

our century until men recognize, or history teaches them again, that 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, infused with true sensitivity, charity, and love, which supplies the richest meaning every man finds in his and every man's and every thing's existence.

## NOTES

<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. 346-347.

<sup>2</sup>The best general study of the secular 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. Bury was anticipated on the secular idea of progress by Ferdinand Brunetière, in "La Formation de l'idée de progrès au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," [1892], in his *Études critiques sur l'histoire de la littérature française* (Paris, 1922), pp. 183-250. Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, who makes a strong case for the Christian contribution to the ideals of civil justice and liberty in Western civilization, objects to Bury's limited historical perspective: "It has been claimed by some historical scholars, most notably perhaps by the late Professor Bury of Cambridge, that our idea of progress is not very old; that it did not emerge until the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. Possibly this is true. It is curious, however, that the Enlightenment and its idea of progress arose and flourished in a traditionally Christian, not Moslem or Buddhist or Hindu, environment. And no matter when the *idea* became prevalent, the *fact* of progress has long been an observable feature of the Western world." *Christianity and Western Civilization*, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup>For a brief account of this point see Carl Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (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*, p. 3-6.

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

<sup>7</sup>This is Christopher Dawson's interpretation of Spengler's theory in *Dynamics of World History* (1956), pp. 374-389.

<sup>8</sup>L. P. Jack's "Moral Progress," in *Progress and History*, pp. 135 and 141. Jack's italics. Before 1914 those who had dared to question the absolute benevolence of science in human affairs were dismissed as reactionary obstructionists on the road to the future.

<sup>9</sup>Hegel, *Reason in History* (The Liberal Arts Press: New York, 1953), pp. 68-69. Pieter Geyl's comment on Hegel's philosophy of history is worth noting: "Since Augustine there had been no such ambitious and impressive philosophy of history . . . and no doubt Hegel owed to the *De Civitate Dei* his basic idea of a purposeful development, a development that would bear out God's scheme. It is St. Augustine secularized." *Use and Abuse of History*, p. 35.

<sup>10</sup>See George Hildebrand, *The Idea of Progress* (University of California Press, 1949), pp. 433-447.

<sup>11</sup>See Charles Beard, introduction to J. B. Bury's *The Idea of Progress*, xxix-xxxi. Carlton Hayes also distinguished between a deterministic and voluntaristic Christian conception of progress: "Progress is not automatic; it depends on human will and aspiration." *Christianity and Western Civilization*, p. 63.

<sup>12</sup>Herbert Butterfield, *History and Human Relations* (London, 1951), p. 38.

<sup>13</sup>Christopher Dawson, *Dynamics of World History*, p. 367.

<sup>14</sup>Herbert G. Wells, *Mind at the End of Its Tether* (New York, 1946), pp. 1-4.

<sup>15</sup>Charles Beard, introduction to J. B. Bury's *The Idea of Progress*, xxviii.

# *A Footnote on Academic Freedom*

ROBERT RAYNOLDS

SOMETIMES I long for academic freedom, because a novelist's freedom to think it all out for himself wears me down.

Perhaps academic freedom means something like this: you let me teach Marx and I'll let you teach Burke; we will defend each other's right to teach opposing ideologies, and may the gods preserve us both from the terrible burden of being free to think for ourselves.

I have had the shocking experience of real freedom to teach. For two years at Columbia University I taught courses in short-story writing and in novel writing. I came to it with some years of experience as a novelist, but none as a teacher. I had only two confining orders: first, I signed the old King's College oath of loyalty to the State of New York, and second, Professor Donald Clark, who was head of my department, after a brief meeting and general conversation, said, "All right, Raynolds. Go ahead and teach."

I had the appointment and the order to teach, but no ideology or textual authority to furnish my mind with what to teach. I had some twenty-five years of experience as a practicing writer to draw on, but no curriculum. And each class lasted two hours.

The stark freedom to teach is appalling.

Compared with this stark freedom to teach, the academic freedom to present your chosen and preferred authorities, with perhaps an occasional witty gloss, is an easy comfort. I groaned in my heart for some easy way out, for an escape from this almost absolute freedom to teach. As a resident of Connecticut, I had no lively or concealed desire to overthrow the State of New York, so that that negative inhibition was not even a hair for guidance, and Professor Clark's "go ahead and teach" was boundless license.

I had to come to each class and each

time try to be myself—not Plato, not Aquinas, not Einstein, but myself—for I had nothing else to teach. For true freedom to teach lays it upon a man to teach what he is. Not for him is there an ordered subject matter, with a text book handy and choice authorities to hedge off the mystic anguish of making up his own mind and committing his own spirit, as an escape and shelter from pure freedom to teach.

Of course, by the end of two years, using my wits, I had begun to compound a corpus to teach, which is the oldest of intellectual felonies, and the way out of freedom. But then I quit teaching, and went home to write a novel, which was that awful freedom again.

Now when I hear that academic freedom is threatened, I do not think it means that teachers are going to be thrown back on their own creative intelligence, but only that someone is trying to herd them out of the shelter of one authority into that of another. To do this would be to place a silly and stultifying restriction on intellectual types and groupings. Carried far enough, it would narrow education down to the stupidity of one authority, one intellectual felony, one compounded corpus.

But what would happen to our schools and colleges if, beginning tomorrow, each and every teacher were relieved of text, authorities and pre-determined subject matter and told, "You're free. Go ahead and teach. . . ."?

Know thyself, indeed!

How many are prepared for the stark freedom of teaching what they are?

And yet, for a man to teach what he is, is for him to teach the greatest subject in the human curriculum.

But be of good cheer, for nobody is threatening teachers with the stark freedom to teach.

*A keen observer's account of a summer behind the Iron Curtain—with cautionary asides.*

# *The Tourist's Soviet Russia*

GERHART NIEMEYER

A FAIR-SIZED stream of foreign tourists poured into Soviet Russia this year; and the stream will be larger next year. Most of the tourists will be Americans. The Soviet government is encouraging this influx: granting visas to all applicants, lowering the exchange-rate of the ruble from 1:4 to 1:10 for tourist dollars, increasing the number of interpreters, opening hotels in parts hitherto inaccessible (central Asia, for instance), and adding new itineraries to the sixteen already offered.

Why? What interest have the Soviets in foreign tourists? Economic, the tourist traffic is unprofitable, at least in terms of rubles. Every tourist paying thirty dollars a day enjoys the luxury of two king-sized hotel rooms with bath, four meals a day, the use of a huge car with driver, the company of an interpreter (who also is housed and fed), and transportation in *de luxe* railway cars, steamship cabins, or airplanes. Also he receives tickets to all sights *en route* and twenty-five rubles in cash daily for spending-money. In current ruble prices, this totals about twice what the tourist has paid to Intourist (the Soviet travel agency).

Operation Tourism, financially speaking, is a deficit project of the Soviet government. Soviet interest is not in the tourist's pocketbook, but in his mind. The Soviets are convinced that the difference between the mental image of communism which the tourist brings to Russia, and the one he

takes away, is a gain for communism. This is especially true of American tourists, so accustomed to think in clichés. The average American—unless he is a fellow-traveler—will expect to find in Russia stark evidence of police oppression, material misery, inefficiency, undernourishment, and dissatisfaction. Countless books, newspaper articles, lectures and picture accounts have combined to make up this image. His support of American policy toward the Soviet Union hinges on it. The average American's mental image of the Soviet Union is thus an important strategic objective for communist psychological warfare. It is the main target of Operation Tourism. The operation makes sense on the assumption that a person who can see with his own eyes things in Russia that contradict his dismal expectations will leave the Soviet Union as a man disposed henceforth to throw the benefit of the doubt to the Soviet side.

What makes the Soviets so confident that the tourist will be more favorably impressed than he expected? What does the visitor to Soviet Russia actually see?

### *"Everything for the Children"*

In Russia, the tourist will visit chiefly cities. Among the sights he will surely want to see are the numerous institutions to take care of children either at pre-school age, or during their time after school. He will visit, for instance, a typical kindergarten.