



---

## MUST WE HATE OUR ENEMIES?

**A UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO ROUND TABLE BROADCAST**

**With**

**MORTIMER J. ADLER**

Law School, University of Chicago

**WILLIAM F. OGBURN**

Chairman of the Department of Sociology, University of Chicago

**MANDEL SHERMAN**

Department of Education, University of Chicago

*Although the United States itself has not yet felt the impact of battle it is at war with Japan, Germany, Italy, and their satellites on far-flung battlefronts. Only a small number of American fighting men and fewer American civilians have tasted modern war or seen and met the enemy. The question is often asked whether a people can fight effectively unless they hate the enemy.*

*What is hate—how does it differ from anger? What are the effects of hate upon people? Can hatred be stimulated, controlled and directed, and finally dispelled by able propagandists? If it can, is this something America needs today?*

These are questions the University of Chicago  
ROUND TABLE analyzes in the discussion  
“*Must We Hate Our Enemies?*”

**MR. OGBURN:** The question “Must We Hate Our Enemies?” seems to be very interesting to the public at the present moment. I notice, indeed, that eight refugee governments have addressed a statement to the Pope and to the President, describing the horrors committed by the Nazis in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

This is surely designed to stimulate our hate. I wonder if these atrocities are the reason for our hatred?

**MR. ADLER:** I don’t think the public is asking the question “Must We Hate Our Enemies?” It seems to me that this is a question raised by the professional and self-appointed molders of public morale. It is the sort of a question that the public-relations type of mentality considers, thinking of winning the war as if it were conducting an advertising campaign. Anyway, I’d like to know whose hatred they are worrying about.

**MR. SHERMAN:** There are two questions here. Are they worried about the soldiers or about the civilians?

**MR. ADLER:** Generally we don’t have to worry about the emotions of the soldiers. The emotions of soldiers occur naturally under natural circumstances. I think we can agree that the problem, if it’s raised by the public or even by the professional propagandist, is a problem largely of civilian morale and the place of hatred and other emotions in civilian morale.

**MR. OGBURN:** You feel, then, that the problem of hatred during war is really one that doesn’t concern the civilian so much as it concerns the government. If this is the basis of our interest in these questions, we might very well consider the meaning of hatred—because I’m not at all sure that the word “hatred” means the same thing to everyone.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The term “hatred” has been misunderstood by scientists as well as by the public. We know that hatred arises out of a given type of anger; and we know, also, that anger occurs every day with most people. Naturally, our anger isn’t very severe; but it occurs nevertheless.

**MR. OGBURN:** Yes. The emotion that is most often correlated with fighting (and that’s what we’re talking about, of course: fighting a

---

<sup>1</sup> On July 18, 1942, it was reported that the leaders of eight governments in exile at London and the Fighting French sent an eighteen-page account of ‘Nazi atrocities’ to President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, Premier Joseph Stalin, and Pope Pius XII.

war) is anger. I want to know how anger is related to hatred.

**MR. ADLER:** In the first place, there's another emotion that I don't think we ought to forget. That is the emotion of fear. Fear is the first emotion that anyone feels in war, and anger and hatred are secondary. I'd like to ask Sherman whether he agrees that there is a real distinction between hatred and anger.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I think there is. We can take examples from everyday behavior. We're angry at many things. A car cuts in front of us; we're angry. We don't *hate* the driver of the car. But in a war, when we try to mobilize the energies of the people, when we try to direct their emotions, we need hatred and not primarily anger.

**MR. ADLER:** Isn't there also a difference in the objectives of hatred and anger? Hatred, as I understand it, is toward an evil thing to be destroyed, to be completely obliterated. Anger is an emotion directed toward an obstacle, an impediment, something in our way, which we remove, or to something to be punished. As a matter of fact, anger is an emotion that occurs in judicial punishment.

**MR. OGBURN:** It seems to me that anger is a feeling of reaction which accompanies a stimulation to fight. We know, for instance, from the observations of Walter Cannon in his studies on the animals, that, when they become mobilized for aggressive action, the adrenals flow more freely and stimulate the glycogen, puts it into the blood; and that the blood flows from the internal organs to the external limbs, to mobilize them for greater activity; and thus we have a real anger component to the fighting.

**MR. ADLER:** In the case of all these emotions—anger or fear or hate—isn't it necessary to distinguish very carefully between the violent emotions in which the physiological changes are marked and the mild emotional attitudes?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I think that you have touched upon a common fallacy. When people speak of emotions, they think of violent emotions. Now we know very well that we all have emotions and that they needn't be violent.

And I think laboratory experience, experimental evidence, has shown that emotions can be controlled and directed, and experience has also shown that certain kinds of emotions energize a person and make his learnings, his reactions, and his mobilization of activity even more effective than without emotions.

**MR. ADLER:** I think that's true, but mustn't we keep in mind the distinction between emotions that get out of hand and emotions properly controlled and properly directed?

It would be true, would it not, from laboratory experience, that emotions can be destructive; that they can interfere with efficiency; that they can actually interfere with digestion and clear thinking? If emotions are not properly directed and properly controlled, they can hinder efficiency just as much as they aid it.

**MR. OGBURN:** I think that people often think of hatred as the opposite of love and that they think of fear as being the opposite of anger.

What I'd really like to clear up is the relation between hatred and anger. Is hatred merely a sustaining, driving force of anger, or is it something different?

**MR. ADLER:** I for one (and I may not have the grounds for making this remark) think that hatred and anger are quite separate. I agree with your first point, Ogburn, that hatred is the opposite of love. You hate the evil as you love the good. But anger is quite a separate emotion. You can be angry without any hatred being involved at all.

**MR. OGBURN:** According to the James-Lange theory, emotion is simply a correlate of activity. Do you think we can stimulate hatred or anger and thus get a mobilization of activity, or is that something that just necessarily comes?

**MR. SHERMAN:** I think, given the proper stimuli, given the proper conditions, given the proper setting, the emotions can be stimulated.

And I'd like to say one more thing about the difference between anger and hatred. What we need in this war, obviously, is direction, organization, mobilization of energy, and a goal. And anger, which is momentary, which is direct, which is at an object and disappears when the object is removed, is not sufficient for the mobilization of our energy toward the goal of winning the war.

**MR. ADLER:** I think that's true. I think that anger is a momentary and effervescent emotion. The question is whether or not hatred is the kind of emotion that we can stimulate, or one that we want to stimulate, because of all the effects of hatred. Your point, I take it, Sherman, is that hatred is an emotion that is continuing and persis-

tent and can be the source of a sure determination.

**MR. SHERMAN:** No

**MR. OGBURN:** There is just one other point I want to raise. Do you figure that you must hate a *person* or that you must be angry at a *person*? Can you be angry at something else? Is there some other stimulus?

**MR. SHERMAN:** We can hate ideas, for example. We can hate principles. But I don't think that we can differentiate very clearly in everyday experience between hating an idea, or between being angry at an idea, and hating the people who produced the idea. I think we should be clear in our minds that we cannot differentiate them.

**MR. ADLER:** That is the only point that raises the moral problem with which anyone should be concerned. If this discussion today were about any emotion other than hate—if it were about “Shall we be angry at the enemy?” “Shall we fear the enemy?” “Shall we desire to win the war?”—any question of that kind—there would be no moral problem nearly so great as the one raised by hate. Hatred of persons, as opposed to the hatred of principles, acts, injustices of one kind or another, raises the moral question of whether or not persons should be hated.

But let us postpone that until we discuss further the problem of civilian morale and the relation of hate to it.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I think we're agreed that the emotions do arouse our energies, and I think we're agreed that we need some emotion. The question obviously remains as to whether we should use hate or some other emotion.

**MR. OGBURN:** The discussion so far has concerned the problem of fighting, in which we had in mind a sort of antagonistic combat between persons.

We're really at war, however, and war is really something bigger than just merely two combatants fighting. How is it that a war differs from fighting, and what aspects of war are concerned with this question of hate?

**MR. SHERMAN:** There isn't really a basic difference except in the procedure in this war versus combat fighting. In other words, in this war, obviously, we organize our activities.

**MR. OGBURN:** But you do have two groups in war that you don't have in ordinary combat. You have the civilian, on the one hand, and the soldier, on the other. And you may have to divide the problem up into those two segments.

**MR. ADLER:** May I qualify that? Some civilian populations are noncombatant, such as is our own, and some, like the Czech, Polish, and Russian populations, are just as combatant as are the soldiers.

The problem we're discussing is raised by the fact that we have a large civilian population removed from the theaters of war, whose emotions are not readily tapped by immediate offensive action; and so we have a very special problem in this country that the other countries do not have.

**MR. SHERMAN:** The problem we're facing is exactly how we should arouse the emotions of our people.

**MR. ADLER:** "Should we" or "how shall we"?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Both! How *should* we and *shall* we arouse the emotions of our people to unite themselves in an organized, directed way? Obviously we're not going to wait until we're invaded.

**MR. OGBURN:** I think that we should look at this question from the point of view of the soldier and from the point of view of the civilian. I think that the problem with regard to the soldier is not an especially difficult one. We probably take the view that a soldier who has a technical skill to use in warfare, such as running an airplane or a tank or figuring the trajectory of a bullet, can't, if he's too emotional, do his intellectual work as effectively.

On the other hand, it would seem to me that a soldier who has some emotion is on the whole likely to fight better than if he doesn't have it. Although anger might complicate the situation, very likely hatred might stimulate his fighting.

Don't you agree with that?

**MR. ADLER:** No. I think that anger is an emotion that is likely to occur in the heat of battle—anger and fear. I would like to submit to you gentlemen that there is some evidence that in the last war there was not much hatred between the fighting forces actually opposed to one another in the trenches. There was a great deal of

fraternization. So much so, as has been pointed out, that the general staffs tried to stop it.

**MR. OGBURN:** I think it's true that a man who's trained as a boxer can go out and whip a couple of combatants in a saloon, let us say, without losing his temper; but, on the other hand, generally speaking, if he loses his temper, he probably fights a little better.

Your question, as I understand it, Sherman, is really whether, since we aren't invaded, we need *stimulation* of anger or hatred.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I think that studies have shown that in this war our civilian population has not made the collective effort that we should like to have them make. Therefore, if we can stimulate them to a collective effort by emotion—that is the problem we are discussing.

**MR. ADLER:** May I suggest as at least another alternative that civilian morale in a *civilized* population (and I'm emphasizing the word "civilized") may depend upon convictions, upon ideas, upon intentions, as much as upon emotions? Perhaps the problem of our civilian population—a problem made different by the fact that they don't have *esprit de corps*; that they aren't organized; that they aren't immediately responsive to duties—is a problem of how to focus their convictions upon the end in view without too much arousal of violent emotion.

**MR. OGBURN:** I would like to refer to your opening remark, Adler, in which you described this problem as one that concerned the public-relations experts.

The losses that we are suffering now in the fronts in Russia and in Africa are posing a very serious problem for us. We in America, since we aren't invaded, do not have the response which would come from invasion, but we must fight in some other people's country. I think that is why we have to consider the civilian problem of morale from the point of view of stepping them up to further activity.

**MR. SHERMAN:** We are agreed that we ought to do something about arousing emotion. I suppose we disagree upon how it should be aroused.

**MR. ADLER:** And what emotions should be aroused.

**MR. OGBURN:** We have analyzed two points so far. One is the na-

ture of hatred, and the other is the nature of warfare. But we really haven't touched the problem of what should we do about it—the problem of the “ought.”

In directing our attention to that question, I take the liberty of differentiating, for purposes of clarity, between two kinds of “should.”

There is one “should” which has reference to planning or to a practical program, a program of expediency—what we *should* do in a situation like this. Then, of course, the problem of “should” can be approached from the moral point of view.

I would suggest that we take up the problem of expediency, of what we really should do with regard to hate and anger.

**MR. ADLER:** You raised a moment ago the question (with respect to expediency) of the role of propaganda, the role of definite agencies for arousing public emotions. I consider that whole question to be based upon what seems to me is a false assumption—that the morale of the American population is not good. I quote a recent statement by Mr. Archibald MacLeish: “The morale of the American people, whatever that ambiguous and patronizing word may mean, is excellent. If I have any knowledge of American opinion, the American people are considerably sounder in their opinion than most of those who worry about American opinion seem to think.”<sup>2</sup>

Now I would say that the American public is now doing all that it has been asked to do; that it is fully prepared to do much more; that the trouble is that the government, lagging far behind the public, isn't asking it to do enough; and that, when the government asks it to do more, it will do more.

**MR. OGBURN:** I certainly wouldn't want to put myself in the position of maintaining that the American people do not have a good morale and haven't responded wonderfully to the war. Of course, the only question in a war is whether there is such a thing as a satisfactory response. We've got a war to win. The question is: Are we doing everything we can to win the war? And if we seem to be losing on a couple of fronts, then I'm wondering whether we are doing all we ought to do.

Whether it's the government or the people at fault doesn't interest me very greatly. If it's the government that needs the stimulation

---

<sup>2</sup> Archibald MacLeish, “The Image of Victory,” *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1942.



of hatred or anger, then let us have it in the government rather than in the people.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Recent evidence shows that at least the youth of this country are not doing all they can. In a survey we're conducting, we've found that only about 40 per cent of the youth feel "all-out" toward the war; and about 60 per cent are either indifferent or don't care one way or the other.<sup>3</sup>

**MR. OGBURN:** That's very interesting.

**MR. ADLER:** May I suggest, sir, that it sounds as if the evidence was taken from the Middle West? It isn't only the youth; it's the adults as well.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, it *is* taken from the Middle West, in the Chicago area.

**MR. ADLER:** Then it's open to suspicion for that reason.

**MR. OGBURN:** If we do build up a campaign to stimulate anger or to stimulate rage or to stimulate hatred, the question is: What effect is that going to have on our general population? Are we not putting in the souls of men a real cancer, which will burn and cause interminable trouble after the war is over? Will it not raise a bar to the peace? Can we have as good a peace as we should have if we inculcate hate and anger into the hearts of men?

**MR. ADLER:** You're assuming that by propaganda the people can be aroused to hate the enemy; to hate the Axis peoples; to hate the Germans. Is that right?

**MR. OGBURN:** I'm not only assuming, but I'm sure it's correct.

**MR. ADLER:** I go on to say that I know you're right, because the Germans have done it. It seems to me that a perfect analogy is with the campaign in Germany which led to anti-Semitism. There the German people, by propaganda, were aroused to a violent hatred of a whole people. We can do the same thing in this country.

**MR. OGBURN:** Not the *same* thing!

---

<sup>3</sup> A study of opinion among youth of high-school age in and out of school is being conducted by Dr. Sherman and assistants as a part of investigations being made by the Communications Seminar at the University of Chicago. The results of the study will be published in the near future.

**MR. ADLER:** Arouse the American people

**MR. OGBURN:** But not in the same way!

**MR. ADLER:** How would our propaganda be different?

**MR. OGBURN:** The propaganda of the Germans may be for very definite ends which we do not like, namely, totalitarian ends, un-democratic ends. We can set up a series of stimuli which will be quite different.

**MR. ADLER:** Only in the ends. I think the means are equally bad in both cases.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I should like to come back to the question of how hate will affect the character of the people. I think that's very important.

**MR. OGBURN:** It is indeed.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Teachers are asking it about their students; parents are asking it about their young children and about their adolescents. My very definite feeling is that, just as you can dispel anger when the stimulus is gone, so you can dispel hatred. And I don't feel at all concerned about the post-war condition of these children who will have hatred aroused in them immediately.

**MR. ADLER:** It seems to me that something we've already said indicates at least a question against what you have just said now. Anger, you said, is a quickly removable emotion—removed when the obstacle is removed. Hate is a persistent one. Doesn't that mean that anger is an easier and less dangerous emotion, because if you hate the German people the German people remain with us after the war? If you hate their injustice or are angry at their acts, when those acts are corrected or removed, the emotions are gone. Isn't hatred of the German people exactly the kind of emotion which is likely to persist and therefore likely to spoil the possibility of a good peace?

**MR. SHERMAN:** No. I don't think it will persist, for this reason. When we win the war, what the German people stand for will no longer be true, and, therefore, the stimulus of the German people will be removed.

**MR. ADLER:** That sounds to me as if hate were a rational thing; but hate is unreasoning. When you've attached hate to the German

people because of punitive characteristics, then that will continue, I'm afraid, as the evidence of anti-Semitism and other race prejudices do. Once you create race prejudice, I doubt if you can remove it.

**MR. OGBURN:** This, of course, is an extremely serious point. To advocate a program of hate or of anger, if it was to leave a permanent scar on our population and make a peaceful world more difficult, would surely be a thing we wouldn't want to do.

But this exchange of words which you've just had seems to me to offer a clue to the solution of that point. You spoke of the defeat of the Germans and of the issue then being removed. Well, that really means, does it not, that we are hating the things the Nazis stand for; we're hating Nazism; we're hating the tyranny, the abolition of freedom, the cruelty, the punishment, and all that? And if we hate them—that set of traits—we're really not hating the people. And if we operate a program on that basis, do we really not insure a right attitude after the peace?

**MR. ADLER:** Let me only add that there are two questions here. One is the effect of hatred upon what goes on at the peace table. The other point is that hatred, known to the enemy as something that the American people feel for them, is likely to prolong the war.

The *New York Times*, commenting on a speech by Joseph Stalin, said that it was good diplomacy to make the German people understand, and the underground movements in those countries understand, that we do not wish to destroy the German people.

**MR. SHERMAN:** And yet the Russians hate the Germans and fight better for it.

**MR. OGBURN:** We're discussing the practical question of stimulating civilian energy toward prosecuting the war further. We've been talking only about anger and hate, but there are other things for which civilian support may be aroused. They may, for instance, fight for gains—maybe for territory; maybe for booty; maybe for gains of an idealistic sort. They may fight for democracy. They may fight for our own way of life.

When we speak here about mobilizing energy by arousing anger, that doesn't mean that that's the only thing that we would mobilize. I do believe that if we set up the idea of a peace for a better world in which to live we may compensate for the anger which we

stimulate in our program.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I think there's another point. We're talking about hating ideas. We're agreed that we hate the Nazis; we hate the Axis people, or rather their ideas. Can we differentiate between an idea and the people who produce an idea?

**MR. OGBURN:** Practically, it's very difficult.

**MR. SHERMAN:** It's very difficult. I think we can differentiate when the fighting is over.

**MR. ADLER:** We're agreed, I take it, that it is the emotion of hate rather than any of the other emotions—fighting for something positive or anger or fear—that raises the moral problem to which we now want to turn in conclusion.

The moral problem, as we seem to agree, is made by the distinction between hating persons, hating human beings, and hating things, or human acts, injustices, principles, policies of one sort or another, that are wrong. And you gentlemen seem to agree that, though that is morally right, it's psychologically impossible for men to separate the two.

I wonder what you think about the maxim of Jesus, which all Christians accept as a fundamental moral and theological truth, that one shall not hate one's enemy but shall love one's enemy.

**MR. OGBURN:** That, of course, seems to me to be a basic precept for organized, civilized life, and I would take no exception to it.

The only question that I would really raise would be this: When Jesus spoke those words, was he not living in a time and in a country which was peaceful? And I wonder whether he really had war in his mind. And I wonder, therefore, whether the people who cite this maxim are really fair in citing it in wartime?

**MR. ADLER:** I'm no theologian, but I'd like to at least examine the text of the fifth chapter of Matthew, verses 43-48, because I think that, when you look at the whole text, you'll see that Jesus did not mean the obvious thing, that all men can readily love the enemy.

The text that's usually quoted is: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you..." People don't go on and read the rest of that text, in which Jesus

says: “For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more *than others?* . . . . Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.”

I take that last sentence to mean that this is a counsel of perfection. It is not something the ordinary man can do, and no man can do without God’s grace and help. Therefore, I think that Jesus is recognizing the psychological point that the separation of hating principles from hating persons is very difficult and can’t be done, perhaps, without God’s help.

**MR. OGBURN:** But if we are able to attain this ideal of perfection which Jesus sets before us, we, of course, do gain great spiritual value.

But let me direct your attention to this: Suppose that this maxim does apply to wartime, then what it really amounts to—does it not—is that Jesus is saying to us in wartime, since we have to shoot in wartime, that he wants us to shoot our loved ones? Now Jesus was a man who knew human nature better than anyone I know of, and he surely wouldn’t advise us to shoot our loved ones in wartime.

**MR. ADLER:** I think that again requires us to distinguish between hate and anger. You do have to shoot your loved ones. You do have to send criminals to prison and to the electric chair. You do that not in hate but in righteous anger, giving out just punishments.

I think that shooting the enemy, when you’re fighting in a just cause (if you believe you’re fighting in a just cause), is not out of hate.

**MR. OGBURN:** That’s shooting the enemy; but, if we love our enemies, we’re shooting our loved ones. And I don’t quite seem to see that as in accord with human nature.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I think that’s a debatable point, and I don’t quite follow all this discussion, but psychologically I think it’s a matter that should be taken up in a different way.

**MR. OGBURN:** In summary, gentlemen, we can say on this topic that we have agreed that hatred is probably not the most satisfactory solution of our problem of building public morale, nor is the word “anger.”

I think we've also analyzed the question and shown that in peacetime we have many other emotions involved other than anger and hate and that it probably behooves us to stimulate these other more positive emotions.

We all are certainly agreed on this point: That to hate an idea, to hate something in the form of a principle, is very effective, both after the war and to prosecute the war. We will find, if we do this, that this hate will not be in our hearts to rancor us in peacetime. 📖

### SUGGESTED READINGS

BIDDLE, FRANCIS, "Identification of Alien Enemies," *Vital Speeches*, February 15, 1942.

COUSINS, NORMAN, and ROOSEVELT, ELEANOR, "Must We Hate To Fight," *Saturday Review of Literature*, July 4, 1942.

EASTMAN, FRED, "Hate, Radio, and Morale," *Christian Century*, May 27, 1942.

FORSTER, E. M., "The Unsung Virtue of Tolerance," *Vital Speeches*, October 15, 1941.

FRIEDRICH, C. J., "We Need No Goebbels," *Common Sense*, June, 1942.

"Hate?" *Time*, May 18, 1942.

HOCKING, WILLIAM ERNEST, "The Nature of Morale," *American Journal of Sociology*, November, 1941.

"Ledger of Hate," *Newsweek*, January 19, 1942.

"We Need No Goebbels," *Time*, June 15, 1942. *Comments on Professor Friedrich's article listed above.*

### QUESTIONS FOR ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

*The following questions of wider scope, intended for discussion, are suggested by the broadcast, and answers may be found in the literature on the subject listed in the section "Suggested Readings," found above.*

1. Do you think we must hate our enemies? In your opinion do the American people have a feeling of hatred toward the Axis?
2. What is meant by the term "hate"? Is it possible to hate an idea and not hate the people who produced it? Can one hate Hitlerism without hating Hitler?

3. What is the difference between hate and anger? Do you think fear is more effective than hate in mobilizing a people's energies? Do you agree with Dr. Sherman that in wartime we need hatred and not anger?
4. What are the differences between the emotional feelings of soldiers and of civilians? Does the civilian population need more emotion to do less than the soldier does?
5. Why does the question of hatred raise a moral problem? Why is it immoral to hate persons?
6. Is it politically and militarily expedient to try to arouse greater hatred toward the Axis? Would such an attempt be doomed to failure because of its artificiality? What might be the post-war effects of such hatred? In terms of the post-war settlement is there need for an attitude of severity toward the Axis?
7. Should a positive image of the meaning of the victory we fight for be reinforced by a greater arousal of emotion rather than by an intensification of the negative feeling of hate?

*A radio discussion broadcast from the University of Chicago over stations of the National Broadcasting Company, Sunday, July 19, 1942, at 1:30 P.M., Central War Time.*

*The ROUND TABLE, oldest educational program continuously on the air, is broadcast entirely without a script, although participants meet in advance, prepare a topical outline, and exchange data and views. Subjects are chosen because of their social, political, or economic significance. The program has no "ax to grind." In the selection of speakers, the effort is to provide a balanced discussion by participants who have special competence and knowledge. The opinion of each speaker is his own and in no way involves the responsibility of either the University of Chicago or the National Broadcasting Company.*

---



---

**WELCOME NEW MEMBER**

**Jason VanNimwegen**

***We welcome your comments, questions or suggestions.***

---

---

## THE GREAT IDEAS ONLINE

published weekly for its members by the

### CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE GREAT IDEAS

Founded in 1990 by Mortimer J. Adler & Max Weismann

Max Weismann, Publisher and Editor

Ken Dzugan, Senior Fellow and Archivist

A not-for-profit (501)(c)(3) educational organization.

Donations are tax deductible as the law allows.