



1. "A Moveable Feast"
2. Let Sports Be Political
3. Trump and Qatar

A Moveable Feast

By CLAIRE ANASTASIA KITZ
ASSOCIATE EDITOR

Ernest Hemingway's book *A Moveable Feast* was published posthumously in 1964. It is composed of poignant sketches looking back on Hemingway's time in France with his first wife and their baby Jack, known as Bumby. It is set after World War I, when Hemingway was an unknown, struggling American writer living in poverty above a sawmill, writing in the cafes and roaming the streets of Paris.

As part of this nostalgic return to France, Hemingway recounted stories about a number of writers and artists he knew there, such as F. Scott Fitzgerald, John Dos Passos,

Pablo Picasso, Gertrude Stein, Ford Madox Ford, Ezra Pound, and James Joyce. (Some comrades are painted in flattering detail, while others are spitefully eviscerated.)

He was married to his first wife, Hadley Richardson, while living in Paris – his first of four marriages. Hemingway provides a tender and moving description of Hadley and their relationship in this memoir. She was the love of his life, the one he later despaired about leaving all those years ago. This book was Hemingway's tribute to her. She was his hero, his muse, who helped him gain his footing and find his writer's voice; he was both a cosmically gifted writer and a conflicted bum who betrayed her. Their time in Paris seemed magical until it wasn't.

Paris, itself, is an original character in the book. The city is described in great detail: its *arrondissements* or districts, trains, streets, cafes, and stores. Hemingway certainly prized Paris as the "City of Light" and all it had to offer a struggling young writer. The title of the book came from a fragment of a letter he wrote to a friend in 1950: "If you are lucky enough to have lived in Paris as a young man, then wherever you go for the rest of your life, it stays with you, for Paris is a moveable feast."

Hemingway wrote nostalgically about Hadley, Bumby, and their time together in Paris. Notebooks, found in one of his old trunks in the storage basement of the city's Ritz Hotel in 1956, helped him piece together the smallest details. Certain words or fragments triggered memories. The notebooks were an

invaluable time capsule of Paris and the people, places, and events Hemingway knew there between 1921 and 1926.

One can sense, from his writing in this book, that Hemingway wished to go back to the beginning, when he was an unknown writer – when his writing was pure, uncorrupted by fame and wealth. He wanted to return to the time when he was a determined, serious, and disciplined writer and was still married to the decent, open-hearted, and beautiful

Hadley. He needed to re-create and savor those pleasant times, when they "ate well and cheaply and drank well and cheaply and slept well and warm together and loved each other."

Along with Hemingway's descriptions of his life and Paris, there were glimpses of his writing process, how he understood his talent, and how committed he was to achieving literary success. One learns about his early experiments with short stories and how he worked up to his first novel, *The Sun Also Rises*, in 1926. Hemingway knew he was a skilled writer. He sought to protect his gift so it would always be there, as if he were drawing from a hidden spring. He dedicated *The Sun Also Rises* to Hadley and his son, and transferred its copyright to Hadley in their divorce settlement.

Hemingway wrote many short-story collections and novels in his career. He led a colorful and flawed life of travel, hunting, fishing, adventure, and failed marriages. He won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1954. And yet he experienced a debilitating mental collapse – a long decline fueled by guilt, drink, and mental illness. Leaving Hadley haunted him; it was the self-inflicted wound that never healed. Hemingway completed *A Moveable Feast* in 1960. He killed himself with a gunshot to the head in 1961.

A Moveable Feast will always be a favorite Hemingway work. Not because the others fall short, but because it was a bittersweet fairy tale, told with longing and regret, about an enchanted city, a remarkable writer, and his lovely young wife whom he betrayed. Read it and feel transported. But do not be surprised if it breaks your heart.

Read it and feel transported. But do not be surprised if it breaks your heart.

Let Sports Be Political

By ELZA HARB
STAFF WRITER

Last Friday night at a rally in Alabama, President Donald Trump called for those NFL players who knelt during the national anthem at games to be fired. He was referring to former San Francisco 49ers quarterback Colin Kaepernick, who started kneeling during the anthem last year in protest of police brutality against black men, and is now unemployed because of his political views. Others have recently knelt in protest and in solidarity with their fellow football player Kaepernick, also starting the twitter hashtag #ImWithKap.

During Sunday's fourteen games, NFL players knelt or refused to leave the locker room when the "Star Spangled Banner" played. This show of solidarity, a silent rebuff against President Trump, led him to tweet in retaliation. He tweeted that the NFL should "fire or suspend" the players, that the league should "back our country," and that this will cause "bad ratings." Steven Mnuchin, the Treasury secretary, took it a step further on ABC's *This Week*, saying "they have the right to have their First Amendment off the field."

I have one pressing question for the Trump administration: Why do American football players lose their freedom of

Why do American football players lose their freedom of speech when they are on the field?

speech when they are on the field? The First Amendment reads: "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech." There is no asterisk stating: "freedom of speech is only applicable when not playing a sport." Some argue that by kneeling, the players are disrespecting America. Legal precedent, however, says that expressions of opinions critical of America cannot be abridged.

In *Brandenburg v. Ohio* (1969), the Supreme Court found that the state may only punish speech that would incite "imminent lawless action." Kneeling in protest, while it can be construed as offensive, does not incite others to

continued on back

break the law. In *Texas v. Johnson*, the Supreme Court ruled that even symbolic expressions like burning the American flag are legal. This line of logic finds that the government cannot stop football players from kneeling during the national anthem. It finds that NFL players have their First Amendment rights even while on the field.

Trump’s—and his administration’s—

attempted shaming of players blatantly ignores American laws and values. What makes America great is that, unlike in countries with repressive authoritarian regimes, one is allowed (and even encouraged) to protest when the state is malfunctioning. One can criticize the government and its actions.

Football players are in a place of privilege because football is so beloved by

Americans. Julius Thomas of the Miami Dolphins put it best: “lots of people don’t have a voice and I wanted to tell those folks that they’re not alone. I used my position to try to empower everybody who seeks equality.” Contrary to what President Trump says, football players should use their stardom to highlight societal problems because that is what makes a democracy flourish. So I say, kneel on.

Trump and Qatar

By EMMA RITZ
GUEST CONTRIBUTOR

Donald Trump’s supposed support of free speech and his opposition to excessive political correctness helped garner him him legions of followers. Cherry-picking examples, Trump made it appear as if there was a credible threat to free speech, and thus set himself up as a defender of the First Amendment. His war against left-leaning media outlets, combined with his stream-of-consciousness tweeting style, also make clear that his loose definition of free speech is largely one of self-convenience. His hypocrisy, however, is especially evident right now in regard to a very different issue: his handling of the Saudi-Qatar crisis.

In June of this year, Saudi Arabia cut off relations with Qatar; the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Egypt, and others quickly followed suit. This has left Qatar isolated and suffering from a land, sea, and air blockade. Before the crisis, it imported 40 percent of its food over the Saudi border, so these moves forced the small nation to find alternative ways to feed its people, mostly by cozying up to Turkey and ironically Iran. Adding to this strife, the markets in Qatar immediately fell by 10 percent and three countries have expelled Qatari citizens.

Saudi Arabia stated that it cut ties and imposed restrictions primarily due to Qatar’s sponsorship of terrorists. To support this accusation, Saudi officials said Qatar has maintained relations with Iran and has ties to the Muslim Brotherhood, Al-Qaeda, ISIL, and Hezbollah. Some in the press have cited this as an example of the pot calling the kettle black, but that would assume that Saudi Arabia and Qatar are equally at fault for sponsoring terror. In reality, Saudi Arabia inspires and funds more terror than any other state, including Iran.

Wahhabism, the puritanical and warped religious movement followed in Saudi Arabia, is responsible for inspiring much of the radicalism in the Middle East. The oil boom in Saudi Arabia brought laborers from all over the region into the kingdom looking for work. While there, they were indoctrinated with this unfortunate distortion of Islam. When these laborers returned home, Wahhabism was exported to other parts of the Middle East, where it became integral to the founding ideology of many terror organizations. Furthermore, of the 61 terrorist organizations officially designated by the U.S. State Department, most are inspired by Saudi Wahhabism and receive funding originating in Saudi Arabia. Only two of the 61 terror groups, in contrast, are Shia, the sect of Islam practiced in Iran. These facts alone evidence the absurdity of Saudi Arabia blaming Qatar for being a main supporter of terror, through either its relationship with Iran or other dealings.

If this conflict is not about sponsoring terrorism, it begs the question why Saudi Arabia is so furious at Qatar. The answer lies heavily in the third and fourth points on the list of thirteen demands that Saudi Arabia made of Qatar. It ordered Qatar to “shut down Al Jazeera and its affiliate stations ... [and to] shut down news outlets that Qatar funds directly and indirectly, including Arabi21, Rassd, Al Araby, Al Jadeed, and Middle East Eye.” While Qatar has its own share of domestic human rights issues, we should applaud advances it has made toward fostering a level of media freedom that is not present in Saudi Arabia. These news outlets, Al Jazeera especially, reveal to citizens of many countries in the region the issues within their own

governments. Nothing is more dangerous to an authoritarian government than an informed populace. Understandably, the Saudi government felt threatened, and, in retribution, it is working to force Qatar to censor its media by cutting off ties and imposing restrictions on its tiny neighbor.

America’s role in this conflict is difficult to define. Morally, it would be best to support Qatar and oppose the Saudi crackdown on free speech and free media, but international situations can rarely be examined purely from a moral perspective. As a close ally of Saudi Arabia, the United States would be unwise to blatantly oppose it. However, Qatar hosts the Al Udeid Airbase, the largest U.S. military base in the Middle East, and this base is essential to our influence in the region. It is best, then, for America to either stay out of the conflict or work as a mediator since it has ties to both countries.

While it is morally in our interest to side with Qatar, and politically in our interest to remain neutral, President Trump has decided to side with Saudi Arabia. On June 6 he tweeted: “So good to see the Saudi Arabia visit with the King and 50 countries already paying off. They said they would take a hard line on funding extremism, and all reference was pointing to Qatar. Perhaps this will be the end to the horror of terrorism!” The Pentagon tried unsuccessfully to mitigate the damage from the tweet. With a just a few words over social media, Trump made it impossible for the U.S. help resolve the conflict as an impartial actor, and also demonstrated how little he cares about either morality or rationality.

Once again, President Trump has shown how willing he is to work against the cause of free speech and a free press. The Middle East has so much potential, and we should be encouraging all steps in the region toward an open media. His actions are contradictory to the overall U.S. goals for the Middle East, and to the core values of our nation. As the crisis wears on, one must wonder how it will be resolved. Since Trump has made it impossible for the U.S. to act as a mediator by siding with the Saudis, a solution to this conflict remains steadfastly out of reach.

If this conflict is not about sponsoring terrorism, it begs the question why Saudi Arabia is so furious at Qatar.

ENQUIRY

vol. V

Sam Benevelli
Editor-in-Chief

Claire Anastasia Kitz
Andrew Juchno
Associate Editors

Helen Sternberg
Layout Editor

STAFF WRITERS

Julia Dupuis
Steven Falco
Elza Harb
Fred Pollevick
Montana Sprague
Allison Zuckerman

The opinions expressed in these articles are the views of their authors and do not represent the views of Enquiry or the Alexander Hamilton Institute.

Enquiry accepts articles of 500 to 800 words at sbenevel@hamilton.edu. Please be aware that we do not accept anonymous submissions.

CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION

1. “A Moveable Feast”
#AMoveableFeast
2. Let Sports Be Political
#PoliticalSports
3. Trump and Qatar
#TrumpQatar