the impugned article appeared. This is no question of heresy hunting. Mr. MONTEFIORE has a perfect right, indeed, it is his duty to express his opinion in regard to the Old Testament (or in regard to anything else for that matter) with perfect freedom, and to offer his views as he conscientiously holds them. But others who hold a contrary opinion have an equal duty not to let go by default what Mr. MONTEFIORE says, as if it were, in fact, what he represents it to be. We imagine that Dr. HERTZ will eagerly grasp this opportunity of defending the *Torah* from the grave assault which Mr. MONTEFIORE has felt it right to deal the sacred heritage of our people, and of placing Judaism, as understood by the vast majority of its adherents, in a far less sinister light than that in which Mr. MONTEFIORE has pictured it.

In Aid of Education.

THE Society, the purpose of which is to assist in the education of those who give promise of success in what are termed the higher walks of life comprised in the professions, is appealing to the community for funds. In another column will be found a description drawn from the annual report of the Society's activities, and there is no gainsaying its usefulness or its permanent value to the community. Nor are Jews likely to turn a deaf ear to the calls of education, even those constituting Anglo-Jewry, which it is regrettable to have to say, has not been distinguished at any time for its enthusiasm in the cause. We sincerely hope that the Society will get the money it is asking for, and thus be enabled to carry on the good work it is doing. We have but this reservation in mind as we commend this appeal to our readers: are there not even more insistent urgent claims unfulfilled, those of the Board of Guardians for instance? In regard to that institution an esteemed correspondent, with no small influence in matters Communal, suggests in another column (writing under a *non de plume* that betokens much more clarity than the affairs of the Board and its consequent position exhibit) that the support by the Community of its own poor is redundant, and that Jews, like others who fall by the way of life, should be relegated to the Poor Law and the Workhouse. It is impossible to believe that this view would be taken, much less enunciated in public, had the Community done its sheer duty to the claims of the Board. The precedent our correspondent cites of the education of the poor is, of course, all against his argument; because it is notorious that since denominational education was ruled out of Jewish duty, the vast proportion of out