

# The Present Impasse of the Idea of Progress

Peter J. Stanlis

The idea of progress as the modern world understands it is roughly two-hundred years old. The Greeks had no word for it, because they conceived of man as involved in the process of temporal Nature, which was characterized by the cycle, the endless cycle of birth, growth, decay and death. To the ancients the repetitious patterns in the history of city-states, nations and empires were taken as proof that man also was dominated by the cycle of perpetual recurrences in Nature. Even Platonic idealists and Epicurean naturalists were in agreement that Time and Nature, being a cycle, were man's great enemies, that Time did not offer man the necessary means of fulfilling a glorious destiny, but was a ravager from which there was no escape. The cyclical theory of history explains why so much of the literature and philosophy of the ancient world was dominated by the mood of fatalistic despair. There were, indeed, a few suggestions of a theory of progress in ancient thought. Thucydides traced the growth of Athens from barbarism to civilized culture, but when Athens declined he returned to the cyclical theory. Lucretius also believed in a tentative theory of progress until events drove him back into despair. However broad the upward swing of the cycle of history might seem, the ancients were convinced that Time would bring the wheel of Fate around to men's inevitable defeat.

## The Christian Conception of Time and History

Against this dark, pagan cyclical conception of history, Biblical Hebrew and Christian thought introduced the Messianic idea that man's life in temporal nature moves toward a significant future, a future that does not merely stand over Nature, but opens up at the end of temporal Time into a supernatural eternity. This revolutionary conception of Time appeared first in man's individual life, but it was soon applied to his social life in the form of a linear conception of history and tentative theory of social progress. Among the Christians of the Fourth Century, Eusebius, Ambrose and Prudentius contended that the universal acceptance of Christian morality and discipline would result in such good social consequences that a future Utopian kingdom on earth would be assured. This Christian theory of progress was justified by the idea that God's

will should be done on earth as it is in heaven; social salvation was the approximation, on a mundane level, of the ultimate meaning of life beyond history in personal salvation.

Nevertheless, as St. Augustine readily saw, there was grave danger that through this application of Christianity to social affairs, men would come to accept Christianity not because it was true, not for its religion, but because it was materially useful, socially convenient or culturally brilliant; in short, because it was an instrument of social progress. In time these utilitarian Christians might become Christian Utilitarians. They might not argue that social progress followed from accepting the truths of Christian revelation, but that acceptance of Christianity depended upon proof of the truth of its revelations through evident social progress. What was even worse, the Christian idea of social progress could evolve into a theory of poetic justice, in which God was expected to make the meek inherit the earth by showering material and social rewards upon the faithful. Should the theory of poetic justice prevail, how could men distinguish the things of God from the things of Caesar? Furthermore, Christians who had made social progress depend upon the acceptance of Christianity, or who believed that in worldly affairs God was on the side of the righteous, or who in any way identified the kingdom of God on earth with the material and social welfare of any empire or institution, were likely to reject Christianity as false when the worldly interests and civil order to which they gave allegiance failed or was destroyed. This was precisely what happened when the Germanic barbarians destroyed the Roman Empire, and St. Augustine wrote *The City of God* not only to combat the pessimistic pagan cyclical theory of history, but also the worldly optimism and insipid heresies of the utilitarian-Christian theory of progress.<sup>1</sup> From St. Augustine's time to the present, Christianity has been divided over the idea of progress in two different but not irreconcilable groups. Augustinian Christians, with their emphasis on original sin and the power of evil, have strongly insisted that the mundane destiny of man is ever uncertain, unstable and unpredictable, that virtue may fail and wickedness succeed, that no necessary or logical connection marks man's personal spiritual destiny in eternity and his temporal affairs in history. Augustinians have been most skeptical that individual Christian sanctity will ever become widespread and lead to man's social perfection. But those Christians who emphasize man's rationality and power of will have maintained the hope that as more men accept Christianity man will extend God's divine purpose to his earthly destiny.

## The Modern Idea of Progress

Had it not been for Christianity it is quite probable that the modern theory of progress might never have been conceived, or that it would have developed its Utopian objectives in quite another way. For the hope of better and better social consequences through man's increasing control over historical destiny is common to the Christian and modern theories of progress. The vital differences are in the source and substance of revealed truths, in the substitution of science for religion, of a deterministic and materialistic conception of man and the universe for the spiritual realities and moral values of Christianity. These differences are so absolute that it is impossible for anyone to believe both in Christianity (or any theistic religion) and in the modern theory of progress. For the past two hundred years the idea of progress has been based entirely on the assumption that the methods of the physical sciences, which have given man so much power and control over the laws and processes of Nature, can also be applied to man himself, to his social, political and cultural problems and activities, so that man will bring the processes and laws of history under his control. The consistent

theme of every modern disciple of progress has been that through scientific knowledge and its practical application in industry, farming, medicine, economics, law, politics, the arts, education and morals, historical processes are modified and improved, that history is made creative, that Time alone is needed for man to win complete control over history and redeem himself from every personal and social evil.

The ideas, sentiments and systems of the most prominent modern philosophic and scientific thinkers have combined in various ways to enrich and reinforce this faith in progress. The beginnings of the theory may be traced back to Bacon's renewed insistence on *the inductive method* and Descartes' skepticism and rationalism.<sup>2</sup> Hobbes, the first real positivist and utilitarian in English thought, contributed the idea that mathematics supplied the only useful and valid method of dealing with social affairs. Locke, his chief political enemy and philosophic imitator, popularized the empirical-rational method among the French *philosophes* and *Encyclopaedists*, who constructed the theoretical and practical synthesis of the idea of progress for the Eighteenth Century.<sup>3</sup> Condorcet refined upon Turgot and argued that as the physical objects and social arrangements within man's empirical perceptions were perfected through science and education, man's intellectual, cultural and moral nature would automatically improve. Bentham taught that only that which is scientifically true is economically and socially useful for the greatest pleasure (good) of the greatest number. Comte added that nothing exists, is true or meaningful unless it is subject to scientific description, measurement and prediction. Darwin's theory of man's biological evolution in Nature was translated to mean that man's social and cultural nature in history was also necessarily evolving. Rousseau, who abandoned his original Calvinist belief in universal depravity for the theory of progress, retained enough faith in intuitive feeling and sentiment as the basis for morality to give the whole emotional tone and temper to the idea of progress. Naturalists like Herbert Spencer were no less infused with Rousseau's type of sensibility than idealists like Kant and Hegel. There were, of course, many other influences both as causes and effects upon the idea of progress, such as Nietzsche's superman theory and the doctrines of pragmatists and relativists. But the main currents of ideas all converged upon the cardinal conviction that science was bringing the laws of both Nature and history under man's control.

The following passages by Charles Beard forcefully illustrate the enormous contrast between the ancient, Christian and progressive conceptions of Time and history, and the essential objectives of the modern idea of progress.

It is not until commerce, invention, and natural science emancipated humanity from thralldom to the cycle and to the Christian epic that it became possible to think of an immense future for mortal mankind, of the conquest of the material world in human interest, of providing the conditions for a good life on this planet without reference to any possible hereafter . . . Technology is the fundamental basis of modern civilization, supplies a dynamic force of inexorable drive, and indicates the methods by which the progressive conquest of nature can be effected . . . Technology . . . constitutes the supreme instrument of modern progress . . . [Through] technology . . . what was once Utopian becomes actuality. What appears to be impossible may be surmounted. The ancient theory that mankind revolves in a vicious circle is destroyed by patent facts. The mediaeval notion of a static society bound to rule-of-thumb routine is swept into the discard of events.<sup>4</sup>

Briefly defined, it [progress] implies that mankind, by making use of science and invention, can progressively emancipate itself from

plagues, famines, and social disasters, and subjugate the materials and forces of the earth to the purposes of the good life—here and now . . . [Progress is] a synthesis of all explorations, scientific, economic, and social, of all energies devoted to subduing matter and force to ordered human ends . . . It is a theory that the lot of mankind on this earth can be continually improved by the attainment of exact knowledge and the subjugation of the material world to the requirements of human welfare . . . Its controlling interest is in this earth, in our time, not in a remote heaven to be attained after death . . . It is founded on the belief that civilization is on the threshold of time.<sup>5</sup>

These passages clearly reveal that the modern theory of progress is, in essence, a religion of materialism. Beard further defines it as "a philosophy of history" and a "gospel of futurism," which aims to establish "a society secular in motive, dynamic in economy, scientific in intellectual interest." Material progress is offered as an alternative to Christianity, and all religion. In the religion of progress *there is no personal* spiritual redemption beyond temporal Time, but rather a social redemption of the species through Time. History, therefore, is not something to be desperately avoided, as the ancients thought, nor does it merely complicate and perplex the ultimate meaning of life, as Christianity implied. To the progressivist history is something gladly to be fulfilled; history is itself the clear and ultimate meaning of life. In the religion of progress, history and science replace philosophy and theology, and Time becomes God. Time is not something that the believer in progress feels he must explain; Time is that by which he explains all things. Since all ignorance, disease, poverty, tyranny, war, etc. is contingent upon knowledge through future scientific research, the worshipper of material progress is confident that, given enough grace through Time, he can solve every unsolved problem, and bring historical processes so completely under control that in Time mankind will be redeemed. Since Time has the most vital position in "progress," the question of whether it is later than the progressivists think, whether (temporally speaking) Time is running out and "progress" must have a stop, is very central in considering the present impasse of the idea of progress. Time, therefore, should not be out of our minds in examining the theory of progress since the First World War, in the light of the historical circumstances in which man finds himself today.

## The Theory of Progress Since the First World War

That great watershed of contemporary civilization, the First World War, more than confirmed the worst fears of skeptics toward the idea of progress, disillusioned many of the faithful, and profoundly modified the hopes and doctrines of moderate and ardent believers. The so-called "gloomy Dean" Inge of St. Paul's, who mercilessly pilloried the prophets of material progress, was able to say after 1918 that nothing he had ever predicted was nearly half so bad as what had actually happened.<sup>6</sup> If the pre-war "gloomy Dean" appeared as a bouncy optimist in 1920, the dark night of the soul engulfed many whose faith in progress had suddenly been shriveled by the red blast of war. This mood particularly dominated the defeated nations, where moral and economic collapse and the dissolution of old national boundaries and political institutions produced a fatalistic despair best expressed by Spengler. It is a common mistake to dismiss Spengler as a prophet of gloom because he denied progress as an adolescent illusion and predicted inevitable decay of the West. There is little doubt that Spengler was indeed merely projecting the defeat of Germany into a European catastrophe. Nevertheless, his thoroughly unhistorical denial of the Christian contribution to Western thought, and his deterministic-materialistic

conception of a segmented European history, reveal that he was not a skeptic of progress but a disillusioned believer who had turned against the theory with a vengeance. Spengler's shallow pessimism may better be regarded as the final disillusionment of the optimistic illusions of Kant's idealism and Hegel's nationalism, the fusion of which had led Germans to identify "progress" with the fulfillment of their national destiny.

## The Humanist Reaction to the First World War

Perhaps the most intelligent and interesting reactions to the First World War occurred among a group of moderate English humanists at Oxford and Cambridge. In 1916 they delivered a series of twelve lectures, later published as essays,<sup>7</sup> on various aspects of the theory of progress. Although each writer expressed his unfaltering faith in "progress," the general sobriety and occasional despair in these essays stands in the sharpest contrast to the optimism of pre-war pronouncements on "progress." All of them admitted, as Arthur Ekirch again admitted in 1944, that "progress has been set back by the spread of war." L. P. Jacks' essay, "Moral Progress," is characteristic of the sober revision in mood and ideas which the war effected in the theory. Jacks advised men to "believe in moral progress, but do not believe in too much of it," because morally . . . "we are still in a neolithic age, not brutes indeed any longer, and yet not so far outgrown the brutish stage . . . The present war . . . has revealed us to ourselves as nothing else in history has ever done, and it has revealed . . . that moral progress is not nearly so advanced as we thought it was."<sup>8</sup> Although Jacks felt that science was not discredited by the war, in his analysis of the role of science in the war he grasped an idea that has become increasingly paramount in modern thought:

Had it not been for the progress of science, which has enormously increased the wealth of the world, it is doubtful if this war, which is mainly a war about wealth, would have taken place at all. Or if a war had broken out, it would not have involved the appalling destruction of human life and property we are now witnessing—such that, within a space of two years, about six million human beings have been killed, thirty-five millions wounded, and wealth destroyed to the extent of about fifteen thousand millions sterling—though some say it is very much more. Science taught us to make this wealth: science has also taught us how to destroy it. When one thinks of how much of this is attributable to the progress of science, I say it is *permissible to raise the question* whether man is a being who can safely be entrusted with that control over the forces of nature which science gives him. What if he uses this power, as he plainly can do, for his own undoing? . . . It is conceivable that the progress of science might involve for us no progress at all. It might be . . . a step toward the self-destruction of the human race.<sup>9</sup>

Having noted that science gives man power but not moral wisdom, Jacks' moderate faith in progress permitted him to raise, but not to examine critically, the whole question of man's moral nature. Like all his *academic* colleagues, Jacks dismissed this momentary fear by reaffirming his belief in the natural goodness of man. However, the great War caused most moderate progressivists to discard totally the Nineteenth Century belief, best expressed by Herbert

Spencer, that progress was both inevitable and proportionate to greater and greater social heterogeneity. Therefore, the unwavering theme of the Oxford and Cambridge humanists was that the pre-war conception of progress was too heterogeneous and circumscribed by local and national interests, that a more "organic," "universal," "completely human, not merely nationalist" conception of progress, in which man willed progress through conscious collective effort, would yet redeem mankind. This voluntaristic and collectivistic modification of the theory was seized upon by the most ardent progressivists, such as John Dewey, Beard, J. H. Robinson and H. G. Wells, and applied vigorously to new areas of thought.

## The Voluntaristic and Collectivistic Theory

To appreciate fully both the catastrophic impact of the First World War and the changes it effected on the idea of progress, it is necessary to recall how profoundly Nineteenth-Century progressivists like Spencer had believed progress was absolutely inevitable:

When it is shown that this advancement is due to the working of a universal law, and that in virtue of that law it must continue until the state we call perfection is reached, then the advent of such a state is removed out of the region of probability into that of certainty . . . Progress . . . is not an accident, but a necessity . . . [and as] the things we call evil and immorality disappear . . . so surely must man become perfect . . . Progress is not an accident, not a thing within human control, but a beneficent necessity.<sup>10</sup>

To Spencer history was a vast escalator like H. G. Wells' Time Machine, on which man, with or against his will, was being carried by Time onward and upward forever. The rate of acceleration near the top of this supposed upsweep of history was far greater and smoother than among the non-scientific and un-industrialized Ancients, or unenlightened Christians. Most progressivists interpreted the Great War as an unfortunate accident, a collision in the dark resulting from a miscalculation of man's historical development. But the extent, horror and futility of the destruction made it impossible for Beard, Dewey, Wells and other social theorists to regard progress any longer as inevitable. All agreed that such a war must never be allowed to occur again, and that therefore the naive "policy of drift" which had characterized the deterministic theory had to be replaced by a hard-headed, "realistic" belief in progress, in which man's conscious collective control over events would be exercised. Where Spencer and the Nineteenth Century had said man *must* have progress whether or not he wants; Beard<sup>11</sup> and Dewey said man can have progress *only* if he wills it. A voluntaristic conception of progress, which insists that men *must* will to be saved in their social life, may at first appear strangely anachronistic in the mouths of social theorists who deny man's free will. The paradox is readily resolved, however, when we realize that what is really meant by "must will" is that man *must be forced to will* progress. How was this to be done? In general, Wells and Dewey held that, beyond the original elements necessary for progress, man had to be scientifically conditioned to will progress in his thinking processes and values. This required an enormous development of psychology and semantics, applied practically in an expanded educational program. Wells and Dewey put forth the thesis that a universally valid scientific education would create a universal perspective that would destroy sectarian parochialism and provincial na-

tionalism, thus ridding the world of heterogeneous religious and political divisions, and making it possible for man to *collectively* will himself to progress.

The First World War also made progressivists aware that an improved external physical and social environment was not enough to guarantee "progress" while men's twisted and immature mental processes allowed them to be led by their emotions into disastrous wars. Therefore, the achievements of physical science and sociology had to be supplemented vitally by psychology and a scientifically accurate use of language. The enormous interest in psychology and semantics since 1920 can largely be attributed to this modification in the theory of progress. Practically every contemporary textbook in the humanities and social sciences reflects this interest. Beginning with James Harvey Robinson's *The Mind in the Making* (1921), and running through Walter Lippman's *A Preface to Morals* (1929), Stuart Chase's *The Tyranny of Words* (1938) and Harry A. Overstreet's *The Mature Mind* (1949), the presses of America produced a staggering number of works aimed at conditioning man's mental processes and responses to words according to strictly scientific truths. The sub-title of Robinson's book "the relation of intelligence to social reform," summarized the progressivists' conviction that the one additional thing necessary for social salvation was scientifically clear thinking and communication.

### History Has Discredited Belief in Progress

It should be self-evident that each of these new dogmas in the reformed religion of progress has been thoroughly discredited by historical events since the First World War. The failure of the League of Nations and the rise of new and more violent forms of totalitarian nationalism have invalidated the hopes for greater homogeneity and voluntaristic cooperation. Indeed, the very weapons the progressivists had hoped would be used to cure man of all his former social evils were converted into instruments of still greater inhumanity and destruction. Psychology and semantics, which were supposed to emancipate man from the slavery of his egocentric illusions and passions, were developed into powerful instruments of mental torture and political propaganda. In place of the progressivists' universally valid scientific education, new scientific techniques in mass deceit and indoctrination for evil were perfected. The desire for greater homogeneity and "conscious group action" was best achieved in Germany and Russia, and it led to evils far worse than those it was supposed to destroy. The desire to attain racial purity and political uniformity led the Nazis to murder millions of innocent people. In Soviet Russia, the desire for economic homogeneity led to the extermination of all who opposed the collective farm programs and *series of industrial five year plans*, and the attempt to establish atheism as the religion of the homogeneous Communist state has led to a barbarous persecution of all organized religion. In the Western world the progressivist attack upon *laissez-faire* economics was continued long after the real danger had passed from excessive individualism to the "conscious group action" of a far more intrusive political collectivism. In one form and degree or another, the modern world has been swept toward homogeneity or engulfed by collectivism, and the end result is clearly not another step toward Utopia, as the progressivists had hoped, but the unjust limitation or extermination of man's traditional natural and civil rights to his own life, liberty, property and security. The last three decades have witnessed a world-wide depression, the growth of totalitarian tyrannies more despotic than any known to man, the enormous growth, even in free societies, of centralized political authority, and another and even more destructive world war. To climax these catastrophic events, the atom bomb has made St. Augustine's words increasingly prophetic: "And for the injury of men

how many kinds of poison, how many weapons and machines of destruction have been invented." Clearly, the cold, clammy and undeniable revelations of recent Time and history, and the circumstances in which man finds himself, militate against the revised theory of progress.

### The Rejection of Progress by H. G. Wells

To those who admit all these facts and still believe in the religion of progress, the apostasy of H. G. Wells may serve as an illuminating illustration of the impasse to which the thoughtful among the faithful have been driven more and more since 1918. Nobody better exemplified in his intellectual life the history of the idea of progress since just before the First World War than H. G. Wells. Practically everyone used to be familiar in his adolescence with Wells' *The Outline of History*, with its crude underlying assumption that despite some lag resulting from reactionary Medievalism, human world events have followed a constantly evolving and ascending cosmic curve, with only a few minor dips to break man's smooth and inevitable progress to Utopia. Perhaps not everyone has yet forgotten Wells' Utopian books, in which the fictitious accounts of man's future control of the cosmos were taken more than half seriously as inspired prophecies and visions of the shape of things to come. Like many other forward-looking social theorists, Wells abandoned the deterministic for the voluntaristic theory after 1918. Far more keenly than most of his contemporaries, Wells realized that this change implied the necessity of bringing man's vast scientific power under moral control. The vital factor of Time made this necessity extremely urgent. Wells underlined the urgency of the problem in his famous statement that mankind's fate would be decided in a "race between education and catastrophe." This phrase was repeated endlessly by the theorists of progressive education, who generally had no more suspicion of what Wells really meant by it than they know what anyone ever meant by anything. But the economic and military events of the thirties and forties left no doubt in Wells' own mind as to who had won this desperate race. At the time of his death in 1946 Wells published his last book called, significantly, *Mind at the End of Its Tether*. From this book one might well conclude that Wells' early Utopian books, his *New Worlds for Old* and *Shape of Things to Come*, must have been written for *Bebes in the Darkling Wood* who lived in the *Country of the Blind*. For in his last book his faith in progress in any form fell completely to pieces; the Gothic night of black despair contained in Wells' last testament reveals the impasse to which even the voluntaristic theory of progress has finally led:

If his [Wells'] thinking has been sound, then this world is at the end of its tether . . . He [Wells] has come to believe that that congruence with mind, which man has attributed to the secular process, is not really there at all . . . A remarkable queerness has come over life. It is as if the law of gravitation no longer functioned in a physical world. Everything is moving in every direction with increased velocity. Mankind has reached an impasse and there is no way around, or above or through this impasse. It is the end.<sup>12</sup>

In his final epitaph for man, "doomed fornicary," and in his conclusion that "man is at the end of his tether," Wells simply was drawing out the logical end to which the contemporary facts of history had pushed his faith in progress.

## The Present Impasse of the Idea of Progress

The truth is, however, that not mankind but the religion of progress is at the end of its tether. Beard's hope that "a concept of history as catholic as the idea of progress will not be dropped in the march of events,"<sup>13</sup> is, of course, still being realized among green juveniles, enthusiastic undergraduates, and metaphysically insane professors of sociology and education who take their private logical speculations as the sole measure of all reality and truth. Nevertheless, except among those who are ignorant, impervious or indifferent to recent history, the progressive concept of history has been dealt a mortal wound. Modern man finds himself in historical circumstances that are themselves the most eloquent refutation of the progressive philosophy of history. Apart from the theory of progress, that there is a unique crisis in human affairs probably few will deny. Our bloody era is writ large in the image of Hobbes' philosophy. Amid the cracked ruins of a civilization built upon a reasonable recognition and respect for the normative ethics of Natural Law, with its attendant veneration of inalienable human rights, Hobbes' man in a state of nature, backed by all the power of modern science and the Leviathan State, stalks and works his arbitrary will. Yet the real horror of our time is not so much world-wide wars and depressions as the great degree of wilful deceit, brutality and blasphemy that has attended these upheavals. When has there been anything comparable to modern man's denial of the moral law in his social relationships, his general contempt for contracts and agreements, his series of undeclared and unprovoked wars, his perfection of techniques of torture, deceit and propaganda, his wholesale extermination through persecution and concentration camps of entire races, nations and established institutions, his eagerness to embrace brutal racial and economic theories, his veneration of power as an end in itself? We have had most of these things in the past, but never to such a degree, and it is no longer possible to dismiss these facts lightly as the evil work of a few power-mad men who have abused science. The point is that although science is not the cause of such human depravity, there is absolutely nothing that the scientific method can do to control the enormous amount of evil which a few men can inflict upon mankind. The assurance of our physical scientists that an atomic or germ war, begun by a few evil men, could destroy perhaps eighty percent of our civilization, makes it impossible to believe that more science will work our salvation. The real impasse of the idea of progress is man's doubt that civilization can afford another social experiment, however guaranteed by science.

Except for the most mentally agape, the recognition of this impasse has killed the last possibility of avoiding ugly reality by interpreting man's social tragedies as slight digressions from the assumed norms of progress, as dips in the upward curve of human events, which further scientific knowledge and a more thorough application of the scientific method will soon eliminate. With the visible ruins of two world wars around them, even ordinary men are no longer gladdened by news that science is creating greater and greater power. Today, living under the constant threat of the atomic bomb or worse, the significance of Bury's statement is clear to all: "If there was good cause for believing the earth would be uninhabitable in 2000 or 2100, the doctrine of progress would lose its meaning and would automatically disappear." In short, men crave not more physical or social power, but more moral wisdom, and a personal ultimate meaning in life, and these are not to be found in science or the idea of progress but in religion. As Jacques Maritain has said, the events of contemporary history are narrowing man's choices more and more to one of two roads: the road to the slaughterhouse, or the road to Calvary. But the dying illusion of progress will continue to drag its slow length along our century until all men recognize or

history teaches them again that ultimately the scientific method is but a penultimate process, and that the City of God, for each man and for all mankind, lies beyond the known frontiers of Nature and disputed ramparts of history, in religion. For religion alone can give man the sense of an ultimate reality, and therefore of the true meaning every man finds in his and every man's and every thing's existence.

<sup>1</sup>For an excellent brief account of the Christian theory of progress which St. Augustine rejected, and the chief arguments against the theory, see Theodore E. Mommsen, "St. Augustine and the Christian Idea of Progress," *Journal of the History of Ideas* (June, 1951), pp. 346-374.

<sup>2</sup>The best general study of the theory, J. B. Bury's *The Idea of Progress* (1920), does not do justice to the origins of the theory and is often superficial and inadequate.

<sup>3</sup>For a good brief account of this point see Carl Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (Yale Univ. Press, 1932).

<sup>4</sup>Charles Beard, Introduction to J. B. Bury's *The Idea of Progress* (New York, 1931), xi, xx, xxii and xxiii.

<sup>5</sup>Charles Beard, *A Century of Progress* (New York), pp. 3-6.

<sup>6</sup>See W. R. Inge, *The Idea of Progress* (Oxford, 1920).

<sup>7</sup>See F. S. Marvin, Ed., *Progress and History* (Oxford, 1924).

<sup>8</sup>*Progress and History*, p. 135.

<sup>9</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 141. *Jacks' italics.* Before 1914 those who had raised this question had been considered insane, or at least reactionary obstructionists on the road to progress.

<sup>10</sup>See George Hildebrand, *The Idea of Progress* (Univ. of Calif. Press 1949) p.p. 433-447.

<sup>11</sup>See Beard, Introduction to J. B. Bury's *The Idea of Progress*, xxix-xxxi.

<sup>12</sup>H. G. Wells, *Mind at the End of Its Tether*, (New York, 1946), pp. 1-4.

<sup>13</sup>Beard, Introduction to J. B. Bury's *The Idea of Progress*, xxviii.

Valley 2-0060	Valley 2-0061
<b>ACME STORAGE CO.</b>	
New and Used Furniture	
UNCLAIMED FURNITURE	
MOVING and STORAGE	
11248 MACK, at St. Jean	

<b>VALLETTE ROOFING CO.</b>
COMPLETE ROOFING AND SHEET METAL WORK
311 Hancock Street Saginaw, Michigan
Telephone 2-4478
MARSHALL A. VALLETTE