“The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies... is a foolish idea. Instead, the two parties should be almost identical, so that the American people can throw the rascals out at any election without leading to any profound or extensive shifts in policy. Then it should be possible to replace it, every four years if necessary, by the other party which will be none of these things but will still pursue, with new vigor, approximately the same basic policies.”
— Carroll Quigley

“What has most disturbed Carroll Quigley is the deterioration that has occurred in college education. While universities have produced an ever increasing number of specialists, technicians, scholars, and researchers in a wide variety of fields, institutions of higher education have been affected by a philosophical myopia. This has caused a serious erosion of the highest ideals associated with intellectual pursuits and professionalism. Throughout his life, Dr. Quigley has fought against this trend. A chair in Carroll Quigley's name will stand for quality education for as long as it is endowed.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“Westerners came in with guns, they made the native governments sign agreements not to raise their import tariff over 5 percent and in one case 8 percent. Japan didn’t get free from that tariff until the 20th century. In China and in the Ottoman Empire they didn’t get rid of it until well in the 20th century. And this 5 percent tariff made it impossible for them to keep European industrial goods out and preserve the handicraft of their own peasantry. Well, now, the transportation and communication revolution requires capital. Where are they going to get it? There is no development ahead of it which would provide it. It requires labor. Where are they going to get that? Their economic system, their agricultural system, is already producing hardly enough. Well, the way they got these skilled technologists, where they got these inventions, where they got the capital was, of course, from Europe, generally by borrowing it and building railroads and so forth. But they were not paying for it themselves.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“There is a change underway, however. Our society used to be a ladder on which people generally climbed upward. More and more now we are going to a planetary structure, in which the great dominant lower middle class, the class that determines our prevailing values and organizational
structures in education, government, and most of society, are providing recruits for the other groups — sideways, up, and even down, although the movement downward is relatively small. As the workers become increasingly petty bourgeois and as middle-class bureaucratic and organizational structures increasingly govern all aspects of our society, our society is increasingly taking on the characteristics of the lower middle class, although the poverty culture is also growing. The working class is not growing. Increasingly we are doing things with engineers sitting at consoles, rather than with workers screwing nuts on wheels. The workers are a diminishing, segment of society, contrary to Marx’s prediction that the proletariat would grow and grow. I have argued elsewhere that many people today are frustrated because we are surrounded by organizational structures and artifacts. Only the petty bourgeoisie can find security and emotional satisfaction in an organizational structure, and only a middle-class person can find them in artifacts, things that men have made, such as houses, yachts, and swimming pools. But human beings who are growing up crave sensation and experience. They want contact with other people, moment-to-moment, intimate contact. I’ve discovered, however, that the intimacy really isn’t there. Young people touch each other, often in an almost ritual way; they sleep together, eat together, have sex together. But I don’t see the intimacy. There is a lot of action, of course, but not so much more than in the old days, I believe, because now there is a great deal more talk than action. This group, the lower middle class, it seems to me, holds the key to the future. I think probably they will win out. If they do, they will resolutely defend our organizational structures and artifacts. They will cling to the automobile, for instance; they will not permit us to adopt more efficient methods of moving people around. They will defend the system very much as it is and, if necessary, they will use all the force they can command. Eventually they will stop dissent altogether, whether from the intellectuals, the religious, the poor, the people who run the foundations, the Ivy League colleges, all the rest. The colleges are already becoming bureaucratized, anyway. I can’t see the big universities or the foundations as a strong progressive force. The people who run Harvard and the Ford Foundation look more and more like lower-middle-class bureaucrats who pose no threat to the established order because they are prepared to do anything to defend the system.”

― Carroll Quigley, *Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings*

“don’t think you can have any society without self-discipline, individual responsibility, some kind of property that you can call your own, some basis for identity, some system of moral values. Only emotional people cry, “Down with the middle classes,” or any other class. I think that we can design a better society, and we still have about the best society that’s around. The fact that we are discontented with its imperfections is not a bad thing in itself, but it is no justification to destroy it. And if we are to have a society in the future which is strong and healthy and stable, it will be based to a very considerable extent on the virtues that you’re talking about. But it cannot be based upon a rigid loyalty to structures.”

― Carroll Quigley, *Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings*

“told his students in “The World Since 1914” class that there was little point in discussing the Third World when they knew so little about how their own society works: “So I told them about the USA — really very hair-raising when it is all laid out in sequence: . . . 1. cosmic hierarchy; 2. energy; 3. agriculture; 4. food; 5. health and medical services; 6. education; 7. income flows and the worship of GROWTH; 8. inflation. . .

showing how we are violating every aspect of life by turning everything into a ripoff because we... have adopted the view that insatiable individualistic greed must run the world.” 7 He feared “that the students will come to feel that all is hopeless, so I must... show them how solutions can be found by holistic methods seeking diversity, decentralization, communities...etc.” 8 Pleased with the class response, he later recalled: “The students were very excited and my last lecture in which I put the whole picture together was about the best lecture I ever gave. That was 10 Dec. [1975], my last full day of teaching after 41 years.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“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.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies, one, perhaps, of the Right and the other of the Left, is a foolish idea acceptable only to doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead, the two parties should be almost identical, so that the American people can “throw the rascals out” at any election without leading to any profound or extensive shifts in policy.”
— Carroll Quigley, Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time

“Quigley found the explanation of disintegration in the gradual transformation of social “instruments” into “institutions,” that is, the transformation of social arrangements functioning to meet real social needs into social institutions serving their own purposes regardless of real social needs. In an ideologically Platonistic society, social arrangements are molded to express a rigidly idealized version of reality. Such institutionalization would not have the flexibility to accommodate to the pressures of changing reality for which the ideology has no categories of thought that will allow perception, analysis, and handling. But the extraordinary distinction of Western civilization is that its ontology allows an open-ended epistemology. It is engaged in a constant effort to understand reality which is perceived as in constant change. Therefore, our categories of knowledge are themselves always subject to change. As a consequence reform is always possible.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“Yet Quigley perceives — correctly in my view — the possible termination of open-ended Western civilization. With access to an explosive technology that can tear the planet apart, coupled with the failure of Western civilization to establish any viable system of world government, local political authority will tend to become violent and absolutist. As we move into irrational activism, states will seize upon ideologies that justify absolutism. The 2,000-year separation in Western history of state and society would then end. Western people would rejoin those of the rest of the world in merging the two into a single entity, authoritarian and static. The age that we are about to enter would be an
ideologic one consistent with the views of Hegel and Marx — a
homeostatic condition. That triumph would end the Western experiment
and return us to the experience of the rest of the world — namely, that
history is a sequence of stages in the rise and fall of absolutist
ideologies.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“Always the teacher, Quigley emphasized the study of tools of analysis
develop a useful epistemology. In epistemology he always retained his
belief in the scientific method.6 Quigley's explanation of scientific
method as an analytical tool in the social sciences is original with him
only in that he recognized the real limitations of the physical sciences,
as opposed to the scientific extremism of Langlois and Seignobos. The
scientific method Quigley subscribed to consists of gathering evidence,
making a hypothesis, and testing the hypothesis. The laws arising from
the use of scientific method in both the physical and social sciences are
idealized theories reflecting observed phenomena only approximately,
but Quigley felt laws must be based on observation and must be
amended to account for any observed anomalies. After these laws were
scientifically constructed, Quigley used them as conceptual paradigms to
explain historical phenomena through comparison, in contrast to
rationally derived laws of the theorists which will not adapt to anomalies
of observation. “Theory must agree with phenomena, not vice versa.” 7
Thus, Quigley puts the historian at ease with scientific methods by
explaining that physical laws have as many exceptions as the historicists
claim historical laws do.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“Talk comes from ideology but action comes from outlook.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“The lower middle class is petty bourgeois. These people seek their
security in status; status in an organizational structure. They try to find
a place for themselves in an organization which has a hierarchy in which
they can count on moving up automatically simply by surviving. Some
people still think that most Americans are active, assertive, aggressive,
self-reliant people who need no help from anyone, especially the
Government, and achieve success as individuals by competing freely
with each other. That may have been true 100 years ago. It isn't true
today. Today more and more of us are petty bourgeois who snuggle
down in a hierarchical bureaucracy where advancement is assured
merely by keeping the body warm and not breaking the rules; it doesn’t
matter whether it is education or the Armed Services or a big corporation
or the Government. Notice that high school teachers are universally
opposed to merit pay. They are paid on the basis of their degrees and
years of teaching experience. Or consider the professor. He gets his Ph.
D. by writing a large dissertation on a small subject, and he hopes to God
he never meets anyone else who knows anything about that subject. If he
does, they don’t talk about it; they talk about the weather or baseball. So
our society is becoming more and more a society of white-collar clerks
on many levels, including full professors. They live for retirement and
find their security through status in structures.”
— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

“But epistemology also played a dominant role in determining several
other aspects of life. As with all of Quigley's concepts, however, "epistemology" must be clearly defined before its role in shaping history can be understood. The operational definition Quigley gives "epistemology" is "cognitive system" that is, the ways in which "the language of a society classifies human experience in order to think or to communicate and the values which a particular society puts upon these categories, determining the most fundamental engines of human motivation." 17 The generic morphology of a cognitive system consists of those five levels on the continuum of the fifth dimension of abstraction, that is, feelings, emotions, self-awareness, rationality, and spirituality."

— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

"I am a 'macrohistorian' specializing in the processes of change in advanced societies, with a special interest in methodological questions"

— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

and an insatiable curiosity he synthesized into a revolutionary holistic epistemology."

— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

"Quigley's quest for simplicity in history did not preclude his recognition of its complexity. Instead of surrendering to historical complexity as an insurmountable obstacle and retreating to an historicism that would obviate the development of paradigms, Quigley confronted complexity head-on and sought to recognize it as an integral part of historical method. He realized that while reductionism is possible with the physical sciences, any such attempt at dissecting an historical phenomena and isolating and analyzing only one factor as an independent variable is impossible in the social sciences. Thus, Quigley studied the whole context of a phenomena, a method developed by the theoretical biologist Ludwig von Bertalanffy termed "general systems theory" 10 This "generalism" became known as "holisticism" and operationalized as "macrohistory." By "holisticism", Quigley meant that the "whole" of reality held greater meaning than the sum of its parts, thus scholars should tend towards general studies to understand general and comparative historical concepts and paradigms rather than the hyperspecialization pervading the discipline of history.11"

— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

"A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops."

There are no means available to measure the intellectual impact and the far-reaching effects of his influence on the minds of his students. For this reason it is impossible to give Dr. Quigley recognition commensurate with his value to thousands of Georgetown students since his arrival here from Harvard in the Fall of 1941."

— Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings

"For example, I’ve talked about the lower middle class as the backbone of fascism in the future. I think this may happen. The party members of the Nazi Party in Germany were consistently lower middle class. I think that the right-wing movements in this country are pretty generally in
this group."
– Carroll Quigley, Carroll Quigley: Life, Lectures and Collected Writings