

DOCILITY



THE TRAIT OF BEING
AGREEABLY SUBMISSIVE
AND MANAGEABLE

FRANK ARUNDELL

DOCILITY
EASILY TAUGHT

FRANK ARUNDELL

Dedicated to Matthew Swensen
Cover: Thanksgiving Orchid, gift from Kim Brennan

DOCILITY

To be on the same page we should start off with the etymology of the of the adjective “docile.”

docile (adj.)

late 15c., “easily taught,” from Italian or French *docile*, from Latin *docilis* “easily taught,” from *docere* “to show, teach, cause to know,” originally “make to appear right,” causative of *decere* “be seemly, fitting,” from PIE root (Proto-Indo-European) ***dek-** “to take, accept.” Sense of “obedient, submissive,” first recorded 1774.

The word is a little confusing because for many of us it suggests weakness or gullible-ness, easily deceived or tricked. Mortimer Adler (1902-2001) an American philosopher and educator wrote several essays on docility based on it’s true sense of being “easily taught,” or being receptive to teaching. We should hear what Dr. Adler has to say:

“The need for docility arises from the supposition that a student lacks knowledge or the skill to get it and that a teacher, having what the student lacks, can help him. Although the student must never accept what the teacher says simply because he says it, neither can he reject it on that ground. In the field of natural knowledge, the student must ultimately make up his own mind in the light of natural reason, but until he is able to do that finally he should try to get all the help he can from those who offer to teach him. Docility is needed, therefore, to dispose him to seek and to use such help wisely and well. If a teacher claims to demonstrate something which the student cannot see at once to be the case, docility requires that the student suspend judgment—neither accept nor reject—and apply his mind studiously to the teacher's words and intentions.

DOCILITY

He must, with patience and perseverance, continue to submit his mind to instruction, which means nothing more than that he suffer the teacher to continue cooperating with his own active intellect.”

“Unless there were extrinsic signs of authority, which marked the proper objects of docility, the student would be unable to direct himself properly with respect to available instruction. Such signs are not wanting. Assuming that an educational system is wisely administered, those who hold the office of teacher are signified as having sufficient authority for the grade of student allotted to them. *Unlike the political office, which has a certain authority in itself even when held by a bad man, the doctoral office is truly emptied whenever students who have exercised docility discover its occupant to be unworthy. If the de facto rule of a usurping despot is tyranny, the de facto pressure of an inadequate teacher can only be effective as indoctrination, and that, as we have seen, is a kind of violence. Docility requires the student, nevertheless, to respect the office of the teacher until his incompetence is unmistakably revealed.*”

“There are other extrinsic signs. Quite apart from his office, a teacher may command respect because of his past performances. A teacher who has succeeded in bringing us to the light many times in the past despite our intransigence, is one who deserves our patience in the present instance where we are still in the dark. This is the mark which honors the great teachers of all times. In the tradition of European learning, some men have been the teachers of many generations, of many epochs. The fact that these men are so generally honored by the tradition as great teachers—men who both know and can

DOCILITY

communicate—is the most compelling extrinsic sign of an authority to which we must respond with docility.”

“I have elsewhere developed the distinction between dead and living teachers. The living teachers—the local embodiments of learning—are seldom the great teachers. The great teachers are usually dead, though, in another sense, they are eminently alive for us as teachers through their books. Books are instruments of instruction, and obviously call for docility in those who would learn from them, as much as living teachers do. The virtue is essentially the same, whether exercised toward the book of an absent teacher or toward the ministrations of one who is present. When I speak of a "great teacher" or a "great book" I mean one who merits the extrinsic marks of teaching authority because possessing that authority intrinsically, by virtue of a great store of knowledge and great power to disseminate it.”

“It would be a mistake for those of us who are teachers to suppose that the problem of achieving docility is a problem only for our students. To the extent that we, too, are students, the moral problem exists for us as well. It exists for anyone and everyone who is actively engaged in the life of learning. Those who understand the obligations of that life do not give up learning when they begin to teach. On the contrary, a good teacher is usually one who is himself an active student of the subject matter in which he gives instruction. Authority and docility will be combined in him, for he is both a teacher of those who know less than himself and a student of the masters of his subject matter. One might even guess that there will be a certain proportion between his attainment of authority and his exercise of docility.”

DOCILITY

“I want to consider the problem of docility as it exists for all of us, whether we be merely students in the early stages of our education, or teachers who have realized the need to continue study. The problem, it seems to me, has significant implications for education under modern cultural conditions, precisely because modern culture is so ambivalent about tradition. In its horror of subservience, the modern mind tends to the opposite vice of brash indocility. On the other hand, those who deplore modernism and try to combat it too often return to the first extreme, mistaking subservience for docility.”

“The opposition of these extremes is the prevailing tension between the mood of secular and Catholic education. These two systems of education have contrary vices, each a reaction to the other—too little or too much respect for traditional authorities. I might add that the attitude which is characteristic of secular or Catholic faculties toward the great teachers of the past is reflected in the attitude of secular or Catholic students toward their living teachers. The one is usually indocile, the other subservient. (The subservience may be merely outward. I speak only of appearances.)”

“The temper of a culture with respect to its intellectual tradition underlies its educational efforts. If docility is indispensable to sound educational policy and practice, we must rectify the culture itself in terms of this virtue. How shall this be done? We are frequently told that historical scholarship is the way. We are told that the proper study of philosophy, and even science, is impossible without thorough historical orientation. Both modernism and its equally bad opposite, ‘modern scholasticism,’ spring from corrupt history, or the lack of historical insight. In their enthusiasm, the exponents of history

DOCILITY

as the magic open sesame tend to identify the historical attitude with docility. They soon become infected with historicism, which is simply the error of making historical scholarship, truly enough a necessary condition of rectitude in learning from the past, into a sufficient condition.”

“I propose, therefore, to examine the service of history in the life of learning, by considering its relation to the achievement of docility. But before I can discuss these larger implications of the problem, it is necessary first to consider docility from the point of view of the individual person who is trying to be virtuous in his attitude toward teachers and books.”

“For most of the moral virtues, the mean between the extremes of excess and defect is a subjective mean. The mean in the case of courage, lying somewhere between foolhardiness and cowardice, is not objectively ascertainable, and as such the same for all men. It is rather a mean that is relative to the individual temperament of each man who tries to be courageous, a mean which a man’s own prudence must appoint after due consideration of the conditions of his life, the complexion of all his natural tendencies, and the circumstances of particular acts.”

“The mean of docility is subjective in this sense. The definition of docility as the right amount of respect for the authority of teachers (or books) is by itself insufficient to determine action. It is a truth too remote from the exigencies of practice to direct us in the particular decisions we have to make. In this particular case—with this teacher or book, in view of my temperamental weaknesses, my tendencies to be indolent or impatient, and in connection with this point of doctrine about which I have

DOCILITY

strong feelings—what is the *right amount* of respect due those who are trying to instruct me? There is the practical question, and I cannot cultivate the habit of docility unless I can decide such questions prudently time after time as they arise. Aristotle gives us two practical rules to guide us in the casuistry (line of reasoning) of applying moral principles to particular cases of action.” As it is difficult to hit the mean exactly, we must take the second best course, and choose the lesser of two evils, and this we shall do best in the way we have described, i.e., by steering clear of the evil which is further from the mean. We must also observe the things to which we are ourselves particularly prone, as different natures have different inclinations, and we may ascertain what these are by a consideration of our feelings of pleasure and pain. And then we must drag ourselves in the direction opposite to them; for it is by removing ourselves as far as possible from what is wrong that we shall arrive at the mean, as we do when we pull a crooked stick straight (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II, 9).”

“Let us consider the second suggestion first. If by temperament we tend to be impatient of authority, we should pull ourselves in the direction of subservience, for by so doing we shall be going toward the mean. If our temperament is of the opposite sort, we should struggle against our reluctance to exercise an independent judgment. Such counteraction of our natural weaknesses assists us to make a prudent determination of the mean relative to ourselves.”

“But if the mean of docility is hard to hit exactly, which is the better error to make, the worse vice to avoid, subservience or indocility? I, for one, cannot answer this question *absolutely*, that is, without any reference to circumstances. But it can be

DOCILITY

answered *relatively* by considering the generality of cases of different type. Thus, I would say that *for modern culture generally the aim should be to avoid indocility; for Catholic students, in contrast to those in our secular colleges, the motion should be away from subservience; and, in general, it is worse for those who are in the early stages of study to be indocile than subservient, whereas, on the contrary, for those who are mature and who should assume a responsibility of independent judgment proportionate to their competence, it is worse to be subservient.*”

“The casuistical questions which a man faces in trying to be docile are more difficult than those which arise in the field of other moral virtues; but these are always the most difficult questions, not only for each of us to decide for ourselves, but for anyone to prescribe ways of answering for others. Perhaps, therefore, the best thing I can do is to put down some of the considerations which weigh heavily with me when I am trying to read a book with docility.”

“In the first place, I try never to forget that the only ultimate factor which can decide my judgment—whether I shall agree or disagree with the author who is my teacher—is the natural light of my own reason. Remembering this, I will not assent to anything I do not see, be it principle or conclusion or the reasoning from the one to the other. I know, of course, how often I have failed to abide by this precept, how often I have adopted, for example, statements by Aristotle or Saint Thomas, because of emotional predispositions rather than intellectual light. I respect them so much as teachers that I have often permitted them to indoctrinate me—the fault being mine, not theirs, the respect being excessive, rather than right. For many

DOCILITY

years, I affirmed, and repeated to my students as if I knew it to be true, the Aristotelian error about natural slavery. If it is the error I now see it to be, it could not have been a truth I saw. As I review my own life on this point, I realize that I never did *see* the point. I merely accepted it because Aristotle had spoken.”

*“In matters of natural knowledge, no human authority should prevail against the light of your own reason. But we know that our thinking is fallible. We know how often we suffer the illusion that we see the truth, only to discover later that we have judged too soon. Hence the second maxim I try to follow is this: one should suspend judgment long enough to be sure that one really understands what the teacher is trying to say before agreeing or disagreeing with him. Life being short, and the responsibility for making up one's mind on important questions being urgent, how long is long enough? This is a matter which everyone must determine for himself in conscience. If to disagree rashly leads to indocility, to agree without reservation, without making the effort to be sure one really knows what is being agreed to, is subservience. Docility demands sufficient *suspension* of judgment so that when I judge I shall be acting in the light of reason, and not in terms of passionate devotion or equally passionate opposition to the author I am reading.”*

“There are a number of factors I consider in estimating the delay of judgment proper in a given case, the amount of effort to understand which should precede making up my mind. One is the degree of extrinsic authority that tradition has accorded the teacher. I should be less impetuous in judging Aristotle and Saint Thomas than in the case of some nineteenth, or even sixteenth century scholastic textbook. If there is a probable

DOCILITY

correlation between the extrinsic signs of authority and its intrinsic possession, then certainly it is sound to say that the more authority a teacher *seems* to have, the more pause he should give you. This maxim should operate in the case in which you are, for whatever reason, inclined to disagree, as well as when you are favorably predisposed. Here, too, my biography is full of faults. So much of what David Hume says was repugnant to my reason fairly early in my study of philosophy, that I tended to reject him in entirety without due consideration of the extrinsic authority he certainly has in a large area of the modern tradition. I now know that I went astray here, failing through indocility to see the contribution of Hume's positivism for the understanding of empirical science, as through subservience I have parroted errors from Aristotle and Saint Thomas.”

“The rule of practice must, therefore, be sharpened on both its edges, for it must cut both ways. *Wherever I am emotionally, or even intellectually, inclined to agree, I should suspend judgment before concurring, lest I merely indoctrinate myself.* Wherever my disposition is of the contrary sort, I should hesitate to disagree, lest I reject without understanding what greater patience would have made intelligible and acceptable to my mind. And, in both cases, my conscience must determine the degree of patience due the author by reference to the marks of extrinsic authority he bears. I must add here that, in addition to the reputation which tradition has conferred, the degree to which I have come to feel his authority because of his previous successes as a teacher in my own life ought also to be considered.”

DOCILITY

“This first factor is qualified by two others. On the one hand, I must take into account my own position in the scale of learning. Thus, in a given subject matter I may have achieved competence to a greater or less degree. In proportion as I have competence—which means, in proportion as I approach peerage with the great teachers in that field—I am entitled to make up my mind more quickly. What would be indecent impetuosity in the beginner may be protracted deliberateness in the learned. On the other hand, I must know myself as a creature of passions and prejudices in order to make due allowance for every sort of waywardness that could interfere with a prudent determination of the mean of docility in this case, as conditioned not only by the author's authority in relation to my knowledge, but also by my idiosyncrasies in relation to the author.”

“In this process of casuistry, it makes a difference whether I am a student being instructed by living teachers, or at once a teacher of students as well as a student of the dead masters. If I am in that middle position—which should be the position of every good teacher, modest enough to recognize his limitations—the duty of docility is more heavily incumbent upon me, for I have the obligation to exhibit it in my teaching, as well as practice it in my studying. I shall return to this point in a later discussion of the bearing of docility on the role of the teacher.”

“One other thing makes a difference. When I am dealing with the great teachers of the past, I must bridge the gap of time. The continuity of tradition is not perfect. I must be deeply conscious of my own place in cultural time, in order to realize that the author I am reading lived and thought in a different climate of opinion. If my cultural location confers certain

DOCILITY

advantages on me, I am not indocile if I take advantage of the superiority which modern birth gives me over the greatest teachers of the ancient and medieval past. If I exaggerate that advantage, I am, of course, lacking in true docility; but a vicious subservience results equally from minimizing it."

“This last point raises the whole question about the dependence of docility, in an individual teacher, in an educational system, or in a whole culture, upon the cultivation of a historical sense —*a sense of the present as moving into the future, as well as a sense of the present growing out of the past.*” (Prof. Mortimer Adler)

It can never be a waste of time to hear the words of a great teacher, Professor Adler’s form of writing is of an earlier vintage, and like many earlier vintages, vis a vis Shakespeare, the King James Bible or Newton’s Principia, if we are “docile” enough we can learn a lot more easily particularly on subjects in which we have a primary interest. In terms of higher education there are a few facts we need to know. “If you’ve spent time in a college or university any time in the past half-century you probably know that *professors have become strikingly more liberal.* In 1990, according to survey data by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA, 42 percent of professors identified as “liberal” or “far-left.” By 2014, that number had jumped to 60-70 percent.”

“Over the same period, the number of academics identifying as “moderate” fell by 13 percent, and the share of “conservative” and “far-right” professors dropped nearly six points. *In the academy, liberals now outnumber conservatives by roughly 5 or 6 to 1.* Among the general public, on the other hand,

DOCILITY

conservatives are considerably more prevalent than liberals, about 2.5 to 1 and have been for some time.”(The Washington Post modified)

“A revolution in education took place in the United States during the 1960s. The federal government became increasingly education-oriented. Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson lobbied Congress for increased federal aid to education, leading to the creation of new programs. Their efforts displeased conservative politicians and community leaders, particularly those who opposed school-integration (primarily in the democrat south) and who believed that education policy was strictly a local issue (states rights). Education policy became a hotly debated topic during the decade for two primary reasons. First, it was closely related to one of the decade's prime social movements: the fight for equal rights for black Americans. One of the key issues related to that movement was the further desegregation of America's schools, as called for by the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*, Supreme Court decision. Secondly, the government refused to offer funds to private and parochial schools; this incited heated debate throughout the decade.”

(Liberal democrats were determined to create as many young democrats as possible through education in the first push towards “social justice,” another name for Socialism)

“During the 1960s, students from grade school through university-level began studying old subjects in new and different ways. One of the offshoots of the civil rights movement was a change in the approach to teaching American history. *Courses exploring the founding of the United States began emphasizing diversity*. The struggles of black Americans

DOCILITY

for equality were added to course material, as were the experiences of Native Americans. *Education theorists insisted that teachers be empowered to develop their students' minds and encourage their intellectual curiosity, rather than merely stressing learning by rote (a method of memorization).* New scholastic disciplines also became available, from courses in social science, sociology, and theater arts to increasing numbers of foreign language classes. Meanwhile, bilingual education programs increased as immigrants began to *insist* on maintaining their native cultures and continuing to speak their native languages while simultaneously learning English (not necessarily assimilating to American culture, as former immigrants had done). Despite these changes, some scholars and theorists still voiced criticism of the manner in which Americans were educated. (The positive aspects of the American founding and the patriotism displayed in our wars against despots and dictators, and the Civil War against slavery, were set aside.) Formal schooling did little to encourage creativity or individuality. They charged that students were merely being prepared to enter the workforce and accept authority and mediocrity passively, rather than to think for themselves” (The predominantly better parts of American history took a back seat. “American exceptionalism” began being curbed, globalism was being pushed as an inevitability).

“Beginning in mid-decade, young American males not only faced the draft, which was a system by which young men were called to mandatory service in the US military, but also the escalation of the fighting in Vietnam. Many who might not otherwise have planned to attend college, or who might have put off continuing their education, enrolled in college straight out of high school, or applied to graduate school as soon as

DOCILITY

they achieved an undergraduate degree, (while others, moved to Canada to avoid the draft) As the war continued, it was fought more and more by the 'under-classes': those who could not afford college tuition fees. One consequence was that military personnel, particularly the youngest members, were increasingly under-educated. To alleviate this problem, the military committed millions of dollars to fund education programs for its manpower." (It is important to mention at this point, that American anti-communist foreign policy in the Asia Pacific area, was fall-out from the civil war in China following the Japanese defeat. The wait-and-see attitude of Secretary of State Dean Acheson all but handed China over to Mao Zedong and the communists, which was supported by the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union. Aside from the stubborn French colonial involvement in SE Asia, the wars in Korea and Viet Nam were inevitable consequences. In both conflicts we lost 112,455 dead, not to mention multiple millions of Asians).

"The struggle for civil rights and the growing unpopularity of the conflict in Vietnam led to increasing unrest and protest on university campuses. (Guns & Butter was the government goal) (Destructive) student protests and demonstrations during the decade began with the 1964 'free speech' movement, on the campus of the University of California, Berkeley. Within a few years, tens of thousands of students from universities large and small were actively demonstrating on (and off) campus. Their causes included the war in Vietnam, racism in American society, the course content of their curriculum, and what they considered to be an inappropriate union between college administrators and the "military-industrial-complex." (Many ROTC programs which were important to the officer corps of WWII were discontinued) Often, student demonstrators were

DOCILITY

dispersed with firm police crowd-control methods,”(generally to prevent the destruction of life and property.)

“As students petitioned and demonstrated to change the world, they also (forced the rules and regulations to be) changed on campuses. Student protests led to the demise of many long-standing (reasonable) campus regulations. (Test scores were adjusted downward), (Racial preferences were initiated rather than college entrance based on proven ability.) Increasingly, women were no longer required to sign in and out of dormitories, or adhere to curfews. Male and female undergraduates were allowed to visit each other's dorm rooms (etc). The formality of many college classrooms (and lecture halls) gave way to the informality of ‘rap sessions’(what ever they were) and open discussion among students and teachers” (It doesn’t seem there was a lot of docility going on here). (encyclopedia.com, my parens.)

In my opinion, docility, in the true sense of the word was reversed because “orthodoxy” in many cases was on the wrong side of the issue— student-power took over. We can see much of the same in UC Berkley today. At the home of the ‘free-speech’ movement, left-taught students block contrary-opinion as authority stands down; reasoning loses its footing and the first amendment gives way to pocket anarchy. Far left groups are organized and paid for by monied left-wing domestic and off-shore politico’s trying to force the acceptance of a global-socialist ideology among the general public similar to that of many European states; helped along by today’s “main stream” media which perverts the news to support the efforts. The front page of major newspapers are editorialized and become opinion pieces rather than objective reporting of a constitutionally

DOCILITY

oriented free-press. Once again the first amendment is abrogated by personal politics.

No reasonable person will argue that civil-rights was not long overdue, but the reason it was overdue can be placed directly at the feet of a “solid democrat south” which was the third rail to FDR. Finally, in 1964 Johnson and the Republicans got the Civil Rights bill through despite the filibusters of the southern democrats.

On January 1, 1863, it was Abraham Lincoln, a Republican, who signed the Emancipation Proclamation, essentially eliminating slavery. It was executive order of September 23, 1957, signed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a Republican, who sent Federal troops to maintain order and peace while the integration of Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas, took place. It has always been enigmatic to me why Americans of color are only 3% Republican.

On May 4, 1970 a nervous, inexperienced Ohio National Guard unit shot and killed four student protestors and wounded nine others on the campus of Kent State University. Some were innocent bystanders. This was a terrible blow to civility. Regardless of the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) torching buildings and throwing rocks at the police, there was no excuse for the loss of life. “SDS developed from the Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID), the youth branch of a socialist educational organization known as the League for Industrial Democracy (LID). LID descended from the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, started in 1905.”(Wikipedia) To this day the name Terry Norman, a right-wing “photographer” packing a 38 revolver, remains among the

DOCILITY

unanswered questions regarding its cause. Can this tragic event be attributed to a political party? Probably not; but sadly there was no “docility” involved that day. Recent audio forensics detected four shots from a “small handgun” before the deadly 13 second fusillade from the Guard’s M1s began. Norman denied firing the gun, though a police witness observed four of the five chambers of the gun empty when it was confiscated.

We should have a look into teaching pupils from K through 12. I prefer to distinguish between the terms “pupil” and “student,” although my Word Web doesn’t make that distinction in its first definition— it does make it in its third definition: *3. A young person attending school (up through senior high school).* I really don’t think there is any doubt that the primary educators of young children are their parents (preferably a man and a woman) by example and instruction. Many will argue the point in defense of same-sex-marriage in an effort to have that situation considered “normal.” It is not normal and can never be normal regardless of what some psychologists or politicians might devise. Still, it must always be kept in mind that an abnormality does not reduce the individual to anything less than human. A child cannot have two daddies or two mommies and somehow not be effected negatively by the circumstances. Chromosomes have never been known to lie. A difficult and contentious marriage where one partner or both are aggressively or even violently argumentative can be terribly devastating to an always docile child or children. People make mistakes and children always seem to pay the price, some with their lives, even before they’re born.

When we’re off to Kindergarten “historically, the starting age has varied widely. In the past five years, both states and

DOCILITY

districts have pushed the minimum age to start kindergarten up so that more and more kids are at least 5 years old when they start school. Still, in states such as Connecticut and Maine (and certain districts in Ohio, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Jersey, and other states), you can easily find a 4½-year-old and a 6½-year-old in the same kindergarten class.” (greatschools.org)

At this age kids are docile by nature. Depending on early parental attention, some kids have already learned their abc’s and can count up to 100 and much more. In grade 1 they’re on their way to becoming “students,” where they are required to pay more attention to the teacher whose degrees in education, hopefully has prepared him or her to instruct the student in the finer points of the three R’s, but more importantly generating in them a certain satisfaction with the process of learning itself. Repeating Prof. Adler here: *“The need for docility arises from the supposition that a student lacks knowledge or the skill to get it and that a teacher, having what the student lacks, can help him or her.”* Many teachers experience great satisfaction in passing on true knowledge, others who consider themselves acting as baby-sitters, or in some cases wardens, have missed the point and are probably in the wrong profession. Just as there must be order in a courtroom, there also must be order in the classroom no matter what the age of the pupils or students. If the student hasn’t learned to “honor their father and mother,” there is little chance they will concede any respect to their teacher.

The revolution in education in the sixties can trace its roots directly to the “greatest generation” of the thirties and forties, following WWII. Those parents wanted more for their children than they had had themselves during the difficult times of the “crash” and the war. In 1940, one year before Pearl Harbor,

DOCILITY

there were 5.5% males with a college degree and 3.6% females. By 1970 there were 14.1% males and 13.6% females. In 2016 there were 33.2% males and 33.7% females with a sheep-skin of one kind or another. Families scraped enough together to send their kids to college. Since 1985 Ph.D's in education have gone down considerably. It seems that there are more lucrative positions open in other disciplines. In my opinion, of the teachers and professors of this generation many are the college students of the 60's and 70's who now hold tenure in most of our colleges and universities. The same applies to those experienced journalists who are presently engaged in the left-leaning "main-stream-press." The 5-6 to 1 left-wing preferences of educators as opposed to a more conservative position proves my point. These are the folks who are now teaching our "docile" kids.

For African Americans now at 12.1% of our population (US Census) "slavery" still appears to be an issue 153 years after the Emancipation Proclamation. I am sympathetic to today's racial minority because many of the white, southern-democrats were psychologically and politically unwilling to concede the outcome of the civil war many years after its conclusion. In the "solid south" blacks were held back. Reconstruction never really worked very well between 1865 and 1965. A hundred years of "black" animosity has built up over the century and is now coming to fruition. Preferential treatment has been education's answer to closing the gap as many historical standards were readjusted to suit the black minority. Militant organizations such as Black-Lives-Matter (2013), Black Panthers (1966), Louis Farrakhan's Nation of Islam (1930), and the NAACP (1909) were formed to agitate against racial inequalities. Recently, President Trump's efforts to put the

brakes on globalization and to resist “open borders,” should have positive results for the American job market, especially for a grossly underemployed black minority, many of whom remain in poverty.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 enacted June 30, 1968), also known as the Hart–Celler Act, changed the way quotas were allocated by ending the National Origins Formula that had been in place in the United States since the Emergency Quota Act of 1921. The Emergency Quota Act restricted the number of immigrants to 357,000 per year, and also set down an immigration quota by which only 3 per cent of the total population of any ethnic group already in the USA in 1910, could be admitted to America after 1921. The Emergency Quota Act was intended to be a temporary measure but the National Origins Formula continued until 1965. The Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1965 abolished an earlier quota system based on national origin, predominantly Europe, and established a new immigration policy based on reuniting immigrant families and attracting skilled labor to the United States. Over the next four decades, the policies put into effect in 1965 would greatly change the demographic makeup of the American population, as immigrants entering the United States under the new legislation came increasingly from countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, as opposed to Europe.

The great waves of European immigrants in the 1830’s and 40’s plus the new illegals since 1965, have been hugely detrimental to American blacks in terms of “jobs”. The three great waves were from 1607 to 1830’s; from 1830’s to 1880’s; and from 1890’s to the 1920’s not to mention illegal immigration

DOCILITY

since 1965. The children of those illegal's who were born on American soil automatically became citizens by birth,

“The de facto pressure of an inadequate teacher can only be effective as indoctrination, and that, as we have seen, is a kind of violence. Docility requires the student, nevertheless, to respect the office of the teacher until his incompetence is unmistakably revealed.” (Professor Mortimer Adler)

Children come into this world, hopefully out of love between a man and a woman. Being born is not a mistake it is a result of the miracle of life through love. The person who sees a child as an encumbrance in or out of a marital relationship has his or her priorities wrong. Infants are the most docile beings imaginable, they agreeably submit to comfort, to peace and tranquility, to love. Although every birth may not be perfect, every child is a gift because it is human and human-beings do not reject gifts. In a mad world, or an evil generation, selfishness is the arch enemy of reality. Relativism, is an ideal, allowing some of us to offer alternate realities that suit only our personal particularities. In reality, we live in communion with one another; though we may rationalize differently, every answer cannot be an “equally correct” answer. The answer that can only be the correct one is the one closest to the ultimate truth. To say there is no Ultimate Truth is to say there is no need for answers. That understanding would be inhuman. It substitutes “self love” for Love itself.

The search for answers, that is, to seek to be educated, requires us to be agreeably submissive— docile to those who have acquired enough truth in matters of meaning and value in the good, i.e., virtue; and in the universal common good passed

DOCILITY

along from those who have taught them. Parents, teachers or Ph.D's for that matter, would not be serving the truth by giving relative or incomplete answers to a child or a student. Dr. Adler says:

The temper of a culture with respect to its intellectual tradition underlies its educational efforts. If docility is indispensable to sound educational policy and practice, we must rectify the culture itself in terms of this virtue.

Is there anyone among you who, if your child asks for bread, will give a stone? Or if the child asks for a fish, will give a snake? If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give good things to those who ask him! (Matthew 7: 9)

Would a parent or teacher say: “Bite into this— see if it’s bread or a stone?” Or would a parent or teacher (as a result of “intellectual tradition”) rather say: “Here is bread for you to eat.” The indispensable virtue of a dispensed *truth*, is always directed toward Ultimate Truth: the “Father in heaven” as taught by Jesus of Nazareth, through the Jews. The “Word of God” for those who have been given the grace to believe in him. The children of the 60’s and 70’s, on the other hand, are now the distinguished, left-wing professors in higher education. They are busy teaching the fantasies of Karl Marx, or the inferences of Hobbs and Hume, which have been historically proven by intellectual-tradition to be disastrous for the world. What Marx, an atheist, proposed must never be confused with the early communal cults of a religious nature, Christian or otherwise. Prof. Adler says:

DOCILITY

The objective (in education) is to know the truth about God, man, and nature, and the ends of human life, not what anyone, however great his authority, thought about these matters. The deviation from a right aim is even greater if it be supposed that students should become acquainted with the sheer diversity of opinions on major questions in order to become, through the conflict of authorities, emancipated from authority itself.

In earthly life “authority” is vested in people. Is this investment knowledge, power, and wisdom? Can a person of authority have wisdom without knowledge and power, or knowledge and power without wisdom? Humans are finite, there are limitations to being human. We must be aware of the fact that no earthling can *know* everything. Neither are there people who will make the *wisest* choices in every matter; and power is purely conditional. No one can hold power for long without the *consent* of those over whom it is held. Might is strictly a temporal condition. By might, the strong may exercise “authority” over the weak, but it is not authority in the true sense. Cicero tells us: “*No power on earth, if it labors beneath the burden of fear, can possibly be strong enough to survive.*” Authority must be consented to from the “*heart,*” compliance must be *given* for “authority” to become a reality. Consent to learn, is categorically different from consent of belief. Consent to be led *to know* is basically curiosity, an intrinsic characteristic of humanity. Seeing is not believing; *believing* is involved with a personal act of mental acquiescence;— from the place in a human being where trust comes from. Docility is a precondition for the possibility of mental-acquiescence, a readiness and willingness to be taught.

One of the great misunderstandings between physics and metaphysics is that *proof* is not *belief*. A proof, or *what is known* is held to be absolutely true. On the other hand, Belief is mental-acquiescence. Yes, you can say: “*I believe that experiment will work the same way every time,*” but wouldn’t it be more scientifically accurate to say: “*I know that experiment will work the same way every time*”? Knowing is proven by the senses. Believing is proven by an act of the “heart”. It is a free-choice.

For example: “*I do not believe I’m making a petty semantic argument here*” is quite a bit different from saying: “*I know I am not making a petty semantic argument here.*” There is puritanical security in knowing something for sure. An absolute conviction which leaves positively no room for doubt, what is *known* is thought to be “universally” true. Whereas a personal act of mental-acquiescence; “believing,” is a *particular*; not necessarily universally true.

This brings to mind “the Socratic quote: ‘I know that I know nothing’: ‘The only thing I know, is that I know nothing’ or ‘I know one thing; that I know nothing,’ sometimes called the Socratic paradox. It is a well-known saying that is derived from Plato’s account of Socrates.” (Wikipedia) Still, not so paradoxical when you consider the cognitive aspects of semantics as described above. With this in mind let’s have a look at what Prof. Adler said once again:

The objective (I presume he means through instruction) ***is to know the truth about God, man, and nature, and the ends*** (all the particulars) ***of human life, not what anyone, however great his authority, thought about these matters.***

Now, subjects such as you and I, at least know “the objective” according to Prof. Adler. “*To know the truth about God, man, and nature, and the ends of human life,*” however, Dr. Adler warns us that we need not believe in what the greatest authority (doctor, professor, teacher, theologian, etc.) thought about these matters. The question then becomes; can we *know* the true God as a physical reality so as to prove his existence, simply because an authority tells us it is so? Can we *know* all about man, and nature, and the ends of human life, if an authority tells us? Of course not; this gives credence to Socrates’s quote: “I know, that I know nothing;” but we can *believe* in God, man and nature, and the ends of human life, because, in freedom, with a personal act of mental-acquiescence we can say: “We believe.” We ought not presume that every perception is trustworthy.

Heraclitus, our ancient Greek guru, tells us in bits and pieces that all is *flux*. Everything is in a state of change. In his Coincidence of Opposites he also suggests that there is unity, (co-instantiation). “*The **unity of opposites** is the central category of dialectics, said to be related to the notion of non-duality in the deepest sense. It is viewed sometimes as either a metaphysical concept, a philosophical concept or a scientific concept. It defines a situation in which the existence or identity of a thing (or situation) depends on the co-existence of at least two conditions which are opposite to each other, yet dependent on each other and presupposing each other, within a field of tension.*”(Wikipedia: Unity of Opposites) Let us look at Prof. Adler’s objectives in terms of the Unity of Opposites. We can believe, but not prove by *knowing* that God and man are unified in Jesus of Nazareth, that Man is a unity of good and evil, and

DOCILITY

Nature, obviously, a unity of quietude and turmoil. One can *believe* that reality exists in the unity of opposites, conceding the *probably* of ultimacy based on faith and reason, as a result of the grace of the living God.

Gospel Acclamation: John 15: 16

Alleluia, alleluia.

*I chose you from the world, to go and bear fruit that will last,
says the Lord.*

Alleluia, alleluia.