bles, and what is their place and meaning in the chain of unfolding events.

A course with the future as its subject-matter could never be a textbook course. It would have to be taught by a truly creative scholar with a wide socio-cultural background and a vital interest in the forces of our age. He would have to possess strong scientific discipline in order to rid himself and his students of prejudice and to force them to part with many of their most cherished hopes and illusions. Though an active participant in the life of his century, he would have to be, for the purposes and duration of this course, a dispassionate and disinterested observer of things future.

In view of the difficult nature of the study and its unifying function, this course should be offered to the student toward the end of his college career, after he has had time to mature and to acquire a fund of knowledge from which to draw. Colleges considering the introduction of a course in cultural heritage on the sophomore-junior level could incorporate the course here advocated into the program of the senior year. Like the courses in contemporary civilization or cultural heritage, it would have to be interdepartmental in character, depending on the cooperation of the entire faculty. Within the traditional setup, the greatest responsibility would naturally rest with the social-science division.

V

Among the many criticisms any new idea is bound to evoke, the writer anticipates three major objections. First, it may be held that no one person would be equipped to teach so novel and broad a subject. In refutation, it may be said that those interested in teaching the future could pool their resources, especially if they were supported in their respective institutions by specialists in the various fields.

Second, overcautious minds may question the degree of certainty and concreteness with which any statement on the future can be made. They will be likely to fear that college funds would be wasted on glittering generalities and wishful thinking instead of being soundly invested in the sober business of teaching established facts. To them we may say that every beginning has been daring and problematic. The natural sciences themselves had their origin in bold speculations of the Greek philosophers of nature in the sixth century B.C. And fragmentary though our information may appear at this point, it will grow in proportion as it is made the subject of serious study and inspired teaching.

Last, some timid souls may recoul from any attempt to lift the veil that hides the future, lest they behold Medusa's face. Such a reaction would be indicative of a wide and deep-seated resistance to scientific truth which has accompanied and obstructed the progress of science through the ages. This attitude can be traced as far back as the ancient