

(b) *Arabia*. Dr. Young writes: "In its desire to be neutral and to save annoyance, the government (of Aden) appears at times to be even friendly to Islam. It seems to confirm the followers of Islam in their belief that all other religions are subservient to it.

"Government attitude largely depends on the Political Resident who may or may not be in sympathy with the work. I should like to see the government neutral in all matters of education. At present it pays a teacher in all its schools who does nothing but teach children how to recite and intone the Koran. They have a bad effect on the Koran reading children, who are apt to persecute their non-Moslem schoolfellows. If the government were firm in its attitude, any opposition at first engendered would quickly disappear."

(c) *Egypt*. We must remember here that Great Britain is not the *de jure* ruler of Egypt and this naturally and rightly makes a difference in her *de facto* attitude. She only advises a Moslem government—a ministry under an independent Moslem prince named the Khedive. Consequently she regards Moslem acts of the Moslem government as not her own acts.

I therefore pass over the vexed question of Sunday labour; it is admittedly a terribly difficult one, and is not made easier by the obvious indifference of many British officials about their duties towards God and the worship of His House. But the point in which Britain can fairly be severely criticized is in the matter of religious education. Here Britain is responsible, for she has the power to alter the present system.

Until a few years ago that system reached the very *ne plus ultra* of injustice. In the primary schools the Coptic boys who numbered on the average a quarter of the whole, and in some schools in Middle Egypt nearly a half, were allowed no religious instruction; while the