human caravan may move. Out of these three, only two seem probable, for we may safely exclude the optimistic assumption that mankind as an integrated unit will continually progress toward greater liberty, equality, and fraternity through the use of organized intelligence, world-wide co-operation, and peaceful adaptation. We are, therefore, left with two real alternatives: Our Western civilization may decline as a result of further wars and revolutions, of crises and disintegrations, leading up to a complete breakdown of modern society and a regression in all fields of human achievement. In that event, the collapse of the modern world would bring forth a new "dark age". This period would resemble in general effect the era from which our present civilization sprang, although the regression would not necessarily imply complete loss of all material advances attained since the early Middle Ages. Last and perhaps most likely, we may witness, during the next century or two, the slow and painful emergence of a world equilibrium, primarily brought about through conquest and revolution and in part achieved through accommodation and rational compromise. There is little reason to assume with Spengler and Toynbee that such a world society would necessarily be uncreative or short-lived. In contrast to previous world empires, the new world state would be based on much greater scientific and technical efficiency. Comprising all continents, it would be free from any threat of aggression from without. Still, we may imagine that the world community would remain diversified enough to leave room for friction and readjustment, compensating, to a certain extent at least, for the high degree of bureaucratization, mechanization, and standardization that will probably be prevalent. Thus there is still hope that this global society could serve as a basis for new cultural creativeness.

III

If it is true that an increasing concern with the problems of the future is discernible and that a body of useful material is accumulating among present-day scientists and scholars, it may rightfully be asked why educational institutions in general and the liberal-arts college in particular have as yet shown no interest in the day after tomorrow. A serious investigation into the future - "futurology" as a science - is scarcely a generation old; it is, historically speaking, still in its swaddling clothes. With education only beginning to adjust to the needs of a dynamic age, it is natural that such problems as are here indicated have not yet penetrated into classrooms and textbooks. In spite of many protestations to the contrary, most schools and universities continue to rely on the perpetuation of the status quo, being satisfied to teach what was and what is. Not only do our history courses terminate with the year they are taught, but the same situation exits in the study of government and economics, psychology, and biology. And, quite obviously, if any one