* I am writing you this piece firstly, to thank you and the group for their excellent efforts in reviewing Tragedy and Hope by Carol Quigley. Unfortunately, in the last session that approached five hours, we pushed the time envelope, and I did not want to be An A hole by offering my comments after that length of time. I apologize for the delay in doing this because normally when I write or think I like to apply past lessons or pattern recognition to current events in anticipation of future outcomes. Unfortunately, I was not drawing any inspiration from current events as they all seem scripted, predictable and fabricated. Bad actors, staging a mutiny on a ship of fools, in the theatre of the absurd. The only thing that made sense to me was to withdraw into a real activity duplicating what you just did regarding your family circumstances. I needed a break to put things in perspective.

Before I proceed, I would like to go back to the A hole comment. I think anybody has or can be an A hole. When I'm being an A hole, I'm fully aware of the fact that I am, however, I'm not sure that a lot of the actors we see in day-to-day life are fully aware of the fact that they're being an A hole. I guess it goes back to that self-awareness thing. Back in the day one of my favorite takedowns was accusing somebody of playing - The Role. The script would go as follows: you're not an honest politician you're just playing the role of an honest politician. Someone interested in their constituents would have done A, B and C. Instead, when you get in the office you choose the caucus over us and you choose to do Z... Little did I know that this would have transformed into a full-time job in these dystopian times. Maybe someday I’ll be able to use Allan’s "you are a composite of your previous indoctrinations. " I digress

" Give me 6 lines written by the most honorable of men, and I will find an excuse in them to hang him. " is a quote by the infamous Cardinal Richelieu that is fully applicable to the Quigley paragraph found on paperback page 793 which reads as follows:

After 1940, writers tended less and less to attack the bourgeoisie way of life; that job had been done. Instead, they describe situations, characters, and actions that were simply non bourgeoisie: violence, social irresponsibility, sexual laxity and perversion, miscegenation, human weakness in relation to alcohol, narcotics, or sex, or domestic and business relationships conducted along completely non bourgeoisie lines. Ernest Hemingway, William Faulkner, Erskine Caldwell, John Dos Passos, and a host of lesser writers, many of them embracing in the cult of violence, showed the trend. A very popular work like The Lost Weekend could represent the whole group. A few, like Hemingway, found a new moral outlook to replace the middle-class ideology that they had abandoned. In Hemingway's case he shook the dust of upper middle-class Oak Park, Illinois, off his feet and immersed himself in the tragic sense of life of Spain with its constant demand upon men to demonstrate their virility by incidental activity with women and unflinching courage in facing death. To Hemingway, this could be achieved in the bull ring, in African big game hunting, and war or, in a more symbolic way, in prize fighting or crime. A significant point here is that Hemingway's embrace of the outlook of the Pakistani Peruvian axis as a token of his rejection of his middle-class background was always recognized by him as a pretense, and, when his virility, in the crudest sense, was gone, he blew out his brains.

Now let's contrast the aforementioned paragraph with some quick highlights of Hemingway's career and life which read as follows:

- Ernest Miller Hemingway (July 21st, 1899- July 2nd, 1961) was an American novelist, short story writer and journalist. Known for his economical understated style that influenced later 20th century writers, he had been romanticized for his adventurous lifestyle and outspoken, blunt public image.

- after leaving high school, he went to work for the Kansas City star as a cub reporter. Although he stayed there for only six months, the star style guide, which stated " use short sentences. Use short first paragraphs. Use vigorous English. Be positive, not negative" became a foundation for his prose.

- Hemingway wanted to go to war and tried to enlist in the US army but was not accepted because he had poor eyesight. Instead, he volunteered to a Red Cross recruitment effort in December 1917 and signed on to be an ambulance driver with the American Red Cross motor core in Italy. On May 19, he sailed from New York and arrived in Paris as the city was under bombardment from German artillery. That June he arrived at the Italian front holding the rank of a second Lieutenant. On his first day in Milan, he was sent to the scene of a munitions factory explosion to join rescuers retrieving the shredded remains of female workers. He described the incident in his 1932 nonfiction book death in the afternoon. " I remember that after we searched quite thoroughly for the complete dead and then we collected fragments. "

- on July 8th, right after bringing chocolate and cigarettes from the canteen to the men at the front line, the group came under mortar fire. Hemingway was seriously wounded. Despite his wounds, he assisted Italian soldiers to safety, for which he was decorated with the Italian war merit cross, as well as the silver medal of military valor. For his deed he was promoted to 1st Lieutenant in the Italian army

- he was only 18 at the time. Hemingway later said of the incident: " when you go to war as a boy you have a great illusion of immortality. Other people got killed, not you... then when you are badly wounded the first time you lose that illusion, and you know it can happen to you. " He sustained severe shrapnel wounds to both legs and underwent an immediate operation at the distribution center and spent five days at the field hospital before he was transferred for recuperation to the Red Cross hospital in Milan. He spent six months the hospital.

- in the fall of 1921, Hemingway married his first wife (of four) Hadley Richardson and the two in embarked for Paris where Hemingway became the foreign correspondent for the Toronto Star. There Hemingway would meet writers such as Gertrude Stein, James Joyce and Ezra Pound who " could help a young writer up the rungs of a career ". Hemingway was a tall, handsome, muscular, broad shouldered, brown eyed, rosy cheeked, square jawed, soft voiced young man. Stein who was the bastion of modernism in Paris, became Hemingway's mentor and godmother to his son Jack, she introduced him to the expatriate artists and writers of the Montparnasse quarter, whom she referred to as the Lost Generation- a term Hemingway popularized with the publication of the Sun Also Rises. Hemingway also met influential painters such as Pablo Picasso, Joan Miro, Juan Gris and Luis Quintanilla. Hemingway frequently embarked on alcoholic sprees with James Joyce during his 1st 20 months in Paris, Hemingway filed 88 stories for the Toronto Star newspaper.

- The Sun Also Rises epitomized the post war expatriate generation, received good reviews and is " recognized as Hemingway's greatest work ". Hemingway himself later wrote to his editor Max Perkins " that the point of the book was not so much about a generation being lost, but that the earth abideth forever ", he believed the characters in the sun also rises may have been " battered but were not lost ".

- Hemingway sustained a severe head wound that required 57 stitches. Still suffering symptoms of the concussion, he accompanied troops to the Normandy landings wearing a large head bandage. The military treated him as " precious cargo " and he was not allowed ashore. The landing craft he was on came within sight of Omaha beach before coming under enemy fire when it turned back. Hemingway later wrote in Colliers " that he could see the first, second, third, 4th and 5th waves of landing troops lay where they had fallen, looking like so many heavily laden bundles on the flat pebbly stretch between the sea and 1st cover. "

- in 1951, furious at the critical reception of Across the River and Into the Trees, Hemingway wrote the draft of the Old Man and the Sea in eight weeks, saying " it was the best I can write ever for all my life ". Published in September 1952, it became a book of the month selection, made Hemingway an international celebrity, and won the Pulitzer Prize in May 1953.

- in October 1954, Hemingway received the Nobel Prize for literature. He modestly told the press that Carl Sandberg, Isaac Dinesen and Bernard Berenson deserved the prize, but he gladly accepted the prize money. Hemingway had coveted the Nobel Prize, but when he won it, months after his plane accidents and their worldwide press coverage, there must have been a lingering suspicion in Hemingway's claim that his obituary notices had played a part in the academy's decision. He was still recuperating and decided against travelling to Stockholm. Instead, he sent a speech to be read in which he defined the writer's life: writing, at its best, is a lonely life. Organizations for writers palliate the writer's loneliness, but I doubt if they improve his writing. He grows in public stature as he sheds his loneliness and often his work deteriorates. For he does his work alone and if he's good enough writer he must face eternity, or the lack of it, each day.

- in the early morning hours of July 2nd, 1961, Hemingway " quite deliberately " shot himself with his favorite shotgun. Hemingway's behavior during his final years had been like that of his father before he killed himself, his father may have had hereditary hemochromatosis, whereby the excessive accumulation of iron in tissues, culminates in mental and physical deterioration. Medical records made available in 1991 confirmed that Hemingway had been diagnosed with hemochromatosis in early 1961. His sister Ursula and his brother Leicester also killed themselves.

Hemingway's health was further complicated by heavy drinking throughout most of his life, which exacerbated his erratic behavior, and his head injuries increased the effects of the alcohol. In neuropsychiatrists Andrew Ferraro's 2017 book Hemingway's Brain, a forensic examination of Hemingway's mental illness is hypothesized. In a review of Feraro’s book, it was postulated that Hemingway suffered from the combination of depression, the side effects of nine serious concussions, then, she writes, " add alcohol and stir ". Ferrero writes that Hemingway's concussions resulted in chronic traumatic encephalopathy which eventually led to a form of dementia, most likely dementia with Louie bodies. He bases his hypothesis on Hemingway’s symptoms consistent with DLB such as various comorbidities, and most particularly the delusions, would surface as early as the late 1940s and were almost overwhelming during his final years.

Needless to say, when I read Quigley's comments about Hemingway I was somewhat taken aback. The amount of trauma that Hemingway experienced in his early life would have been a setback for any normal human being and, in fact, despite these setbacks, Hemingway forged ahead in an incredible, meaningful way. In my estimation, and by applying Richelieu's standards, Quigly hung himself by admonishing Hemingway in this manner. But unlike Richelieu, and Quigley for that matter, I will not judge the entire book or Quigley in this manner, but rather, I will try to translate it into a teachable moment.

The questionable paragraph highlights several fallacies or tactics which could be interpreted as purposeful not inadvertent. The first of which is the common fallacy of appeal to authority. The appeal to authority fallacy, also known as argumentum ad vericundiam, is a logical fallacy that occurs when someone accepts a claim as true solely because an authority figure supports it, without considering other evidence or evidence of the authority's expertise in that specific area. Quigley clearly used his unopposed authority to disparage Hemmingway. The second tactic of ad hominem or personal attack was displayed when Quigley described Hemmingway as " embracing the outlook of the Pakistani Peruvian axis as a token of the rejection of his middle-class upbringing ". Ad hominems are a diversion strategy, used to refute an opposing view without having to do the hard work of refuting anything. The pigeon-holing or snap shotting Hemingway as " in the bull ring, or in the boxing ring, in war or big game hunting " could be considered a strawman fallacy where his character was misrepresented or distorted to make it easier to attack. How often are these fallacies and misrepresentations used? Well, the orange man appointed little Marco as Secretary of State, Governor Trudeau stated there wasn’t a fentanyl problem at the border because only a small amount was seized (19.5 kilograms seized at Canadian border vs. 9800 at the Mexican border by US customs, this represents a false dichotomy because both quantities are undesirable, 19.5 could mean they captured very little of a much larger number also known as the base rate fallacy). Prime Minister Mark Carney signed the order to cancel the carbon tax. (There are no executive orders in Canada so what exactly was Carney signing? The carbon tax can be withdrawn by a parliamentary vote that won’t happen due to prorogation or an order in council which is signed by the Governor General.) He is Prime Minister in name only because he hasn't sat in parliament. To enable Carney to sit in parliament without an election some other liberal MP would have to give up their seat. Or he could win a seat in a general election This whole scenario could be described as the steel man fallacy where the character is embellished to deter criticism. My guess is these actions represent a limited hangout where they're getting ready to insert Carney as the Prime Minister due to unforeseen circumstances like a war or through a rigged or disputed election. The carbon tax was dropped without following any of the procedures and then none of the opposing parties complained about the abuse of procedure because everybody hated the carbon tax so much, this is known as appeal to hypocrisy. The opposition party has several key members, including the opposition leader, who were WEF young global leaders and the conservative party has previously signed on to the WEF agenda agreements. When challenged on this the party states that they are against the WEF. This is known as gaslighting.

Although I identified the transgression, I am having difficulty ascertaining the motive. So much so, that I needed further affirmation of Quigley's character. There are countless testimonials like this taken from the Carol Quigley endowed chair brochure written by colleague Dr. Jules David, as follows:

" The key to Carroll Quigley’s success as a teacher and as a scholar lies in his creative intellect, the depth of his perceptions, and the wide interdisciplinary range of this interests, which encompasses the fields of history, economics, philosophy, and science. An iconoclast and a person of insatiable curiosity, as well as keenness of mind, Dr. Quigley stands apart from the specialized scholar who plows diligently in the rutted grooves of narrow disciplines. "

Quigley's malignment of Hemingway is completely out of character. Was he accusing Hemingway and the affiliated artists from the lost generation of creating the foundation of weakness for subsequent generations? Was the paragraph a warning or message? Was Paris of the 1920s a template for Tavistock and Laurel Canyon? Was the paragraph designed to generate a Manchurian activity like the impact of JD Salinger's A Catcher in the Rye on John Hinckley junior, John Lennon’s assassin, and countless other assassins?

Could Hemmingway have been involved in espionage as suggested by the History Channel? In his book “[Writer, Sailor, Soldier, Spy: Ernest Hemingway’s Secret Adventures, 1935-1961](https://www.amazon.com/Writer-Sailor-Soldier-Spy-Hemingways/dp/0062440136/ref=tmm_hrd_swatch_0?_encoding=UTF8&qid=1490794489&sr=8-1),” Nicholas Reynolds chronicles Hemingway’s suspected espionage work for both Soviet and U.S. intelligence agencies, before and during the Cold War. A military historian and former U.S. Marine colonel, Reynolds also spent more than a decade as a CIA officer. As Reynolds recounts, Hemingway wasn’t particularly political, until the Spanish Civil War broke out in 1937. While reporting on the conflict for the American Newspaper Alliance, Hemingway became passionately devoted to the anti-fascist cause and even joined the republican guerrillas fighting Francisco Franco’s nationalist forces. He would later draw on the experience when writing “For Whom the Bell Tolls,” one of his most acclaimed novels. His experience in Spain plunged Hemingway into the world of the revolutionary left and brought him to the attention of the Soviets. The Soviet Union was the only foreign power to provide real support to the Spanish rebels, while Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy backed Franco.

In a 2009 book written by an estranged former KGB officer, Alexander Vassiliev, Reynolds found “verbatim excerpts from Ernest Hemingway’s official Soviet file that Vassiliev had smuggled out of Russia.” The excerpts showed that around December 1940, NKVD agents had recruited Hemingway for “our work on ideological grounds.” Though it’s unclear what exactly they wanted from Hemingway, his influence and access, as well as his talent as a propagandist, would have made him a potentially valuable intelligence asset.

Despite offering a range of motives for the Hemingway paragraph, I am not certain that I have ascertained Quigley's incentive for doing so; and aside from the historical descriptions, predictions, the influence of secret societies and naming of names there must be another aspect of Quigley's intention for this book that I have failed to realise. I suspect that the answer may be related to the following paragraph:

"The Outlook of the West is that broad middle way about which the fads and foibles of the West oscillate. It is what is implied by what the West says it believes, not at one moment but over the long succession of moments that form the history of the West. From that succession of moments it is clear that the West believes in diversity rather than in uniformity, in pluralism, rather than in monism, or dualism, in inclusion rather than exclusion, in liberty rather than in authority, in truth rather than in power, in conversion rather than in annihilation, in the individual rather than in the organization, in reconciliation rather than in triumph, in heterogeneity rather than in homogeneity, in relativisms rather than in absolutes, and in approximations rather than in final answers. The West believes that man and the universe are both complex and that the apparently discordant parts of each can be put into a reasonably workable arrangement with a little good will, patience, and experimentation. In man the West sees body, emotions, and reason as all equally real and necessary, and is prepared to entertain discussion about their relative interrelationships but is not prepared to listen for long to any intolerant insistence that any one of these has a final answer."

According to Benjamin Espin in his review of Tragedy and Hope: While at first glance this might seem to be merely to be a summary of the early 1960s liberal consensus, its roots go far deeper. Quigley himself considered this to be an interpretation of Aquinas. It is also not the only possible interpretation of Aquinas. But it does represent a durable line of thought in the history of the West.

The relationship between Quigley and Aquinas can be better understood in an article by Walter J. Freeman entitled " [Non-linear Brain Dynamics and Intention According to Aquinas](http://sulcus.berkeley.edu/wjf/CR%20FreemanAquinas.pdf?ref=benespen.com), " The Abstract is as follows:

We humans and other animals continuously construct and maintain our grasp of the world by using astonishingly small snippets of sensory information. Recent studies in nonlinear brain dynamics have shown how this occurs: brains imagine possible futures and seek and use sensory stimulation to select among them as guides for chosen actions. On the one hand the scientific explanation of the dynamics is inaccessible to most of us. On the other hand, the philosophical foundation from which the sciences grew is accessible through the work of one of its originators, Thomas Aquinas. The core concept of intention in Aquinas is the inviolable unity of mind, brain and body.

All that we know we have constructed within ourselves from the unintelligible fragments of energy impacting our senses as we move our bodies through the world. This process of intention is transitive in the outward thrust of the body in search of desired future states; it is intransitive in the dynamic construction of predictions of the states in the sensory cortices by which we recognize success or failure in achievement. The process is phenomenologically experienced in the action-perception cycle. Enactment is through the serial creation of neurodynamic activity patterns in brains, by which the self of mind-brain-body comes to know the world by shaping the self to an approximation of the sought-for input, and then by assimilating those shapes into knowledge and meaning.

This conception of the self as closed, autonomous, and self-organizing, devised over 700 years ago and shelved by Descartes, Leibniz and Spinoza 300 years ago, is now re-emerging in philosophy and re-establishes the meaning of intention in its original sense. The core Aquinian concept of the unity of brain, body and soul/mind, which had been abandoned by mechanists and replaced by Brentano and Husserl using the duality inherent in representationalism, has been revived by Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty, but in phenomenological terms that are opaque to neuroscientists. In my experience there is no extant philosophical system than that of Aquinas that better aligns with the new findings in nonlinear brain dynamics. Therefore, a detailed reading and transcription of basic terms is warranted, comparing in both directions the significance of key words across 700 years from medieval metaphysics to 21st century brain dynamics.

To highlight the Quigley-Aquinas non-linear thinking as it applies to the current environment let’s examine the following commentary from the Social Pathologist blog on Nov. 21, 2010:

He is close (but not there yet) to a good understanding of the PC phenomenon, and he does have some valuable insights. He has put up a rather good post which conservative thinkers need to take heed of. [Why is political correctness utterly immune to evidence](http://charltonteaching.blogspot.com/2010/11/why-is-political-correctness-utterly.html)

is a very good post. I think the pertinent quote from that post is this one:

*My point is that political correctness has now reached such a level of abstraction that no evidence could ever challenge it. Reform is impossible, on principle.*  
  
*This means that those who oppose political correctness should not waste time and energy on rational argument with people who are truly PC.*  
  
*There is no way into the system of sincere PC, no possibility of modifying or moderating it - merely of delaying it.*  
  
*Of course, political correctness will destroy itself, but in doing so it will inflict damage upon its host societies - the scale of which damage increases with every passing year.*

I think Charlton is absolutely correct, there is no point in arguing with the PC crowd as they simply do not admit any evidence which will falsify their world view. My interest is why and what does this mean for conservatives?  
  
  
Our world is full of injustices and miseries. The desire to rid the world of them is laudable and noble. Utopianism is a desire to make the world a better place, and it's from this messianic Utopianism that the PC crowd get their sense of moral superiority. They are always on the "side of angels" and therefore better than the "non-believers". It should not be underestimated of just how powerful a motivant is this sense of belonging to a Utopian creating movement is. As Orwell repeatedly reminds us, the best fighters for socialism weren't the apparatchiks, but the men who *honestly* believed they were building a better world.  
  
One of the great themes of the end of the *Belle Epoque* was the sense of "boredom" amongst the youth. When World War 1 erupted, men suddenly had a purpose to their lives. Several commentators on Fukuyama's End of History expressed regret that there were no more enemies left to battle. I sometimes wonder whether the continual allure of Utopianism is because and women generally lead boring lives. It is an escape from the monotony and gives them a sense of meaning. Amongst these individuals, any attack on the "Utopian vision" is not just a logical refutation of the dream, but a negation of self-worth and hence there is a powerful incentive to counter arguments or outright refusal to acknowledge the error.  
  
  
The other operating factor at play here amongst the more intelligent PC crowd is their innate sense of intellectual superiority and subsequent pleasure in themselves. This sense of superiority is expressed as a dismissal of any "inferior" opinions. These individuals latch onto socialism for the same reason that tradesmen and the peasantry do, it's a simple idea for simple men. It's ready made for the credulous and half-educated, particularly those with "book-smarts" as opposed to "street-smarts". And by half educated, I mean credentialed as opposed to "educated". There is a big difference between the two and it's an important distinction. Many of our universities are nothing more than colleges of advanced technical training and as such our universities are designed around producing skilled graduates, not thinkers. The effect in a left-wing academic environment is that the skilled technicians leave with left wing views under the impression that they are "educated", and hence intellectually superior to the proles. Where in fact the prole may be less skilled but is perhaps more "real world educated" than the university graduate.  
  
This combined sense of messianic utopianism and intellectual superiority are probably the most common motivant factors in the high caste PC crowd. This "priest caste " is so sure of its intellectual superiority and so sure of the moral rightness of its vision that any attempt to dissuade them is going to fail. I agree with Charlton, there is no point, it's a waste of time. The conservative movement needs to circle the wagons, not negotiate with the scalpers.

Linear thinking rationalized through perceptions of poorly scrutinized snapshots validated through the bandwagon fallacy, also known as the *appeal to popularity* or *argumentum ad populum*, is a logical fallacy that occurs when someone assumes something is true or good simply because it’s popular or widely accepted. This cognitive bias can lead people to make decisions based on the actions of others rather than on their own critical thinking "Political correctness " is just "newspeak " for bandwagon effect. This was palpable towards the end of Quigley’s teaching career and highlighted in the introduction of the Life, Lectures and Collective Writng of Carroll Quigley as follows: Much of the joy of teaching left Quigley in his last years. He complained bitterly that his 1970s college students were woefully under-educated and ill-prepared for college level work and that too many of them had their minds elsewhere, fixated more on bringing about a social revolution than on achieving an education. Helen Veit, the person closest to Quigley during the last ten years of his life, wrote in reply to a student who had so strongly opposed Quigley’s “tough grading standards”: […] Impatient he may have been; arrogant he was not. His emphatic manner derived from his experience of teaching large classes and the need for catching and retaining their attention. But he never believed that he had “answers”; what he taught was methods of approaching problems. He often stressed how little we know about the important things of life, especially human relationships. What he sought above all was to help people to become mature, by realizing their potentials and understanding that material things, however necessary, should never be ends themselves, while what is important is seeking the truth in cooperation with others, with the knowledge that one will never find it. Nor was he ever cynical, much as he deplored inefficiency and ignorance. His beliefs and principles were of the highest order; his greatest joy came from finding people who could meet his standards, and from whom he could learn.

I believe I am beginning to understand the intent behind Quigleys controversial Hemmingway paragraph. He was demonstrating how students with a high level of self-aggrandized moral and intellectual superiority without the wisdom of life experience fall victim to an entire array of fallacious thinking including bandwagon or politically correct thinking, strawman and steelman arguments, linear thinking based on snapshoots and cognitive bias, ad hominem posing as substantive argument, false dichotomies, and divide and conquer posing as effective management. The Hemmingway paragraph highlight both a writing technique or teaching method that require a curiousity and capacity to read between the lines. HE WROTE THE PARAGRAPH TO CHALLENGE OUR THINKING.

The iceberg theory (aka the theory of omission) is a writing style created by Hemingway. According to him, there is always more to a story than what is written on the page, and by omitting details that you already know to be true, you can produce a more captivating read for your audience.

“If a writer of prose knows enough of what he is writing about, he may omit things that he knows and the reader, if the writer is writing truly enough, will have a feeling of those things as strongly as though the writer had stated them.” –Hemingway, *Death in the Afternoon*

Commonly used by [authors](https://proofed.com/author/) and writers, this immersive writing technique can be a very powerful tool. To write anything, you need to put words on a page. But the words you leave out can have just as much of an impact on the story itself.

The 20 years that it took Quigley to compose Tragedy and Hope and the 100-year span that it covered made it virtually impossible to include all the details surrounding historical events. He had to rely on the Iceberg Theory or theory of omission to ensure that his obtuse writing style was not stymied by too much detail. On countless occasions my fellow book club afficionados elaborated on details that seemed to be incomplete or missing from Quigley’s interpretation of events. The number of times Quigley’s omissions or diminution of events sent me seeking additional references were frequent. A few that come to mind are: the flight of Hess to Scotland with a peace treaty and his secret imprisonment until his death in the 1960’s, the massacre of Germanic people in Polish border cities that prompted Hitler's invasion ( same playbook for Donetsk, Lugansk, Zelensky, Azov, and Putin’s SMO), Paton’s major contribution during ww2, his controversies and his mysterious death, and finally Che Guevera’s role in the Cuban revolution and fomenting civil unrest or war in the Pakistani Peruvian Axis (one of his amputated hands was delivered directly to George Bush Senior). Theory of omission were used brilliantly by Quigley but were highly dependent on the calibre and curiosity of the reader. Omission also served a second purpose for Quigley as he worked at a Jesuit university in the heart of Camelot amongst an assortment of spys and diplomats. One further example of Quigley’s use of omission involves Hemingway and the Spanish Civil War. Why was a prestigious journalist covering a non-American war? Simple, Pulitzer and Hearst had to sell newspapers. So much so, in fact, that they were both caught directly funding the war and the term Yellow Journalism was foisted upon them.

An interesting side note for the book club was George Orwell’s involvement in the Spanish civil war. [He volunteered to fight for the Republican side in 1936, joining the POUM (Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista) and documenting his experiences in his memoir, **"Homage to Catalonia,"** where he detailed the complexities and challenges of the conflict. The war profoundly influenced his political views and writing, shaping his perspectives on totalitarianism and socialism. Orwell's observations highlighted the disorganization among the anti-fascist forces and the impact of propaganda, which he later critiqued in his works. His experiences in Spain were pivotal in defining his literary and political identity.](https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=45b9d28e267bcdb78c0817c5eda08045454d6f8e9737fa471e03a93fe0c5c08aJmltdHM9MTc0MzM3OTIwMA&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=4&fclid=33580f6e-0e6d-6d76-1c69-1cf40fbb6c3d&psq=george+orwell+and+the+spanish+civil+war&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnL3dpa2kvSG9tYWdlX3RvX0NhdGFsb25pYQ&ntb=1)

George Orwell would undoubtedly agree to the appropriateness of the title " For Whom the Bell Tolls " for Hemingway's novel about the Spanish civil war (I'm being somewhat presumptuous here because Hemingway and Orwell fought on opposite sides). Not only did it affect Orwell and Hemingway, but its impact was felt around the world. The title is an excellent example of Hemingway’s Iceberg Effect. It was an excerpt from John Donne (1572-1631) who was a hugely important figure in Elizabethan and Jacobean literature: in some ways, he is second only to Shakespeare in his literary importance. His prose reads as follows: *No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friend’s or of thine own were; any man’s death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind, and therefore* ***never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.***

***The oft quoted ‘no man is an island’ line, as well as the ‘for whom the bell tolls’ come from the seventeenth Meditation in Donne’s Devotions. Donne was gravely ill and near his own death, and the mortality of all human life, must have been continually on his mind; the Devotions come back to sin and salvation time and again, as in the Holy Sonnets. The meaning of ‘never send to know for whom the bell tolls’ is straightforward. We should feel a sense of belonging to the whole of humanity and should feel a sense of loss at every death, because it has taken something away from mankind. The other famous phrase from this Meditation that has entered common usage is ‘no man is an island’, because no individual can subsist alone.***

***We need not only social company and companionship, but also an awareness of how we all have a share in the world: we are all part of the human race and the suffering and passing of another human being should affect us, not least because it is a regular reminder that one day, it will be us for whom the funeral bell is tolling.***

***Perhaps the bell is tolling for icebergs. If 90% of history is hidden from us and given that most people lack the curiosity to investigate the omissions what does that say about real history? And what does this say about the present, about reality? If we consider the results of the Milgram experiment where all the participants went to at least 300 volts and 65% continued until the full 450 volts leading to the conclusion that under the right circumstances ordinary people will obey unjust orders from authorities. When we factor in the results of the Asch conformity experiment where 75% of participants conformed to a group’s incorrect answer at least once demonstrate the powerful influence of social pressure on individual judgement. We can conclude that a vast majority of the public base their historical frame of reference and their reality on expert opinion and authority, and that these perceptions are validated by a jury of their peers. Most of society’s reality is based on the common fallacies of appeal tto authority and bandwagon effect. Alan is correct, human behaviour has been studied and exploited long before Plato’s Allegory of the Cave.***

***Authority without responsibility, and the means to address passive crowds, provide the requisite environment for individuals afflicted by the dark triad to thrive. Psychopaths, narcissists and Machiavellians are given the means to justify your end. They are notorious, one-dimensional thinkers void of any original thought thus making them the perfect receptacle for unreasonable commands, prefabricated hegelian solutions and stereotypical roles to compensate for their lack of personality. Any successful endeavour realistically should mitigate their activities, but they are always airlifted in as a preordained saviour much to the chagrin of those who played by the rules hoping to succeed. These people are easy to identify because their communication is clouded by a multitude of logical fallacies like the cloud of dirt that enveloped Pigpen in the Peanuts cartoons. One need only remember the recent marvellous medical interventions administered by the hippocratis oafs and lauded by the high integrity media informing the just apparatchiks.***

***“There's a*** ***reason narcissists don't learn from mistakes and that's because they never get past the first step which is admitting that they made one. It's always an assistant's fault, an adviser's fault, a lawyer's fault. Ask them to account for a mistake any other way and they'll say, 'what mistake?'***

***Narcissism falls along the axis of what psychologists call personality disorders, one of a group that includes antisocial, dependent, histrionic, avoidant and borderline personalities.  But by most measures, narcissism is one of the worst, if only because the narcissists themselves are so clueless."***

***Jeffrey Kluger, The Narcissist Next Door***

***What started out as a simple examination of a Quigley paragraph about Ernest Hemingway transformed into an adventure of learning about one of America's great authors, the similarity between his writing and Quigley's teaching style, a review of basic critical thinking, a deeper understanding of Quigleys book and its relation to Thomas Aquinas, an examination of the iceberg or omission theory and its impact on the relevance of history and reality, and how the lack of critical thinking, particularly in regard to anointed leaders in their temples of political correctness, continue to subject us to the hidden multi-millennial influence. Quigley genuinely wanted us to learn through curiosity, read between the lines, think clearly, understand the whole and be relentless in our search for truth. Thank you for including me in the book club. I can appreciate that this book provides an excellent foundation for understanding your efforts and Allan’s work. Before I sign off, I'll offer one final reflection on Quigley’s incorporation of Aquinas’s mind, body and spirit in Tragedy and Hope versus the intuitive and esoteric nature of reality we will be examining:***

***“To be free is to be capable of thinking one’s own thoughts, not the thoughts merely of the body, or of society, but thoughts generated by one’s deepest most original, most essential and spiritual self, one’s individuality.”***

***― Rudolf Steiner***

***All the best, Dan***