



CHAPTER I

The Goal

“There is only one subject-matter for education, and that is Life in all its manifestations.”

Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education*

🐜 The Ant Trail

Picture a four-year-old crouched over an ant trail on the sidewalk. She has been there for eleven minutes. She has noticed that the ants heading one way carry crumbs and the ants heading the other way carry nothing. So she lays a twig across the trail to see what happens. The ants climb over it, then around it, then (after a while) mostly around it. She moves the twig. She watches again.

Her eyes are wide. Her body is still. Her mind is running a small, excellent experiment.

Then an adult walks over, taps her on the shoulder, and tells her it's time to come inside. It's time for the science lesson.

It sounds like a cartoon. It's also an ordinary morning. The schedule said science at ten, and the schedule has no way of seeing that science was already

happening on the sidewalk, at a level of engagement the lesson indoors will struggle to match. We've normalized this so thoroughly that it barely registers. We treat education as something administered to a child on a timetable. The four-year-old at the ant trail suggests another picture: a fire you feed while it's burning.

If you've spent time with young children, you've seen the first half of that scene. It is what learning looks like from the outside: a mind turned fully toward the world, asking something of it, testing the answer, coming back for more. She is inquiring. If she returns to the trail every morning for a week and starts counting ants per minute, she is practicing too.

This book asks a simple question with a large answer. What would it take to build a child's days, and eventually a person's life, around that moment?

My answer is a new model of human development.

The aim is a working method for raising people. Whole people, across every line of their development, from infancy through adulthood, and concrete enough that a parent at a kitchen table can run it on a Tuesday morning.

It's a big swing. The problem is big.

Standing on Shoulders

The model stands on the shoulders of people who did the hard work first. Each of them answered a piece of the question. My contribution is to assemble the pieces into something none of them attempted alone.

Kurt Fischer showed that development runs along many lines at once, unevenly, in a shape more like a web than a ladder. The ladder picture is intuitive: master single-digit addition, climb to double digits, climb to subtraction. Fischer's decades of research found something more interesting. A skill lives in a context and leans on the support around it. A child can hold a remarkably mature conversation about her feelings in the quiet of the living room, then melt down like a toddler in a crowded, noisy grocery store an hour later. On a ladder, that makes no sense: she was on rung five this morning, so

why is she on rung two now? On a web, it makes perfect sense. The quiet room was holding her up, and the grocery store let go. The web flexes with its environment, which means a well-built environment can hold a child at her best level far more of the time.

Kieran Egan showed that a child's imagination changes its tools as it grows, and that teaching built with the tools of the child's current age travels much farther. Young children make sense of the world through story: stark contrasts, heroes and villains, courage and danger. Tell a six-year-old about a knight who stands guard at the bridge so the village can sleep, and she has the idea of duty in her bones by bedtime. The concept stays constant; the tool that carries it changes. Egan maps those tools stage by stage, from the mythic understanding of early childhood through the romantic and the philosophic, and on to the ironic understanding of an adult who can hold several frameworks at once and question the frame itself.

Ken Wilber gathered the lines of development into a single map. Picture a bar chart with one bar for each line of a person's growth: cognitive, moral, aesthetic, interpersonal, volitional, spiritual, and (with Howard Gardner's additions) kinesthetic, musical, and more. Wilber called it a psychograph. It shows at a glance that a person can stand tall on one bar and short on another, and that raising a whole person means tending the whole chart. Wilber also offers four quadrants, four perspectives on anything we attend to: from the inside and the outside, as an individual and as a group. They turn out to be a remarkably practical tool for opening a single lesson into several.

Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi gave us flow, the state in which challenge meets skill and attention becomes whole. Time bends. The worker and the work merge. Any serious method for raising people has to know how to lead a mind into that state, and how to do it again tomorrow.

Bethany Rittle-Johnson and Robert Siegler studied how children learn mathematics, fractions and decimals especially, and brought new rigor to an old question: which comes first, knowing why or knowing how? Educators had argued for generations over whether to teach the concept of a fraction before the procedure for adding fractions, or to drill the procedure and trust

the concept to arrive later. The research found that the two advance in alternating, iterative turns. A little conceptual understanding makes the procedure easier to learn. A little procedural fluency frees attention for the next piece of understanding. Each pulls the other forward.

John Dewey insisted a century ago that we learn by doing. **Alfred North Whitehead**, a mathematician who turned to education, heard a rhythm in learning (romance, then precision, then generalization) and warned against “inert ideas,” ideas received into the mind and never put to use. **Erik Hoel** reminded us how many of history’s most capable people were actually raised: by brilliant, devoted adults who lived alongside them for years, in what he calls aristocratic tutoring.

That’s a long list, and you may be raising an eyebrow. It runs from laboratory studies of fractions to developmental psychology, from a century-old philosophy of education to the history of how aristocrats raised their children. When someone proposes a theory of everything, you should check for the exits. Stitch enough borrowed parts together and you risk a Frankenstein’s monster, lurching in no direction in particular.

And yet a person is many variables at once, and each of these thinkers explained one of them well. Let’s consider what happens when we let them add up. Start with a lesson on fractions, built carefully on Rittle-Johnson and Siegler. Give it an imaginative register the child actually lives in (Egan). Set it in a real kitchen, with a real recipe and real flour (Dewey). Bake the bread for the neighbors (Hoel’s household of real work, and what I’ll call worth). Tune the difficulty to the edge of the child’s skill (Csikszentmihalyi). Notice which other lines of the child’s development the morning touches, beyond the cognitive one (Wilber and Fischer).

Every added piece raises the odds that the lesson lands, and every piece comes from a different thinker. The synthesis is where the leverage lives.

What Is New

Three moves are new.

The First Move: Two Systems

The first move lifts the Rittle-Johnson and Siegler finding out of the mathematics classroom and applies it to every line of human development. I suggest that learning runs on two systems. A given moment of learning can lean on one of them, or run on both at once.

Inquiry is the open, self-directed pursuit of a question. It explores, wonders, tests, and follows its nose.

Practice is the disciplined repetition that turns a skill into a possession. It drills, refines, and returns, until the skill is simply there when you reach for it.

The claim is general. Long division, the violin, and the moral question of whether to tell a friend a hard truth all run on the same two systems.

Take the hard truth. A friend has been behaving in a way that hurts you. The first thing you do is inquire. Why are they acting this way? What do I owe them, and what's the honest thing to say? If I say it this way, how will they hear it? This is open, self-directed, intensely cognitive exploration, and it can go on for days.

Eventually you sit down across from your friend at a café, and the other system takes the lead. You steady your breathing. You keep your voice even and warm. You say the difficult sentence with care, and then you listen to the answer. Inquiry keeps running underneath: you read your friend's face and revise what you say next. Both systems are working at once. The delivery is a skill, and like any skill it grows with repetition. The people we admire for their ability to have hard conversations have usually had a great many of them.

Inquiry works out what to do. Practice makes you able to do it.

The relationship between the two is a lot like breathing. Inhaling and exhaling are different acts, driven by different muscles, and a body needs both, in rhythm. A learner who only inhales collects brilliant ideas and finishes few projects. A learner who only exhales works very hard and runs short of air. Healthy learning breathes.

This also settles an old argument. For about a century, education has hosted a drill camp and a discovery camp. The traditionalists hold that learning is rigorous practice and memorization. The progressives hold that

learning is child-led inquiry and play. Let's give both their due. The drill camp is right about Practice: fluency matters, and it comes from repetition. The discovery camp is right about Inquiry: understanding matters, and it comes from the learner's own pursuit of a question. Both are right. They have spent a hundred years arguing over whether breathing in or breathing out is the correct way to breathe.

Here is the rhythm working, from the adult end of the lifespan. Say you want to learn Python to automate a few spreadsheets at work. You begin with Inquiry: a couple of hours of tutorials, and you come away understanding what a loop does and why a list and a dictionary are different tools. Then you open an editor and write eight lines that rename a folder of files. That's Practice: typing the syntax, making the errors, fixing them. The little script works, and it raises a new question (can it skip the files already renamed?), which sends you back to Inquiry with a sharper mind than you had an hour ago. Round and round, each system feeding the other.

The two systems are distinct enough to fall out of step and entangled enough that either one, left alone, stalls the pair. Hours of tutorials with no typing leave you frozen in front of an empty editor. Hundreds of lines copied from a book leave you stranded the moment the task changes. Practice kept apart from Inquiry turns into data entry. Inquiry kept apart from Practice hits a ceiling, because nothing has been built to test the next idea on.

If you'd like it as a formula (I usually would):

$$\textit{Learning} \approx \textit{Inquiry} \times \textit{Practice}$$

Multiplication, deliberately. Anything times zero is zero. (It's a sketch, of course. If you think it breaks somewhere, I'd like to hear where.)

The Second Move: Engagement as the Measure

If learning runs on two interacting systems, how do we know it's working?

The conventional answer is the outcome test: the Friday spelling quiz, the unit exam, the state assessment. Outcome tests deserve their due. They're cheap, standardized, comparable across children, and they measure something

real. And yet they sit awkwardly with a two-system picture of learning. Once two systems feed each other, their interaction carries most of the information about how a learner is growing.

Scoring that interaction through outcomes leaves two options. The first is longitudinal: follow children for a decade or two to see which early learning endured. That's valuable science, and a twenty-year feedback loop is of little help to a family on a Tuesday morning. The second is the short-term test, where the signal from an interacting system dissolves into noise. A Friday quiz tells you whether a sequence of letters survived forty-eight hours. It says very little about whether Inquiry and Practice are feeding each other.

So I propose a different primary measure: **cognitive engagement**, the sustained, focused intensity a child shows when genuinely thinking.

Engagement is read separately for each system. In Inquiry, an engaged child leans in, asks questions, tests boundaries, and chases the question past the point where you expected them to stop. In Practice, an engaged child stays focused through repetition, tolerates the frustration of the fifth attempt, and corrects their own form. Then the two readings are compared. When they rise together, the systems are feeding each other, and learning is happening long before any test could confirm it. When one climbs as the other falls, one system has begun to cannibalize the other, and the adult knows where to adjust.

Outcomes still matter. They become the validation layer. You steer by engagement every day, and every month or semester you check outcomes against the periods of high engagement, to make sure your instrument is still calibrated.

Can't a child fake engagement? Most of us were experts at looking busy in school: pencil in hand, nodding at the right moments, eye contact held, mind happily somewhere else. Aren't we trading a hard number for a vibe check?

Granted, children fake engagement every day, and adults are fooled by it every day. The answer lies in a distinction. **Behavioral compliance** (sitting still, following instructions, looking pleasant) is easy to see and easy to fake. **Cognitive depth**, the quiet friction of a mind pressing against the edge of

what it can do, is the rarest form of engagement and the hardest to see from outside. Much of the research on engagement exists to correct one habit in particular: mistaking a busy, cheerful room for a thinking one.

Reading cognitive depth is a relational skill. You have to know this particular child's baseline: what their eyes do when they're truly puzzled, what they do when the child is waiting to be handed the answer, the small change in breathing when frustration arrives and the child decides to push through it. Every child has tells. Reading them is a bit like playing cards with the same friend for five years. You know when they're bluffing.

The measurement belongs to adults who know the child well, and one adult can know only a handful of children that deeply. The model's primary measure implies a certain kind of environment: small, intimate, and full of people who know the child.

The Third Move: Dials, Lenses, and a Pipeline

The third move is compositional. It answers the practical question every educator eventually asks: how, exactly, do I design Tuesday morning?

Two dials tune any learning experience, on either system.

Fidelity is how embodied and consequential an experience feels. Consider a leaking kitchen sink. A diagram of the U-bend on a screen is a representation of plumbing. Lying on your back under the sink, wrench on cold metal, a drop of water landing on your cheek, is plumbing. The attention it commands is total, and what you learn under there stays learned. Fidelity belongs to the experience, so it can be raised in a classroom, a workshop, or a well-built simulation as readily as in the wild. A flight simulator is high fidelity. So is a mock trial where the argument has to persuade a real panel.

Worth is whether an experience's output matters to someone and gets used. The appetite for it shows up early. The toddler insists on carrying the groceries in from the car. The four-year-old wants a real job at the table, and setting out the forks is a real job. Worth includes value for oneself (the satisfaction of having made something real) and value for others: tomatoes from the garden on the family table, a bicycle repaired for a younger sibling, a

well-researched letter the town council actually reads. When effort produces worth, the child learns that effort and worth belong together.

Above the dials sits **agency**. Agency is a heuristic: a live reading of the child, taken in the moment, that decides who steers. When a child is deep in Inquiry and driving the questions, the adult follows. When the child hits a wall or starts to drift, the adult leads, offering structure and a stretch of Practice to regain traction. Agency is read rather than set, and it's never tracked as a score. Practice is often uncomfortable, and a child who always steers will sometimes steer around the very repetition that would give them the skill they want. The adult's job is to know which moment this is.

Two **lenses** shape how a learning object is framed and how deeply it's explored. Egan's kinds of understanding set the register: the story, the extreme and heroic, the theory, or the irony that fits the mind in front of you. Wilber's lines and quadrants set the depth: which lines of development an object can reach, and which of the four perspectives a return visit might open.

The model composes all of this into a single pipeline:

1. Start from a line of development, or a crossing of several.
2. Choose a learning object on that line.
3. Frame it through the lenses: the register that fits the learner, and the lines and quadrants it can reach.
4. Tune it with the dials: fidelity and worth.
5. Run it on either system, reading engagement on both and agency in the moment.

Here's one morning of it. Nora is eight, and her cognitive line this month runs through fractions. At eight she lives in what Egan calls romantic understanding: she loves the real, the extreme, the record-breaking, the heroic. So the frame is real. The neighbors down the street have a new baby, and Nora's family is baking them bread. The recipe feeds four. The neighbors' house holds eight, counting the grandparents who flew in.

The kitchen supplies the fidelity: flour on the counter, measuring cups in hand, a dough that will rise or won't. The neighbors supply the worth: people

she knows will eat what she makes. Inquiry arrives on its own. Why does three-quarters of a cup, doubled, become one and a half? Why can't she add a half and a third by adding the tops and the bottoms? Nora wants to know, and her mother follows her questions for twenty minutes, sketching pie slices on the back of an envelope.

Practice arrives while the dough rises: a dozen quick doubling and halving problems at the table, then a few more on Wednesday and again next Monday, spaced so they stick. Midway through the set Nora starts to drift, and her mother tightens it into a race against the oven timer. Agency changed hands twice in one morning, both times on purpose.

The morning also crosses a second line. The bread is a gift, and Nora decides how to wrap it, what to write on the card, and what to say at the door. That's the interpersonal line, exercised with the same care as the cognitive one.

Her mother reads engagement on both systems. Nora leaned into the question of the thirds and stayed with it; she pushed through the fifth doubling problem without being asked. Both signals ran high. That's the model working.

The pipeline, and the fact that a parent can run it at a kitchen table, is the thing I believe is new.

✿ Ten Symptoms, One Absence

The failures in how we raise and educate people are plentiful. I take up ten here, each explored in a later chapter, and I treat them as symptoms of one underlying absence: a coherent account of how a whole person develops, held by the people responsible for the developing. Ask ten school administrators what a child's education is ultimately for and you'll likely hear ten different answers, each sincere.

Distance from reality. A high school senior earns an A in physics. She can calculate the torque on a lever and the gear ratio of a drivetrain. The summer after graduation, her bicycle chain slips off on the way to work, and she stands over it for ten minutes, unsure which gear it goes back on, before calling her

father to come and get her. The machine at her feet runs on the physics she aced. She had spent years handling representations of things while the things themselves stayed at arm's length. Whitehead named the result a century ago: "inert ideas," received into the mind and never used, tested, or thrown into fresh combinations.

The atrophied work gene. A century ago, a nine-year-old on a farm fed the chickens before breakfast, and if she didn't, the chickens went hungry. Today a twenty-two-year-old starts his first job with a degree and sixteen years of assignments behind him. For the first month he waits to be told what to do next, and when he finishes something, he asks, half joking, how it will be graded. He isn't lazy. Every task he has ever done was set by someone else and mattered only to the person who set it. The appetite to see what needs doing and do it was there when he was two, reaching for the grocery bag. Two decades in institutions whose stakes differ from those of productive life let it wither through disuse.

Compliance mistaken for thought. It's observation day in a second-grade classroom. Twenty-four children sit in tidy rows, hands up, worksheets filling with neat pencil. The visiting principal writes "highly engaged" on her clipboard. In the third row, a girl has filled every blank on her subtraction sheet by copying the pattern of the worked example at the top. She hasn't thought about subtraction once. She has thought hard, and successfully, about looking like someone who has. Classrooms reliably produce this kind of good behavior and surface enjoyment, and adults reliably read a busy, cheerful room as a thinking one.

Tests as the measure. Two eleven-year-olds score the same 92 on a fractions test. One has drilled the procedure until it runs on its own, and couldn't tell you why you flip the second fraction to divide. The other understands exactly why, and lost her points to careless arithmetic. The test reports two identical students. Next year, when fractions turn into algebra, one of them will hit a wall, and the instrument that could have warned us said all was well. Used as the primary measure, a test rewards whichever system it happens to favor and hides the interaction between the two.

Partisanship between the systems. A family moves across town. The old school opened every morning with twenty minutes of timed math facts; the new one lets children discover mathematics through open-ended projects. Their son could multiply in his sleep and had never once been asked why. Now he's asked why all day, and his facts, no longer practiced, slip away until he can't finish the projects either. Each school was proud of its philosophy. Each was half right, and the boy paid for both halves. The drill camp and the discovery camp have spent a century talking past each other, each starving the system the other champions.

Curricula fixed in advance. We met this one at the ant trail. Here it is ten years older. A fourteen-year-old watches old footage of a bridge twisting itself apart in the wind and can't stop asking why the others stay up. He spends the weekend building trusses out of spaghetti and hot glue, loading them with cans of soup until they snap. On Monday the unit is poetry, and forces are scheduled for the spring of next year. By then the question will have died of neglect. A curriculum written before the child arrives has no slot for the child's own pull toward a question.

Attention to one or two lines. A young man graduates at the top of his engineering class. He can model the flow of heat through a turbine blade. He cannot sit through a disagreement with a colleague without either caving or storming out. He has never made anything simply because it was beautiful, and when a friend asks what he wants from his life beyond the next promotion, he has nothing to say. Nobody taught him those things badly. Nobody taught them at all. Education tends the cognitive line above all, and sometimes the physical, while the moral, aesthetic, volitional, interpersonal, and spiritual lines grow on their own. A graduate can be brilliant and unmoored at once.

The wrong register, and initiative met with correction. A thirteen-year-old who has just discovered that adults can be hypocrites, and wants to argue about it at every meal, is handed a science unit narrated by a cartoon water droplet. She checks out within a week. A register she has outgrown reads to her as condescension. Younger still, a five-year-old decides, all on her

own, to make breakfast for the family. She drags a chair to the counter and cracks four eggs into a bowl, shells and all. The first thing she hears is “Get down from there, you’re making a mess.” She did make a mess. She also made a plan and carried it out, and what she learns is that making plans gets you in trouble. Hear that often enough, and guilt takes root where purpose should have.

Work for its own sake. A fourth-grade class spends three weeks writing letters to the mayor about the broken swings in the neighborhood park. The letters are graded for spelling and paragraph structure, handed back with stickers, and never mailed. The children notice. The next time they’re asked to write a letter, they write it for the sticker. Assignments whose output matters to no one teach a child that effort and worth are unrelated.

One adult across thirty children. A good teacher with thirty children and a forty-five-minute period has, if she speaks to every child and does nothing else, ninety seconds for each. She notices that the quiet girl by the window has stopped raising her hand. She’s kind and skilled, and she means to find out why. The period ends. So does the week. The tutors who raised so many of history’s most capable people knew their pupils’ every tell, because they had years with one mind. Mass schooling replaced that sustained relationship with one adult spread across a room. The relationship was the mechanism.

Now set these ten beside the three moves, and they begin to pair off.

The physics student and the unmailed letters are each missing a dial. She needed fidelity: the real chain in her hands, long before the exam. The fourth-graders needed worth: a mayor who would actually read what they wrote. The new hire needed both, early and often, for sixteen years.

The girl copying the pattern and the two identical 92s are failures of measurement, and reading cognitive engagement on both systems would have caught them within a week. The boy caught between two schools is the drill-and-discovery argument made flesh, and the two systems end it. The bridge-builder and the girl with the eggs both lost their agency, one to a schedule and

one to a scolding. The thirteen-year-old needed Egan's lens, and the engineer needed Wilber's.

The quiet girl by the window is the one the moves can't reach on their own. She needs an adult with time to learn her, which is the environment the rest of this book describes.

Treat the symptoms one at a time and you get ten reform movements, each competing for the same Tuesday morning.

Ten symptoms, one root. A model that addresses the root addresses them together.

The Goal, in Four Criteria

The purpose reaches past any single child. I want a generation of people more capable, more grounded, and more whole than the one raising them. Adults who trust their own judgment across every line of development. Adults who produce work of real worth, for others and for themselves, earlier and more often than we did, and with greater awareness and agency. Adults whose minds stay alive to the world because they've spent a lifetime engaged with it.

The model builds capacity and leaves content open. A child raised with internal authority ends up choosing their own values; the environment's job is to grow a person able to choose well. In that sense the whole project continues what every good parent already wants, made rigorous and repeatable.

I hold the book, and every environment built from it, to four criteria.

Breadth. Growth across many semi-independent lines, cognitive through moral through physical, and on each of them toward the frontier of the child's capacity. Classical education aimed at a rounded person inside a fixed canon. This model aims higher: a person exceptional across lines, with every line tracked in its own right. Fischer's research supplies the warrant. Progress on one line offers only weak guarantees about another, so each line gets its own attention.

Internal authority. A pattern runs through this whole book: encouragement set against suppression. A child whose initiative meets support learns to trust the instrument in their own head. A child whose initiative meets correction learns to consult whoever holds the power in the room. Across every line, the pattern resolves toward one of two adults: one whose reference point sits inside, or one whose reference point sits with the room. We aim for the first.

Worth. Value for oneself, the satisfaction of having made something real, and the ability and appetite to contribute something others use. Worth appears far earlier than anyone teaches it: the toddler with the grocery bag, the four-year-old with the forks. We cultivate it from there, so that effort and worth stay joined in the child's own experience.

An alive mind. Cognitive engagement, sustained across both Inquiry and Practice, is the running sign that the model is working. Where the two signals rise together, the systems are feeding each other. Where one climbs while the other falls, one system has started to crowd out the other. This is the criterion we can read every single day, which is why it governs the other three.

Readers and Range

This book is for you if you're an innovative educator, or a homeschooling parent who is an innovative educator in your own right. You already design learning experiences rather than administer someone else's. You hold enough control over a child's days to run the full pipeline, from a line of development to a chosen activity on a given morning. The practical chapters assume that level of autonomy, and they reward it.

If you run a classroom inside a larger institution, you'll find much here usable and some of it out of reach; I'll say so where it applies. If you build tutoring systems, human or artificial, the measurement and delivery chapters are written with you in mind.

The model covers the whole lifespan. It begins with the sensorimotor foundations Julia Penn Shaw and Kurt Fischer describe in infancy, where

meaning is first assembled from gaze, gesture, and goal-directed reaching. It runs through Egan's ironic understanding in adulthood, where a person holds several frameworks at once and questions the frame itself.

So every chapter carries worked examples from early childhood, middle childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. You'll see the same mechanism at work at different developmental altitudes: a baby reaching for a spoon, Nora with her fractions, a fifteen-year-old building a bike, an adult with a Python script and a hard conversation to have. The aim is that you learn to recognize the mechanism in the person in front of you, whatever their age.

Why Now

For most of history, the education I'm describing was available to a few hundred families at a time. Aristocratic tutoring, in Hoel's phrase, meant a brilliant, devoted adult living alongside a child for years: instructing, conversing, adapting to that one mind. It produced a striking share of the people we still read.

It stayed rare for a plain economic reason. Let's do the rough arithmetic. A tutor of that caliber costs something like a professional's salary, per child, per year, for fifteen years or so. Call it a hundred thousand dollars a year. Multiply by roughly fifty million school-age children in the United States and the bill comes to about five trillion dollars a year, something like a sixth of the entire economy. Only the aristocracy could pay it, which is how the practice got its name.

That constraint has begun to lift. AI systems can now carry much of the construction, adaptation, and delivery of a fully individualized curriculum. They can hold a detailed model of a learner, keep a task in the zone where challenge meets skill, and generate all four quadrant versions of a learning object at close to zero cost. The binding constraint moves from the designer's time to the child's attention. The design question moves with it, from "what can we afford to build?" to "how much of what we built should this child see today?"

That shift turns the goal from an aspiration into a plan an ordinary family or small school can execute.

Where AI systems are unaffordable or unwelcome, the same design runs on a cooperative, or pod, model. Several families pool adults, expertise, and time, so that each child still has a milieu of engaged, capable tutors, and each adult carries a share of a load they could never carry alone. The model is indifferent to which path a family chooses, and to whether any given tutor is a person or a machine. May the best agent get the job. What the model cares about is the result: a child surrounded by people who know them well and can teach them, with care and craft.

✿ How the Model Could Be Wrong

A philosophy of education can survive any evidence. A model earns the name by saying in advance what would count against it. I commit to three tests.

If sustained periods of high dual engagement fail to predict later competence, the measurement move is mistaken, and outcome testing should return to the center of the system.

If Inquiry and Practice turn out to require a fixed sequence, one always feeding the other in the same order, then agency as a steering signal collapses into a fixed learning cycle. The chapters on reading the child in the moment should then be rewritten as chapters on scheduling.

If worth-bearing work adds little engagement beyond what fidelity alone supplies, the two dials should merge into one, and the chapter on value work becomes a footnote to the chapter on embodiment.

I expect to be wrong in the details and right in the shape. Naming the tests now is how we'll find out which. (If you can think of a fourth test, a sharper one, I'd genuinely like to hear it.)

✿ Neighbors

You likely know several traditions that overlap with parts of this one.

Montessori shares the model's emphasis on embodied, self-directed activity inside a prepared environment. The model adds an explicit Practice system, with mastery gates and spaced schedules; engagement as the primary signal; and the lenses of lines and stages, which tell a guide which capacity a given material is actually exercising.

Unschooling shares the commitment to agency. The model reads agency moment by moment as a signal, where unschooling holds it as a standing policy. That keeps Practice available for the hours when a child is looking for structure and would drift without it.

Classical education shares the respect for drill and for staged development. The model replaces the fixed trivium with lines and stages drawn from developmental science, and raises the bar from a rounded person inside a canon to a person exceptional across lines.

Wilber's integral map shares the lifespan frame and the picture of many lines moving at once. The model supplies the pedagogical machinery the map leaves open: how to choose an activity, how to tune it, and how to tell whether it worked.

🚫 A Guard Against the Ambition

In every line of development, a child's first attempts to lead are met with support or with correction, and what the adults do in that moment decides whether the child comes away with purpose or with guilt. A model this ambitious, held by an overzealous parent, could become a running verdict on the child: a daily judgment of whether they are measuring up.

That's a different thing from a scoreboard. Scoreboards, competition, and external rewards stay in play here as legitimate engagement drivers. Competition is part of the human condition, and the model studies those levers with interest. The distinction is one of direction. A scoreboard the child plays against is a tool. A scoreboard the adults keep on the child is a judgment.

So the goal describes the environment's obligation to the child. Every criterion in this chapter (breadth, internal authority, worth, an alive mind)

measures the adults and the system they built. The child is the beneficiary of the measurement, and the adults are its subject.

✿ The Environment We Build

What the model calls for, in the end, is an environment: a milieu of brilliant, caring adults around the child, in the tradition of the tutors who raised so many of history's most capable people, and made reachable for ordinary families through the tools now available or through families pooling what they have. Inside that environment, the systems, dials, and lenses of the chapters ahead become daily habits.

Picture the four-year-old at the ant trail again. This time an adult who knows her well crouches down beside her, watches for a while, and asks what she thinks the ants will do next. Tomorrow there's a magnifying glass. Next week there's a notebook with a column for each day and a tally of ants per minute. A month later she's telling her grandmother, with considerable authority, how ants find their way home.

I offer the model as a working formulation. I'll keep sharpening it as the theory matures, as evidence comes in against the tests named above, and as the children raised within it grow up and tell us what we got right.

That's the goal. The rest of the book is how.

From Inquiry and Practice, by Anatoly Lezhen. Working draft, October 2026.