

Volume 4, Issue 5 October 2000

Leadership Education

Oliver DeMille

The following speech was delivered at the LDSHEA conference held June 12, 1999, on the campus of Brigham Young University.

Note: This is the actual transcript of his one-hour speech. This lengthy speech has been provided in its entirety.

LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

Doctor Oliver Van DeMille is the President of George Wythe College, the leading college in the United States dedicated specifically to building Statesmen using the methods which trained great entrepreneurs and leaders from Washington to Jefferson, Lincoln to Churchill and Gandhi to Martin Luther King, Jr.

President DeMille earned his Bachelor's degree in International Relations and Aerospace Studies at Brigham Young University, a Master's in Political Science and a Ph.D. in Education from Coral Ridge Baptist University in Jacksonville, Florida. His Ph.D. is with an emphasis in the Education of the American Founding Fathers.

He also earned a Juris Doctor and was awarded an honorary Doctor of Law for his legal and political writings. President DeMille is the author of 3 books and numerous articles, including: Mexico and World Government, Germany and the European Community, and "Rethinking National Security".

His newest book, A Thomas Jefferson Education: Training a Generation of Leaders for the 21st Century, has been long awaited by many home schoolers and teachers and is now available.

President DeMille is a two-time recipient of the prestigious George Washington Gold Honor Medal from the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge. He has delivered speeches and workshops across the United States at business groups, colleges, universities, media and civic events, and has served as a consultant to numerous business organizations including Fortune 500 executives.

In 1992 President DeMille founded George Wythe College, where he served as Professor of Law and Politics, Dean of Entrepreneur and Leadership Studies, and later as Provost until he was appointed President in early 1999. He is married to the former Rachel Pinegar and they have five children.

The Leaders of Tomorrow

Several years ago, a prominent businessman in the United States was asked to give a

speech at a major university. Now I didn't see the contract, but I understand that he was paid \$20,000 for a one-hour lecture. They flew him to the city where the university was on a first class ticket, put him up in a five-star hotel, gave him a tour of the campus, took him to nice restaurants, and met with donors. Then they took him to the big sports arena—something similar to the Marriott Center, in fact, it is a little bit bigger than the Marriott Center, and introduced him with a long résumé. They turned the time over to this gentleman, and he stood at the podium. He said, "Before I get started, I would like to see by a raise of hands how many of you in this room believe that you will be a leader and will change the world?" This basketball arena was almost full and there were tens of thousands of people there. He had been asked to speak on the subject of "The Leaders of Tomorrow." Out of those tens of thousands of people, six individuals raised their hand. Six people, out of tens of thousands, said "Yeah. I'm a leader. I can change the world." The man said, "Would those of you who raised your hands come down here please?" They came down to the podium. He went away from the podium and arranged some chairs in a circle around a little table there on the stage. He put seven chairs there and sat down with those six individuals and began to talk to them. Now people noticed there was a problem and they started talking. The noise got loud in the place, as you know they can during a basketball game or something. The man went back to the podium and said, "Would you please be quiet? We're trying to talk. And, by the way, why don't you leave? I have nothing for you. I am here to talk about the leaders of tomorrow." Then he went back to this small group of students until several people came up and tried to listen in, including the President of the University. The man who had just given him a check. When they came up, he said, "Did you raise your hand?" "Well, no." "Then go away. I am here to talk about the leaders of tomorrow."

Now before we get started today, I would like to ask you all a question. [Everybody's hand goes up.] This is a great group Joyce. I'm really just kidding. But isn't that a tragedy? Isn't that an absolute tragedy? A shame? That out of tens of thousands of young people who have paid tuition or had it paid for them by hardworking parents, hardworking tax payers, whoever it was that paid their tuition, maybe they worked for it themselves, that out of tens of thousands of young people seeking in an institution of higher learning in America, for a superb education, six of those people actually believed that they were going to do something about the world and make it a better place and really make a change. Six. Now, I will bet you there were some out there who thought they would change the world but didn't dare raise their hand for whatever reason.

Unfortunately, we have bred a society where mediocrity is not only acceptable, but in many cases a goal. And, it is easy to point to public schools and say, "There!" But you know what? We can point to our own home schools, and we can see the same thing. All of us can see pockets of mediocrity in our own homes and in the way we do things. So, can I suggest today that we spend some time not pointing fingers but looking at our own programs and asking ourselves the question, "Are we training the leaders of tomorrow? For whatever field? For whatever topic?" Whether they are leaders of homes or communities or business or government. Whatever it is. May I suggest that we spend the next hour talking about how to train the leaders of tomorrow? Because we need them.

Three Types of Education

If there is anything we are lacking in our society, it is leadership. Effective, powerful, real leadership. Let's talk about leadership. To do that, let's back up and let's talk about the three educational systems that have existed in the history of the world. Three major educational systems. What I would like you to do is to take a piece of paper, those of you who are taking notes today, and those of you who aren't can do this mentally in your mind, or if you are on a laptop, you can draw this in. I would like you to take a piece of paper, and I would like you to turn it sideways. Then, I would like you to draw four vertical lines creating five columns on the page. The columns should be roughly of equal size. Once you have done that, if you would draw three horizontal lines creating four columns sideways, or four rows.

Now, I am going to talk fast, and I will leave time for questions at the end. I get excited about these ideas because we are talking about the future of our society, not only of the United States. There were a lot of students from foreign countries, international students in that basketball arena who didn't raise their hands. I don't know. Maybe some of the six were, I wasn't there. But, we are living in a society that has a leadership crisis. Not because there are not good people out there but because very few people are out there systematically paying the price to train to be leaders. There are a few. In total numbers, there are a lot of them, but we need a lot more than we have. Leaders in the home. Leaders in the community. Leaders wherever, and a very special kind of leader called a Statesman, but I will come to that later. Three types of educational designs in the history of the world.

In your top left-hand box, would you write the word "System." We are going to go down to the column below it, and we are going to identify three educational systems. The first one is "Public Education." In the third box down in your first row, if you will write the word "Professional." So, you have "System, Public, and Professional." In the lower box on the left-hand side, write the word "Leadership." In the history of the world, there have been three major types of education. One was public. Another was professional, and another was leadership education. Across the top, in the second box, please write the word "Goal."

Let's talk a minute about the differences between these three educational systems by identifying what their purpose is. Why were they set up? Why were they created, and what are they trying to accomplish? You can tell a whole lot about an educational system just by asking the question, Why do you exist? What for? What are you trying to do? Why do public schools exist? Why have they been setup?

Public Education

If you go back in the history of the world, go to Ancient Egypt, go to Samaria, go to Babylon, come forward to Greece, to Rome, the middle age schools that were created, and you could come to modern times, 18th Century Britain, 19th Century United States, every time you find an occasion where the government moves in and says we are going to set up a public school system. It has always been done, as far as my research can find, and I've tried to find every one of them, it has always been done for the same reason.

Anyone know what that reason is? "Control the kids" is what people are saying. Actually, it's not. There may be those who feel that way. There may be those who are behind the scenes, in fact there probably are those who are saying that, but it is not usually the overarching reason.

There is another reason that public schools are created. Educate the poor. Public schools are designed in almost every case, every case that I have been able to research and find, to educate the poor. See, you have the wealthy. How are the wealthy educated? They are educated in leadership schools. They are tutored. They are home schooled. If you look in the history of the world, you will find that the wealthy, the royalty, and in the United States, the entertainment industry, the media, are home schoolers. They all are in history. They are all home schooled. Home schooling is leadership education. It is naturally designed as that. Public schooling is setup because the wealthy have leadership school. They have tutors in the home, and professionals teach and mentor the middle class families. Whether it's a student doing an apprenticeship or whether it's a professional school, law school, MBA program, or medical school. It is something that is designed specifically to train someone for a specific career. But, public schools are set up with one purpose in mind. Take this underclass of poor people who don't have jobs, who are in poverty, who are in ignorance, and give them some education so that the standard of living can increase. In every case that I know of, it has worked. Public schools have served a significant and a powerful service to society in every case that they have ever set up because in every case, in about 100 years after these public schools are put into place you have a society that is almost entirely middle class.

In other words, you have raised the standard of living for all of the people who were in ignorance and poverty. There is value in that. There is also a side effect. And that is that in every single one of these nations where the poor have raised their standard of living and society benefits as a whole, all of the leadership schools basically disappear. They stop existing because they simply cannot compete with government-funded public and professional programs. And, even the private institutions which remain are then funded significantly from government grants and government monies. The leadership schools disappear.

So, let's call it what it is. Does public school in some ways have a positive benefit on society? Yeah, it does. Does it also have a down side? A negative effect? Yes. What is that negative effect? It is a loss of leadership and eventually-as that loss of leadership, as the spread of mediocrity goes throughout society-you reach a point where the whole society suffers significantly. Freedoms are lost, and major problems and challenges are not dealt with because there are few who are prepared to deal with them, and the few who are, don't have the support of the masses because they themselves don't have the educational background to be prepared for it. They haven't trained for it.

Now, what I am describing is the state of education in our time. A point where we have a high standard of literacy, a high level of literacy, and a high standard of living compared to the rest of the world and even to historical nations. But, our leadership preparation is not only lacking but probably on the downside, going the wrong direction. So, what do

we do about it? Well, back to public school, we will get there in a second. The number one goal, of public schooling through history has been to educate the poor. The second goal is to train them to get a job. Any job. Any job at all. Give them education so that you can get a job.

"I took my kids out of school." "Well, how are they going to get a job?" Have you ever heard that? Well, I know people who haven't been to school and most of them have jobs, and I know a lot of people who went to school and don't have jobs so there is not a direct correlation, right? But, a lot of people see it that way. The goals of the public school, #1 educate the poor, #2 to get a job, #3 by teaching them what to think. Now, I am not saying that as some insidious planned, "Hey we're going to make these people rote followers." What I am saying is that when you set up an educational system designed to create a certain product where everybody is the same, then those who try to get too far ahead get pulled back and those who were behind, you give them special workers to catch them up. Everyone is supposed to go along basically at the same pace. Why? Because you are training them for the job market. They are supposed to be a finished product.

Professional Education

What is the goal of the professional system? The primary goal of professional education is to train professionals; managers, doctors, dentists, and other trade professionals, electricians, mechanics, blacksmiths. You can go through history and you will find these same systems. And, the second goal is to teach them when to think. WHEN to think. That is, when you go to your attorney or you go to your doctor or you go to your accountant or you go to your mechanic, you want them to think. You don't just want them to look in the manual. You want them to be able to be creative, to be spontaneous. To be able to accomplish what you really need for your individual and specific needs. And, for the most part, they are trained to do so. But, go to your attorney, and start asking them questions about health or about mechanics or about politics or government. Do they have the background? Have they learned to think in those areas? Some have, but they didn't get it from the professional training program because that wasn't its purpose.

Leadership Education

And the third type of education: leadership. Its goal is to train leaders. How? By training them how to think. Not what to think and not when to think, but how to think. The lack of leadership education is evident not just at the elementary and high school level. It is even more obvious at the level of higher education. Who writes the curriculum? Who certifies the teachers?

If you take the public school system from the elementary and secondary level and you just list it point by point, you will find that almost every single idea or point or system that makes public schools what they are was designed at the level of higher education. So, it's not just at the lower level. It is at the higher level. I see people very often who home school, pay a great price, both in terms of effort and time and also in terms of what they have to put up with from family or other people who are frustrated with what they are doing. Then they get the student to 17 or 18, and they say "Yeah he was accepted to Harvard." My jaw drops, and I say, "So basically you wasted your time."

Now, you can take that too far, right? Maybe you didn't waste your time. Maybe you gave them such a firm foundation that they'll go there and make a difference. Maybe. And, maybe you didn't. You're the parent, you know the kids. Some kids are like that, and that is great. Some kids aren't, and you know that, and you need to take a good hard look at how you take them from that point on.

Methodology

Let's go into "method." That is our next column. What is the method of the public, professional, and the leadership educational models? Well, the method of the public school is what is called the "Soviet Conveyor Belt." Now, this is not a political title. This is a descriptive title. What it means is that public schools, because of their goals, are modeled to achieve those goals. What are the goals? To take uneducated people and to train them all so they can have the basic literacy in order to get a job. How is that done? Well, it is done on a conveyor belt. What do we mean by that?

We mean that all the students in the class are basically getting the same lectures, being tested the same way, reading from the same textbooks, probably as those in the schools around town and to a large extent as those in the schools across the whole system. This by teachers who themselves went through that same system, and they are being graded by how well they regurgitate back what was told them to say in that pre-prepared material. It's a conveyor belt. First grade, second grade, third grade. Everybody regardless of their interest or their mission or their individual goals getting basically the same thing and being tested in the same way. Teachers, they are not graded, but they have tenure meaning the same basic system, and being on the conveyor belt.

So, you get to the eleventh grade, twelfth grade, you're done. Stamp a diploma on your forehead, and you are a finished product ready to be sold to the job market because you have gotten this basic literacy that you are supposed to have. What is the Soviet part of it? The Soviet part of it is simply this, if you are trying to setup a system that nobody fails in, that every body goes through, then you create the standards, the grade levels, at the lowest possible level, at the level of the 15th or 20th percentile. And that is where the grade levels were established, between the 15th and the 20th percentile so that everybody would basically be able to make it through and get that diploma stamped on their forehead so that they would be ready for the job market. The Soviet part of it is that it's focused on that level.

Professional Method

Now let's go to the professional. The professional is the competitive conveyor belt. Still a conveyor belt, but very competitive. Not based at the lowest 20th percentile but based at the highest 5th or 6th percentile. If you are going to get into the most competitive prep schools to the ivy league colleges and universities to the best law schools, you are going to have to be in that 5th or above percentile. But, once you get there, you are on a conveyor belt. You are in classes being taught to do it a certain way in a certain format.

Now, let me just say something because all of us who have been through public school

can name four or five teachers or exceptions to this rule. I can think of several teachers who were totally not the conveyor belt in a conveyor belt system who pushed me to much higher levels and really did the leadership program. I am not in any way intending with this to knock or attack public school teachers, because I think for the most part they deal in a very conveyor belt system, but deal with it in a very non-conveyor belt leadership way, and I take my hat off to them, and I appreciate what they do. I think it's great. I'm not knocking on the teachers. I am saying that teachers aside, there is a system that requires conformity of thought and conformity of follow through and conformity of action.

Now, let me also say that in the professional system, there is some real power and value. If you are trying to train a mechanic, you want him to have some basics. You don't want a mechanic who is just, "Man, I'm an entrepreneur, and I'll come up with some great ideas, and I'll throw this in here, and I'll throw that engine there, and let's see how it runs." You want a mechanic who went through some steps of training and got some things in order. You want the same with a dentist. Maybe a dentist is the best example of all, right? You want the right thing from a dentist. You want a dentist who did good in that first year of conveyor belt programs.

So, let's understand that the conveyor belt in the competitive sense, in training professionals, is a fabulous educational design. But, when you translate it into the entire society, and nobody rises above that, you end up again with a society that has a mediocre level of education and few leaders because nobody has paid the price to go above and beyond that.

Leadership Method

Let's look at the leadership system. How is the leadership system different in terms of method? In leadership education, the method is individualized by a mentor. A mentor is a person who is ahead of you in studies and in life experience who is worthy of emulation and who can guide you and help you on your way. A mentor sits down with a student and says, (or with anybody, and it doesn't have to be in academia, it can be in any setting with the student) and instead of saying "here is the conveyor belt, here is what you will do," the mentor says, "what do you want to obtain? What do you want to create? What do you want to accomplish? What is your focus? What is your goal? What is your mission? Great! We've clarified that mission, let's build a path to get there. Let's build our own belt that gets us there so that you can really pay the price to get there," and then pushes them to the highest levels of quality, and leads out towards those highest levels of quality. Nearly all great leaders in history had mentors. I have never been able to find an exception.

I have had people say, "What about this person?" I didn't know. I went and researched it, and found out that they did indeed have a mentor. Every great person in history that I have been able to find had a mentor, and that is people on the good side and the bad side. Having a great education doesn't mean you are going to be on the right side. That's another element of it. We'll get to it later. But, who your mentor is has a huge impact on which side you choose or how you choose to approach it. But, you look in history . . .

scientists, artists, inventors, entrepreneurs, statesmen, the great writers, whether it's Newton, Einstein, or you go into the Dickens, the Shakespeares or George Washington and Ghandi, Churchill.

You find great people in history, men and women, Joan of Arc. If you find a great man or woman in history, you will find someone who had mentors. The prophets, they had mentors. Mentors are key, and that is our job as home schooling parents is to be that mentor at least to get them to a certain level. At least to get them kicked off so they can move on to other things, but we are the first mentor. We are the God-given mentor to start with.

Content

Let's go to "Content." That is the next column-the content of the education for each system. First of all, public system. The content of the public systems is about 75 percent social, and it is about 25 percent skills. 75 percent social, social for what? What is it socializing you for? It is socializing you for the work environment. See, the public school system as we have it today, the conveyor belt model, was set up to be a small replica, an exact replica, of the business environment whether you are in a factory or a fortune 500 company. You have first grade, second grade, third grade, mail room, secretarial pool, all the way up to the board room. That's sixth grade, right? And of course the sixth graders don't fraternize with the third graders, right? And there are bells every once in awhile to tell you it is coffee break time, and there are lockers. They were modeled on purpose so you would be comfortable in that environment.

By the way, if you don't believe that it is 75 percent social, I have gone into public school districts where I am teaching the teachers (I don't give them the same talk by the way) and we are going through training on how to make a Thomas Jefferson classroom. How to get the classroom up the highest levels of quality, and when I teach them this part of it, that social is 75 percent, I always get a bunch of hands out there, and do you know what they say? "You are way low on that." Public school teachers tell me that I am way low and that it is at least 90 percent. They are there, they know that and they see that social part of it. And, I was going to say that if you don't believe that this is true, then pull your kids out of school, and I'll bet you that nobody will come to you and say, " what about their academic life?"

Nobody is going to say that to you, but about five or ten people are going to say "What about their social life?" And here is the proper response to that. "Well, we understand that socialization is important, and we've decided to socialize them not to be rote followers but to be the leaders who will lead your children into the future." Not really. I'm kidding. Don't say that, all right? And, you know what? Not only don't say it, don't think it, because the point of being a leader is not to be above but to serve.

It's about service. It's not about being better, it's about serving. Let's look at the skills. How do they give them that 25 percent skills? Textbook, lecture, grades, and tenure. That is the major focus of it.

Professional system: 50 percent social and about 50 percent skills. Again, I would maintain that in the professional system, that socialization is very important because they need to know how to work with people in their profession. 50 percent skills, how is it done? Textbooks and some classics. Lecture and a lot of discussion. Projects, simulations, learning in a hands-on environment. If you are in law it's a moot court, if you're in medicine, it's working with cadavers or going in as a resident, doing a residency. See, it's hands-on. You are learning. If you are in the military, you drill it over and over. If you are on a sports team, you practice the play over and over. It's practice. It's hands-on. Professional is good at that. And, field experience. You have to clerk before you become a partner. You have to do a residency before you become a full doctor. There is real-life experience there, whether it is internships or work experience. Real life experience is part of that.

Now note that the "method" of leadership is individualized by the mentor. The content of leadership education is that it's individualized around the classics. There is no set formula because you have to find out what the student wants to create and accomplish and become. What's their mission? Then, you build the system for that mission, but there are some basics. A basic educational understanding of the great people in their field, in their chosen area of focus who have gone before them. Take math for example. You have a choice. You can learn math from Einstein, Newton, Nicomachus, and Kepler, or you can learn math from a couple of professors at the University of Texas who wrote the math textbook. Take your choice. You build on the shoulders of those that you decide to learn from.

By the way, while we are on the subject of math, let's look at math for a moment, because math is a fun one for home schoolers. Isn't that great? We love math don't we? Math is where it's at. If you are getting it from the University of Texas professors and a textbook, guess what you are going to learn? You are going to learn that $1+1=2$. Right? However, is the number two the most mathematically correct answer to the question, $1+1=?$ This is not a trick question.

You see, Thales suggested this $1+1=2$ way back when. It's been a theory that's run through the great mathematical minds of history through Pythagoras, through all of them, and the one who supported it the most was Newton. Isaac Newton said this is where it is, and we are going to base everything else on this. It was finally proven mathematically false by Einstein in the 1940's, and he proved what the right answer was. [A member of the audience responded that the answer is three.] Yes? No it's not 3. But, it could be. Yeah, $1+1=3$ because you are going to have a baby? You see, this is a woman who thinks! That's good. Is this your first baby? It's your fourth. So, it's actually not three. See, that's the point.

What Einstein proved was that mathematically $1+1=$ infinity. It does. That is the most mathematically correct answer. An example he gives is this, if you take one molecule, and you add it to another molecule, $1+1$, what will you get? It depends on the molecule, and it also depends on how you bond them. Newton had said, $1+1=2$, there is the equation. He said, that the important items here are 1, 1, and 2. But Einstein said, "Not

so." The important thing is the "plus" because if you use a covalent bond or a polar bond or a metallic bond, you've got a different thing. It doesn't equal two, it depends on the plus. And, he also said it depends on the "equals," and he goes on to say there is no such thing as equals. Equations don't work. There's no such thing as equals. Einstein proves this mathematically by showing that nothing is equal to anything. Is this 1 equal to this 1? See, I have two fingers. No. Why? One is here, and one is here. They are in different places. They are not equal. What about this ? [He holds one finger in the air, moves it away and then back to the same spot] Is this one equal to this one? No, they were a half a second different. They are not equal. They're not the same. They're not identical. They are different things.

Now, you could take that too far. And, how many of you have kids here? How many have kids in your kid's school where you are really mad at me right now because your kids have just thrown their math books away. "No math for me! Look at what he said." Right? No. Because it is absolutely essential in our society to learn to speak a foreign language, and one of the foreign languages which you better learn to speak in our society is Newtonian. That's what math is as taught today. Math today is Newtonian. It is a specific guy's theory on how numbers work. It's an important theory that's true enough, it's close enough, that we can do all kinds of things with it scientifically, in engineering and in other places. But are we going to teach it as this is the only truth?

See, it's amazing to me what they have done with this. In society today, we've got the hard sciences, math, chemistry, physics, and then we've got the soft sciences, history, theology, religion, morals, we could go on . . . These are all soft-that means they are relative. The physical sciences are hard. This means they're that way all the time. But reality proves that's a textbook figment of people's imagination. If you move from the textbooks, and you go to the leaders, the great thinkers of time, you will find the opposite. You will find that there was much debate about the hard sciences and whether these theories are correct. Very little debate about whether God exists. Very little. A few classics down through history who disagreed. The classics teach overwhelmingly that there is a God. There is a right and a wrong. There is a good and a bad. And $1+1$ might = 2 in some settings. Do you see how we've switched that in our modern society?

The leadership method is individualized around the classics. The classics give you a totally different kind of education. An education designed to help you think. Not to be told that $1+1=2$ and always believe it, but to say, "No. Wait a minute. Let's challenge the assumptions. Let's understand this. Let's go to the root of it. Let's really know whether this is true or false, or right or wrong, or good or bad. Let's really know. And then we'll follow." There are a lot of people out there saying, "Yeah. Hard sciences, we've proven there is no God."

Not in the classics they haven't, because as soon as they put forth that theory, the other classicists stand up and tear them down and show all the reasons that they are wrong and that it is not good science, ...and they do it mathematically. But we don't read those things. We read textbooks and so we're told a certain thing, and we believe it. Now, let me just see one thing before I move on. How many of you were home schooled that are

above the age of 18, raise your hand? Counting . . . 10 people in this room were home schooled who were above the age of 18. How many of you who are above the age of 30 were home schooled? How many of you who have kids that you are home schooling were home schooled yourself? Counting . . . 7. How many of you were public schooled?

There is an interesting thing about leadership education, and that is this, most of us were public schooled. That is what we know, and so when we decide to home school for whatever reason, it might be religious, it might be social, it might be purely academic, it might be because of our geography. Whatever the reason is that we choose, we tend to do the normal thing which is try to setup the homeschool in our home to look exactly like the school that we went to and understood.

So, we come home, and we set up a little mini conveyor belt in our house. We say, "from 8:00-8:50 our student will study math. They will then take a 10-minute break at which time they will go get a drink, they will run around a little, they will talk, and then they'll come back and from 9-9:50 we will study history." And we set it up as a conveyor belt. Learn something from those who have been home schooling since it began, from the royalty, to the super rich, from the aristocracy. Learn something from the way they home school. How do they home school? They don't structure the content, they structure the time. We make that mistake as home schoolers all the time. See if this experience is familiar to you.

For six months we will un-school, that means none of us will do anything except feel guilty. Then, for six weeks, we will have a regimented conveyor belt in our home. We will study, and the kids and Mom, and we're going to study because Dad said so because he is tired of this! Does this sound familiar to anybody? Hopefully, that's not your experience. There is enough laughter out there that I'm concerned that this is the fact.

Here is how the great people in history did it. Here's how Jefferson's home school ran. They structured the time. In other words, there was a structured time in which Mom, hopefully Dad, put everything away, didn't clean, didn't answer phones, and they work on their studies. Now, what do they work on? It doesn't matter. Whatever the kids want to. Is there a specifically designed format? Yeah. Whatever the kid is interested in that day. That's the format. Here's how we do it in our home. I don't know that this is the best model in the world, but it works for us.

We have a four hour period for our oldest, the young ones, they play. It is amazing how playing is really a very valuable educational tool which our society should consider. Entertainment, by the way, is not the same as play. Being entertained and playing is not the same thing, but our older kids study from 8-12 every day, except Sundays, six days a week, and that is 12 months out of the year, although it is interlaced with a lot of field trips, and a lot of "Hey, let's take the day off and go do this or that." But, by the time you're done with that year you've got a good 9-10 months of every day for four hours. This is our home schooling.

And, who does it? Everybody. The whole family sits and studies. Now, I'm not always

there for the full four hours, but I'm there for the first one every day unless I'm traveling or gone. And for that four hours, we study. What do we study? Whatever they want. But, we're there and we're a resource. And what do we study? We study what we want to study and then we help them. We read to them if they're younger, but it's a time of study. It's a time of learning. Half of it's done outside especially in the science section, but there is structure there, every day without fail unless we are doing something else, if we are home, the environment is that we have home school. We learn.

Now, you take a kid and put them through that for 10 years and are they going to have a superb education? They will. You put that much time into learning. . . By the way, they've done a bunch of studies. Do you know how long it takes the average person to learn to read, write, and do college level algebra? 70 hours total. 70 hours total from someone who is totally illiterate and totally enumerate, who wants to learn, to just learn the material and get up where they're reading at a college level, doing algebra [Newtonian] at a college level. 70 hours. How much time do we spend on that when they're going through an education? It doesn't take that long, but it does take some structure as long as the structure is not too structured.

It's a structure of time not a structure of content. Based on this model that I've given you, home schooling is the natural training place for leaders. Leaders in history. Find them, they were home schooled. Did they maybe go away to college? Did they do other things to supplement? Absolutely. But, home schooling is not about where the kid sits geographically. Home schooling is a state of mind where a parent says, "I will mentor my child to be a leader, to become great. I will show them the way, and I will help them choose the way." One student I know, (this student is 14 years old, this was a couple of years ago) came to George Wythe College for two classes during the day, went to the public high school for two classes in the day. That was his home school. It's the parent and the child sitting down and deciding what that child's mission and interests and goals are and then designing a program to help them get there. Could the public schools be part of that? They possibly could. It depends on you, it depends on your child and it depends on your school, but it's the idea of parents taking responsibility and not only telling the child but helping the child choose it so they're a leader.

And, in the history of the world, great leaders have been home schooled. They have been mentored. They've had the classics. Now, some of you are saying, "Yeah, but I don't really know that much about the classics." Well, do you have bookshelves? Go look on those bookshelves, and I'll bet you'll find five or six books that are classics. Let me give you my definition of a classic. Everyone has their own list, everyone has their own definition.

The best definition of a classic is that it is a work, it doesn't have to be a book, it can be art, it can be music, it can be a sculpture. A work that is worth studying over and over and over again, and you learn more each time than you did the last time. That's a classic. There are lots of those out there. You've got them on your bookshelves. Pull them off, sit down, and read them. Some people say, "But, I've got teenagers, and they won't do it," That's because it has never been modeled for them. Model it for them, and they will

follow it, and then you teach it to them. "How do I convince my teenager who is 13 years-old, there is just no way I could get him to read a classic, he wants to just read whatever."

Well, first of all, find out if what he is already reading is a classic or not. Just because it is not on your list, doesn't mean it's not worth reading over and over again, and he's getting more each time. Be careful before you get snobbish and say, this is a classic, and this is not. Some of the most powerful classics out there are books by Louis L'Amour. If you have a boy somewhere between 12 and 16, and he won't read a classic say, "well, for now it's all right if you won't read a classic, that's fine, but would you read the Lonesome Gods by Louis L'Amour? And then you read it, and then you discuss with them.

What was read and how does it apply to their life? How does it apply to your life? How does it apply to what is going on in the news this evening? How does it apply to what is happening in your neighborhood, and in your society and around the world? That is mentoring. That's classics. That is all it takes. It's easy. Some of you say, "Well, I just don't have the background, and I don't know how to do that." That's not true. Yeah, you sit down and you read.

Well, what if they won't even do that? What if they won't even read the Louis L'Amour or if it's a girl what if she won't even read Jane Eyre or Jane Austen? Well, then you model it for them. "8-11 is your study time. You can study whatever you want, and I'm going to study with you." You sit down, and you read the classic. How many of you believe that in your educational background you got a superb world-class Thomas Jefferson level education?

Seriously, there have got to be a few who feel like you got a great education. Most of us didn't. We live in a very public society. We live in a society where if a leader or anybody ever says "here's a problem," our natural response as a culture is, "you know, that's right, and my neighbor better shape up." We don't internalize it, or we say, "you know education does have all of these problems, and my kid deserves better." You know what? You deserve better. All of you housewives and mothers at home, I am giving you permission to sit for three hours a day and read, and you can tell your husbands. Okay? Don't tell them where I live, but feel free to tell them that part of it. If you are going to nurture, lead, and provide a superb education for your kids, you've got to pay the price to get it yourself. Don't say, "I haven't got it, therefore . . ." Say, "I haven't got it, therefore, I will get it." How much does it take? How much can you do? Twenty minutes a day? Good. Then, do it.

I recommend that you start out with a classic that's a novel. Something that is exciting to you that you want to read that does the work for you because as you carry it around in your purse or briefcase, it's down there screaming at you "read me! read me!" And, then don't leave it at that. You are sitting there on the couch with your son who will not study that stuff, and you are reading, and he is doing whatever he is doing, and then you say, "Oh man!! Wow!" You get a pen out and take some notes. Then, you turn the page, and you read some more. Suddenly you say "Oh! That is so true!! I never thought of it that

way. That's so neat. Huh? Hey, Tom. Can I read something to you?" And, this is if he hasn't broken into you already, and said "what Mom! I've never seen you this way! You have emotions! What's going on?" Model it for them. Model it for them, and then start talking and then say, "You know son, I'm getting so much out of this."

Or you can say, "Oh man! What a jerk. [Throw the book]. Let me read it to you, and show you. This guy is so wrong." Model. Model great education for them. That's how mentoring is done. It's by you setting out to get a superb education, and inviting them to come along with you if they choose to. What if they choose not to? Then, you've got to model it all the more. You've got to model it all the better, all the deeper. If you've got the rebel and the renegade, then you have got to be at the highest level possible. When they're old they'll come back because you have modeled it, because you've paid the price, because you did it. These are true principles, and they work, they work every time. Model it, and it will happen. Don't force it. "You must do . . . model it, and invite them to come along.

Now, if you've got them while they are young, you're set. Model it right now. Get started, and take them and go with it. If they are a little older, and they are into their un-schooling, and by the way I am talking about un-schooling, with a model of how you are supposed to do it. God leaves us the freedom to choose everything, but then he gives us prophets, and he gives us Christ, and he gives us others and says "Okay, I am going to let you choose what you want, but you see that guy? Follow him and you'll get it right." That's what it is. You give them the freedom. Let them choose whatever they want. Wonderful. That's getting them off the conveyor belt, but then you show them by example how it is done. That's where the power is.

And, you'll find out when all the kids are gone, and they have their own families, you'll find out that not only did they get a great superb education, but you've got one too. That's mentoring. That's leadership education. People say, "Yeah but the aristocracy, they had tutors who did it for them." They did, and they hired those tutors, and they interviewed them, and they knew the right questions to ask because they themselves knew what the tutor should be teaching, and they sat in on the classes and listened to what was being taught and they interjected and said "Hold on. I'm going to correct that point." Yes, they hired tutors, but they knew what the tutors knew, and that's how they knew to hire them. Leadership education is, more than anything, not about what you do with your kids, it's about what you decide to do with you.

Do you want to be a leader? In your home? In your community? In your church? In society in whatever setting you are in? Do you want to be a leader? Set out and do it. Ten years from now, you will either have a poor education, a mediocre education, a superb education, or somewhere in between. What will make the difference? You will. Your choices. 100%. Nothing else will make a darn bit of difference. It will be what you choose to do. If you want to have a superb education, pull those books off your shelf that you know you should be reading, and get into them. Start with the scriptures. Go much more in depth, and really pay the price and then measure everything else by the scriptures as the central guideline, as the central rule. Everything else is measured by how it

measures up to what the Lord says, sifted through that. That's all we're talking about.

Leadership education. It's very simple. Get a superb education. How? Start reading the classics, and then discussing and talking about them. Now, another thing that helps in those structured time periods is that every day at the end, they have to give a written report of what they have learned. They can study anything they want to. They can cover anything they want to or they can sit there and look at the wall; but while they are looking at the wall or studying, you are going to be there doing it or modeling it at least for part of the time.

Many of you have busy schedules, and you can't do it the whole time, but at least for part of it you are modeling. And then at the end, they give a written report of what they have learned in that day, and you discuss it. Then, when Dad gets home, he discusses it with them. And, if you get a week behind, that's great! That means you have a good two hours of quality time to sit down and talk about it. Not a problem. You have to discuss it. You have talk about it. What if the kids are too young to write? Write it for them. Take notes. It's a great way to document what you are doing. It's a great way to go back and look at what you're doing. It's a great way to add structure without getting in and telling them they have to learn it a certain way or in a certain order. And, it's the leadership way. You model it. You show them how to do it, and then you go for it.

Thank you.