

mans then invited the Roman Catholics to occupy, who did so.

“In German East Africa for some years we have had clear signs of the very favourable attitude of government towards mission work. Under Count von Götzen’s rule the missionaries and their work were set at high value and much encouragement was given all round.”

The Bishop adds that the German government, while showing no partiality, makes it clear that it does not regard the Christian religion as one of many, but as the one religion which it can recognize as paramount and unique, and that it values Christian education for its local officials. “And this,” says the Bishop, “is what should be.”

*Under Great Britain :*

Great Britain as such has no attitude towards Islam. Clearly the British colonial and foreign offices profess no one principle that guides them in all their dealings with the Moslem peoples in the many parts of the world where the Union Jack flies among Mohammedan peoples. Everything depends on the attitude of the local government and that varies strangely, as we shall now see.

(a) *India.* I have no special report from this country, but have no reason to believe that there is anything in the attitude of the Indian government that calls for serious protest. The present political situation makes Indian Moslems very markedly loyal to Great Britain, and this fact no doubt makes the Indian government very willing to avoid offending Moslems. But as far as I am aware the same liberties are given to missionaries to work among Moslems as among Hindus. The trouble seems to be rather that our missions have not fully availed themselves and still do not avail themselves of the liberties that actually exist.