

Comparative Education

Nicholas Hans

COMPARATI EDUCATION

A Study of Educational Factors
and Traditions

by

NICHOLAS HANS

Ph.D., D.Litt.

ROUTLEDGE & KEGAN PAUL

LONDON, BOSTON, MELBOURNE AND HENLEY

First published in 1949
Second edition 1950
Reprinted twice
Third edition (revised) 1958
Reprinted 1961 and 1964

Published as a Routledge paperback 1967
by Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited
39 Store Street
London. WC1E 7DD,
9 Park Street
Boston, Mass., 02108 USA,
296 Beaconsfield Parade
Middle Park, Melbourne
3206, Australia and
Broadway House, Newtown Road
Henley-on-Thames
Oxon. RG9 1EN
Reprinted 1971, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1980 and 1982

Printed in Great Britain by
Unwin Brothers Limited
The Gresham Press, Old Woking, Surrey
A member of the Staples Printing Group

No part of this book may be reproduced
in any form without permission from
the publisher, except for the quotation
of brief passages in criticism

ISBN 0 7100 3266 8 (c)
ISBN 0 7100 4668 5 (p)

PREFACE

The following book is based on the courses of lectures delivered in 1945-7 at King's College and the Institute of Education, University of London. It is a composite of two separate courses: for the Teachers' Diploma students and for the M.A. students. The first course included an abridged exposition of factors and traditions and the description of educational systems of America, France and Russia. The course for the M.A. students forms the first twelve chapters of the book. The chapter on England was added for foreign readers. Some of the material was written by the author before the war for various volumes of the *Year Book of Education*, published by Evans Brothers in association with the Institute of Education. The author is indebted to the publishers for the permission of incorporating some parts *in extenso* in Chapters VI, VII and VIII. The book is intended as a text-book for the present and future students of University Education Departments. Whilst it is sufficient for the examination requirements of the University of London for the Teachers' Diploma students, it forms but a part of a two years' course, which is delivered at the Institute of Education by Professor J. Lauwerys in conjunction with the author for the M.A. students. The latter are expected to extend the course by supplementary reading and special study of some particular country.

Although writing primarily for intending and actual teachers, the author had the general reading public in mind and treated the material accordingly. Educational reforms since the first World War are so intimately connected with politics, with problems of race, nationality, language and religious and social ideals, that they ceased to be of narrow professional significance and have become a matter of general interest as the main problem of democratic government. This book is an attempt to combine the two purposes: an academic text-book and a general introduction into Comparative Education as a study of contemporary solutions in various democratic countries. The present division of Europe into Western and Eastern halves may be better understood and surmounted if the origins and conditions of the actual divergence are studied on a historical background of educational

traditions. The author, therefore, expresses the hope that besides his students, the book will find readers among the general public.

The author is greatly indebted to his colleague, P. P. Brown, of King's College, for reading through the manuscript and supplying many valuable suggestions.

The author must also gratefully remember the late Professor Karl Mannheim, who suggested the inclusion of this book in the International Library, of which he was the Editor.

N. HANS

King's College, London
November 1947

NOTE. The present revised edition has substituted all out-dated figures in facts by the newest available information, especially in England, France and U.S.S.R. A Portuguese edition is being published in Brazil with two additional chapters on "Latin America" by the author and on "Comparative Education in Brazil" by Dr. A. Texeira.

N. H.

September 1958

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	ix
 CHAPTER	
I. DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF COMPARATIVE EDUCATION	1
First pioneers of Comparative Education. Other comparative studies. Statistical approach. Psychological approach. Historical approach. National traditions and the definition of a nation. Short survey of contents.	
 PART I NATURAL FACTORS	
II. THE RACIAL FACTOR	17
Definition of a race. Heredity. Racial problems in education. Educational policy in British dependencies. Policy of the French Empire. Racial problem in Latin America. Education of Maoris in New Zealand. Racial entanglement in South Africa. Intelligence of the Black Africans. Negro education in the U.S.A.	
III. THE LINGUISTIC FACTOR	40
Language as repository of racial and national experience. Language as medium of instruction. Imposition of a foreign language and its results. Various linguistic groups. Bilingualism in Belgium. Bilingualism in South Africa. Four languages in Switzerland. Two languages in Canada. The revival of Irish. Bilingualism in Wales. The solution of linguistic problems in the U.S.S.R. Two national languages in Norway. The linguistic problem of China.	
IV. GEOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC FACTORS	63
The influence of climate and geography. The case of Australia. History and Geography as factors in the U.S.A. and Canada. Economic factors. Industrial revolution in England and gradual adaptation of education to new conditions. Russia before the Soviet Revolution. Socialist and industrial reconstruction and rapid adaptation of the educational system. Educational Finances. Equalisation of burdens. The English system.	
 PART II RELIGIOUS FACTORS	
V. RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS OF EUROPE	85
East and West. Three religious traditions in Europe. Catholicism. Protestantism. Eastern Orthodoxy. Catholic medieval tradition in education. Lutheran tradition in Germany and Scandinavia. Byzantine tradition in the south-east of Europe. The Slavonic Church. The Russian Orthodox Church. The influence of Islam. Comparison of different parts of Europe by religious traditions.	

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. THE CATHOLIC TRADITION	106
The struggle with Protestantism and differentiation of Catholic policy. The Society of Jesus. The Jansenists: Oratoire and Port Royal. De la Salle and the Christian Brothers. Inquisition and the Jesuits in Spain. Latin America. Catholics in Protestant countries. Separate Catholic school systems in the English-speaking countries. Catholic Church in Ireland and Quebec, Canada. Catholics in the British Dominions and the U.S.A. Ultramontaniam.	
VII. THE ANGLICAN TRADITION	129
The intermediate position of the Church of England. The class policy of the Church. Schools for the élite and schools for the poor. The Evangelicals and the High Church Party. Christian Socialism. The Great Public Schools. Anglican Churches in Scotland and Ireland. The policy of the Church in Canada and other Dominions. Episcopalian Church in America.	
VIII. THE PURITAN TRADITION	151
Calvinism in Switzerland. Two traditions within the Calvinist communities. The Huguenots in France. Arminians and Precisians in Holland. Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists in England. Dissenting Academies. Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The scheme of John Knox. Calvinism in the Dominions. The Puritans of America. Theocracy in Massachusetts and freedom in Rhode Island. Gradual change from orthodoxy to liberalism.	
PART III SECULAR FACTORS	
IX. HUMANISM	174
Broad and narrow meaning of Humanism. The causes of Humanism in Italy. Platonic Academies. Bacon and Descartes. English Deism. John Comenius. Rosicrucians and Freemasons in England. Private Academies of the eighteenth century. The French Enlightenment. The struggle with the Church of Rome. American Humanism. Franklin and Jefferson. The French Revolution. Pestalozzi and Froebel. Scientific movement in England. John Dewey.	
X. SOCIALISM	195
Socialism of Plato. Sir Thomas Moore. Rousseau, Condorcet and Pestalozzi as precursors of Socialism. Utopian Socialists, Saint Simon, R. Owen and Cabet. Scientific Socialists, Marx, Engels, Bebel and Lenin. Idealistic Socialists. P. Natorp. The British Socialists. Socialist education in the U.S.S.R.; Mexico; Bulgaria and Yugoslavia.	

CHAPTER	PAGE
XI. NATIONALISM	215
Humanistic nationalism. Fichte in Germany. Mazzini in Italy. Pan Slavism. The Czech "Awakeners." Palacky. The quarrel of nationalities after 1848. Fascism in Italy. Gentile and Bottai. National-Socialism in Germany. Blood and Soil. Hitler's ideal. Pan Slavism after the War.	
XII. DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION	235
Definition of democracy. Political and Social Democracy. The Western and Eastern European interpretations and their limitations. The equality of educational opportunities in the West and the East. The State and the Church. Monopoly and the Dual system. Tolerance and political indoctrination. Educational Highway. Education of Women.	
PART IV EDUCATION IN FOUR DEMOCRACIES	
XIII. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF ENGLAND	254
Education Act 1944. Central and Local administration. The Primary stage. The differentiation of Secondary Education. Technical Education. Public Schools. Universities. Adult Education. Religious difficulty.	
XIV. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE U.S.A.	273
Federal, State and local educational authorities. Inequality of opportunities. Primary Schools. Secondary and Technical Schools. Senior High School and Junior College. Private agencies. Universities. Adult Education.	
XV. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF FRANCE	290
Centralisation of administration. Independent Catholic system. <i>L'École unique</i> . Primary education. Secondary and Technical education. <i>Culture générale</i> . Universities. Regionalism. Post-war reforms.	
XVI. THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE U.S.S.R.	308
Federal, Republican and local authorities. Pre-School education. Primary Schools. Secondary education. Technical and industrial education. Higher Institutions. New tendencies. Return to "culture."	
CONCLUSION	324
BIBLIOGRAPHY	326
INDEX	329

CHAPTER I

DEFINITION AND SCOPE OF COMPARATIVE EDUCATION

It is only quite recently that Comparative Education has been admitted as a subject of academic studies. It is generally recognised now that intending teachers and educational administrators should have some knowledge of foreign educational systems and their comparative merits. In some Universities Comparative Education is even included in the requirements for Teacher's Diploma qualifications. However, there is no general agreement as to what Comparative Education comprises or exactly what methods should be used in its study. The first comprehensive scheme of comparative study of educational systems was devised by Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris in 1817. In his *L'Esquisse et vues préliminaires d'un ouvrage sur l'Éducation Comparée*, Jullien quite clearly formulated the purposes and methods of comparative study of education. He envisaged an "analytical" study of education in all countries with a view to perfecting national systems with modifications and changes "which the circumstances and local conditions would demand." He said:

Education, as other sciences, is based on facts and observations, which should be ranged in analytical tables, easily compared, in order to deduce principles and definite rules. Education should become a positive science instead of being ruled by narrow and limited opinions, by whims and arbitrary decisions of administrators, to be turned away from the direct line which it should follow, either by the prejudice of a blind routine or by the spirit of some system and innovation.

However, his detailed scheme of comparative enquiry remained unknown and was rediscovered only in the twentieth century.¹ Historically the beginnings of Comparative Education were not even comparative and were confined to description and information on education in foreign countries.

Reports on foreign schools and school methods abounded in the nineteenth century. Perhaps the first study of that kind was the two volumes of Professor John Griscom, of New York City, who after his return from Europe issued the results of his observa-

¹ See P. Rossello, *Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris*, Geneva, 1943.

tions on educational institutions in Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Italy and Holland under the title of *A Year in Europe*, published in 1818-19. It had great influence on the development of American education. In 1831 Victor Cousin, Professor of Philosophy, by direction of the French Minister of Public Instruction visited Prussia and published his famous *Report on the State of Public Instruction in Prussia*. It was translated into English and influenced education not only in France, but in both England and America. But it was a straightforward description of the Prussian system and any conclusions on the comparative value of the system had to be made by the reader himself by comparing it with that of his own country. The pioneer of the American Common School revival, Horace Mann, after a six months' visit to Europe embodied his observations in his Seventh Report, 1843, and in it compared education in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany and Holland, and incidentally put England at the foot of the list. This report, perhaps, was the first attempt at assessing educational values, but it was almost entirely devoted to comparison of school organisation and methods of instruction.

In this country the pioneer of Comparative Education was Matthew Arnold who, after visiting France and Germany in 1859 and 1865, made some caustic remarks on the differences in national character. More important were the *Special Reports on Educational Subjects* (1898-1911), published by the Board of Education and edited by Sir Michael Sadler. They followed the practice of giving detailed information on foreign systems established earlier by Henry Barnard in his thirty-one volumes of *The American Journal of Education*, 1856-81. On the same lines were the many valuable publications of the United States Bureau of Education from 1868 onwards. The twentieth century saw the culmination of these studies in P. Monroe's *Cyclopedia of Education* (five volumes, 1911-13), Foster Watson's *Encyclopedia and Dictionary of Education* (four volumes, 1921-2), Kandel's *Educational Yearbook of the International Institute*, 1925-44, the *Year Book of Education*, started by Lord Eustace Percy in 1932, and many other publications in English and foreign languages. However valuable was the information on foreign systems contained in these publications, the main purpose was the utilitarian use applied for the reform of education at home. The principles underlying the development of national systems were not yet included in the scope of these studies and only accidentally mentioned in some works.

The first approach to a comprehensive point of view was made

by Sir Michael Sadler in his *How Far Can We Learn Anything of Practical Value from the Study of Foreign Systems of Education?* published in 1900. Sir Michael said:

In studying foreign systems of education we should not forget that the things outside the schools matter even more than the things inside the schools, and govern and interpret the things inside. We cannot wander at pleasure among the educational systems of the world, like a child strolling through a garden, and pick off a flower from one bush and some leaves from another, and then expect that if we stick what we have gathered into the soil at home, we shall have a living plant. A national system of education is a living thing, the outcome of forgotten struggles and difficulties and of battles long ago. It has in it some of the secret workings of national life. It reflects, while seeking to remedy, the failings of national character. By instinct it often lays special emphasis on those parts of training which the national character particularly needs. Not less by instinct, it often shrinks from laying stress on points concerning which bitter dissensions have arisen in former periods of national history. But is it not likely that if we have endeavoured, in a sympathetic spirit, to understand the real working of a foreign system of education, we shall in turn find ourselves better able to enter into the spirit and tradition of our own national education, more sensitive to its unwritten ideals, quicker to catch the signs which mark its growing or fading influence, readier to mark the dangers which threaten it and the subtle workings of hurtful change? The practical value of studying in a right spirit and with scholarly accuracy the working of foreign systems of education is that it will result in our being better fitted to study and understand our own.

Most English-speaking writers on education are reluctant to take the last step and usually avoid any mentioning of "principles." The author remembers how Sir Michael half jokingly answered his plea for a definite philosophy of education. "The English recognise no philosophy of education," said Sir Michael, "the only philosophy they would accept is to have none." But Sir Michael himself had a philosophy of education and his studies served as an indispensable basis for the later development of Comparative Education.

The first attempt at dealing with Comparative Education from a philosophical point of view was made by a Russian philosopher and educationist, Sergius Hessen, who in 1928 published his "Kritische Vergleichung des Schulwesens der anderen Kulturstaaten" as a part of the German *Handbuch der Pädagogik*. Selecting four main problems of educational policy: compulsory education, the school and the State, the school and the Church and the school and economic life, Hessen analysed the underlying prin-

ciples and then followed this up by giving a critical account of modern legislation in many countries on these questions. In his *Principles of Educational Policy*, published independently in 1929, the author used a similar method. In addition to the four problems dealt with by Hessen, the relations of the State and the Family, National Minorities, Universities, Finance and Political Education were also included. In the second edition, 1933, Vocational and Adult Education were added. In the preface it was stated that "the time has come when educational policy ought to be in conformity with some definite conceptions and should cease to be a temporary compromise between opposite tendencies." To find these principles the educational problems mentioned were analysed from a democratic point of view and the modern legislation of many countries supplied typical solutions. Neither Hessen nor the author, however, attempted in these works to connect in detail the national systems of education with their historical backgrounds. This was done by I. L. Kandel in 1933 in his *Studies in Comparative Education*, which became a recognised text-book in many Universities both in England and America. The aim and plan of his book were stated as follows:

The comparison of the educational systems of several countries lends itself to a variety of methods of treatment, depending somewhat on its purpose. One method of approach might be statistical . . . from this point of view there would be compared the total national expenditures for education, the cost, size and character of school buildings, *per capita* costs for different items of expenditure in educational systems, the enrolment, average attendance and retention of pupils through the different levels of educational ladder. By another method it might be possible to institute a comparison between education and national welfare and progress as expressed in statistics of illiteracy, the volume of trade and commerce, *per capita* wealth, or incidence of crime and poverty. These methods are attractive and may some day be useful; at the present stage it is impossible to institute comparisons of such a character until the raw material, the statistics, become more uniform and comparable. Still another method would be to undertake comparative studies of the quality of education in different countries; this, too, may be possible in time, but not before the instruments of measurement have been made more perfect and reliable than they are at present or when aims of education in different countries are more nearly alike, or finally, when tests have been developed which can measure more accurately the results of education rather than instruction in fundamentals of subject-matter. In the present volume [says Kandel] none of these methods has been followed. The task which

has been undertaken is to discuss the meaning of general education, elementary and secondary, in the light of the forces—political, social and cultural—which determine the character of national systems of education. The problems and purposes of education have in general become somewhat similar in most countries; the solutions are influenced by differences of tradition and culture of each. The present volume seeks accordingly to serve as a contribution to the philosophy of education in the light both of theory and practice in six of the leading educational laboratories of the world—England, France, Germany, Italy, Russia and the United States.

Accordingly Kandel paid special attention to nationalism and national character as a historical background to actual conditions. He did not, however, analyse these factors in detail. But he quite clearly formulated the necessity of a historical approach and the study of determining factors.

The chief value of a comparative approach to educational problems [says he in his textbook] lies in an analysis of the causes which have produced them, in a comparison of the differences between the various systems and the reasons underlying them, and finally, in a study of the solutions attempted. In other words, the comparative approach demands first an appreciation of the intangible, impalpable spiritual and cultural forces which underlie an educational system; the factors and forces outside the school matter even more than what goes inside it.

In his monograph "Comparative Education," published in 1936 in the *American Review of Educational Research*, Kandel expressed the same idea still more succinctly: "The purpose of Comparative Education, as of comparative law, comparative literature or comparative anatomy, is to discover the differences in the forces and causes that produce differences in educational systems." And we should add here "to discover the underlying principles which govern the development of all national systems of education," which is certainly implied in Kandel's definition.

The present writer's contributions to the *Year Book of Education*: "Comparative Study of European Education" (1936), and "Comparative Study of Education in Latin America and Countries of Islam" (1937) emphasised still more the historical approach and dealt with education in each country as the result of cultural and national background. The next study, "Educational Traditions in the English-Speaking Countries" (1938), by its very title laid stress on a historical approach.

Among the German-speaking pioneers of Comparative Education we should mention Professor Friedrich Schneider, Director

of the Institute of Comparative Education, Salzburg. Professor Schneider started his contributions to Comparative Education in Cologne in 1930 by editing the *International Review of Education* in four languages. Interrupted by the Nazi régime, he resumed the publication of the journal in Salzburg in 1947. In his latest book, *Triebkräfte der Pädagogik der Völker*, published in 1947 he systematically covers the whole ground of Comparative Education, adopting the historical approach to the educational problems of many countries. He has divided his material into the following factors which have influenced educational theory and practice: National character; Geographic space; Culture; Sciences; Philosophy; Economic life and Politics; Religion; History; Foreign influences; and the immanent development of Pedagogics. Based on a wealth of historical and factual material, Professor Schneider's work should be considered as one of the most important contributions to the study of Comparative Education.

It appears that Comparative Education has followed the way of earlier branches of comparative studies. The development of comparative law, comparative grammar, comparative religion and even of the scientific branches like comparative anatomy followed the same pattern. They all started by comparing the existing institutions, living languages or adult organisms. Gradually, however, these comparisons led the pioneers of these studies to look for common origins and the differentiation through historical development. It unavoidably resulted in an attempt to formulate some general principles underlying all variations. Montesquieu¹ was perhaps the first philosopher who established this pattern of comparative study. In his famous *L'Esprit des lois* (1747) he used both the historical approach and the formulation of principles in his classification of laws. The nineteenth century saw the rise of other comparative studies. Comparative Grammar was started in the eighteenth century by comparison of Sanskrit and Latin grammar. In the beginning of the nineteenth century the Dane Rask and the Germans Bopp and Grimm followed up the evolution of languages and formulated the first laws of their growth. Thus modern Comparative Philology was born. Comparative Religion had the same history. The modern classification of religions into tribal, national and universal employs both the evolutionary and philosophical methods. It is interesting to note that Comparative Anatomy, a scientific branch, has followed the

¹ Both Plato and Aristotle used comparative method, but their comparisons were limited to small Greek town-communities.

same way. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says: "The study of comparative anatomy led to the development of the conceptions underlying the terms homology and analogy, and an attempt further to discriminate between these two caused comparative anatomists to begin the study of embryology in order to determine the homologies of structures from their mode of origin."

Comparative Education of the twentieth century has adopted the same method, and, as Professor J. Dover Wilson said in his preface to the present writer's book,

there is no reason why Comparative Education should not prove as interesting and fruitful a study as Comparative Politics. The time will come when men realise that the structure of a nation's educational system is as characteristic and almost as important as the form of its constitution. And when it does, we shall have our educational Montesquieus analysing educational institutions and our Bryces classifying them.

We have not reached this stage yet, but a great deal of material has been collected and a start has been made in analysis and classification.

The task is tremendous and can be successfully completed only by team work of educationists of all countries and international educational agencies. The first step is to study each national system separately in its historical setting and its close connection with the development of national character and culture. For some European nations this work has been done by authors who combined the gifts of a historian and a philosopher. But in many cases, especially in non-European countries, the studies were disconnected and still await a comprehensive treatment. The history of education in England, for instance, in spite of many excellent volumes dealing with some periods or some aspects of education, has still many gaps to be filled and has not yet produced a single comprehensive work. The second step would be to collect data on existing systems of education in various countries. This task includes statistics on all aspects of educational administration, organisation and also tests of intelligence and achievements. The existing statistical information is still in a stage of raw material not yet ready for comparative treatment. The author attempted statistical comparisons in the *Year Book of Education* and has come to the conclusion that at present they have little value. Each country has its own terminology, based on national history, its own classification and its own method of collecting and compiling statistical tables. In some cases these statistics are only con-

jectures and serve the purposes of propaganda. Statistical comparisons are valid only when they deal with commensurable units and internationally equivalent terms. For instance the comparison of costs per pupil in different countries without going into lengthy explanations of economic structure, standards of living, rates of exchange, national traditions, as well as statistical methods, is not only valueless, but often misleading. Statistical comparisons of numbers of institutions and students, of hours devoted to each subject and of equipment are meaningless without their respective backgrounds. This is especially true of the institutions imparting secondary and higher education. Only the study of their historical development and their functional rôle in the social life of a particular nation can give a true insight into their values and thus lead to a valid comparison. To enable such statistical tables to be used by comparative education an international authority, like UNESCO, should establish a recognised dictionary of all educational terms in different languages and accepted equivalents of educational values.¹ The attempts made in this direction both by the *Year Book of Education* and the *Annuaire* of the Bureau International d'Éducation, Geneva, must be considered unsatisfactory, and the task is now inherited by UNESCO, which may succeed where previous efforts have failed.

The comparison of educational values by psychologists in applying various tests to pupils and students in different countries is still in its initial stage. This method may in future bring valuable results and lead to the establishment of internationally recognised quotients. At present this method can be used only within certain limitations as the standardised tests are fully applicable in the country for which they were devised. In the Soviet Union, for instance, the authorities discontinued the application of psychological tests devised in Russia to the pupils in the Central Asiatic Republics, as the Uzbeks, Tadzhiks and Turkmens were invariably below the Russian children in their I.Q., which did not correspond to real conditions in the majority of cases. Testing Indian or African children by European tests usually leads to quite wrong conclusions. It appears that at present at any rate neither the purely statistical nor the psychological method of approach can furnish Comparative Education with a firm foundation on which to build.

The question arises whether educational values can be compared at all. Our scepticism should not go so far. If educational

¹ This work is being undertaken by UNESCO.

values of different national systems often cannot be compared by mathematical methods, a valid comparison of their functional rôle in their respective situations may be successfully attempted and fruitfully achieved. That brings us back to the thesis that national systems of education as well as national constitutions or national literatures are the outward expression of national character and as such represent the nation in distinction from other nations. If we could separate and analyse the factors which historically were active in creating different nations we should go a long way towards a definition of the principles which underlie national systems of education. The English usage of the term "nation" is not a sure guide in this case. We speak for instance of the "British" and the "Irish"; both terms it appears may be applied to the Northern Irish, but not to the Southern Irish. We speak of Soviet "nation-wide" measures, implying by it that all the sixteen national Republics which constitute the U.S.S.R. are in fact a single nation. When we sometimes speak of the South Africans it appears again that we include in the term the white minority only, whether Boer or Briton, but not the native and coloured population, which forms the majority of permanent residents of the country. The English language in its common use of the term emphasises the citizenship rather than the "nationality."

In the "Educational Traditions" the author has enumerated five factors which make an ideal nation: (i) Unity of race, (ii) Unity of religion, (iii) Unity of language, (iv) Compact territory and (v) Political sovereignty. One of the factors may be lacking without seriously endangering the unity of national culture. Belgium, for instance, lacks linguistic unity, having two national languages, Flemish and French, and in spite of difficulties is nevertheless a nation. Holland is divided by religion, the Latin American Republics include in their population three distinct racial stocks, and Poland for a century was deprived of her political sovereignty, and yet all these countries are nations in the full sense of the word. In certain circumstances even two factors may be absent and if the divisions thus created do not coincide a nation may be formed. In Switzerland, for instance, the population is divided both by language and religion, but the lines of division cross and did not prevent the birth of the Swiss nation. But in South Africa where racial, linguistic and religious divisions run parallel it is very doubtful if the Whites and the Blacks will ever form a single nation without fundamental changes in their