It is not surprising that Mr. Winston Churchill, after acknowledging the Report, commends to the High Commissioner a "revision of the light of the lessons learned from the cause of the outburst" and urges the enactment of regulations, together with measures suggested by Sir Herbert Samuel affecting police and military action in Palestine. There can be but little doubt that to this measure has to be attributed the fact that the rioting in Jerusalem a few days ago was not in its results more serious than it was.

Mr. Montefiore's "Nineteenth Century" Article.

In entering into details of the argument which Mr. 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 "MINTON" in his caustic exposé has made an unanswerable plea in the reference to the subject. His argument is supported by some strong and well-considered facts. 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 similar view of the Bible to himself. 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 by only one who, like Mr. Montefiore, is without any reverence for the interpretation of the Bible. If any man, in the opinion of Mr. Montefiore, is to be dealt with in a similar way, it is not a question of reverence for the Bible or any interpretation which is rendered to it. Nor must it be ignored that the particular magazine which Mr. Montefiore chose for his Biblical exxurbs is one that is largely identified with the High Church, if not with the Roman Catholic, section of the country. To ask Mr. Montefiore to lend a sympathetic ear to his argument from a 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 it is left to answer and dispel Mr. Montefiore's charge. 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 (as 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 right 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 this opportunity will have been grasped by the person in question. In the charge 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 the following is a description drawn from the annual report of the Society's activities, and there is no gain saying its usefulness or its permanent value to the community. Nor are Jews likely to turn a deaf ear to the call of education, even those constituting Anglo-Jewry, who are most amenable to this appeal, and who have not yet recognized the need of learning at an early age. It is a need which they have been accustomed to meet with the help 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 pseudonym that it behooves much more clearly than it has hitherto done) that the affairs of the Board (and its communally-appointed director) must be under the support of the Community. That is its own poor is redundant, and that Jews, like others who fall by the wayside, 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 share duty to the claimants 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 our