

# **An Enlightenment Model of a Modern University**

Blueprints for a new faculty of social science within a new university embodying the ideas of the Enlightenment, designed for the needs of the modern age

*by Paul Frijters and Gigi Foster*

## **Executive Summary**

Today's universities are burdened with social science faculties that signal virtue rather than modelling or instilling virtue in their students. The image of pro-social activism has taken the place of historically aware stewardship of society, both as a teaching objective and as the goal of much research. Classic scientific methods of inquiry have been pummeled out of existence by bureaucracy and top-down siloing of knowledge. No longer is providing real help for the communities that pay their bills a relevant consideration for many public universities. The university sector has lost its way.

In this proposal we propose an alternative mission, structure, teaching approach, and suite of continuously evolving content for a faculty of social science within a modern university whose leadership wishes to recover and restore the social role that universities used to fill, while also embedding into its pedagogy and material new knowledge developed and synthesized in recent decades about the social life of humans. The goal is to create a place where genuine leaders of society are built and the discovery of new knowledge is incentivised through institutional design.

### *Core ingredients*

The faculty we envision, and the university within which it sits, have the following features.

- Education delivery and continuous renewal of course content happens via a competitive model in which teams of academics compete for students and for inclusion of their content in core branded undergraduate educational packages that together represent the faculty. Each team of academics is run like a classic academic discipline and is grounded in a particular distinct school of thought.
- Competing academic teams form the spokes around a central hub that carries the core identity and holds the power to allocate the brand of the faculty. The central hub consists of a core of 5-10 academics of whom, once the faculty is established, one is re-appointed by citizen jury every two years, making the entire system dependent on the community for continued survival and relevance.
- The governance structure transitions from an initial phase similar to a tech start-up to a mature phase in which the wider community serviced by the faculty (alumni, feeder school graduates, emeriti, associated organisations, former faculty executives) plays key roles in appointing leaders, deciding on administrative overhauls, judging competing content claims, and authorising changes in direction and strategy.

-If a particular spoke team of academics becomes highly successful, it is encouraged to break off to form its own school, independent of the core brand. The whole place is thus an incubator for new schools of thought, each school teaching whatever its leaders deem appropriate (preferably involving own textbooks and journals), with only a fairly minimal shared curriculum run by the centre. New spoke teams are encouraged to form and dissolve organically in response to market demand and innovation.

-The content of core branded packages spills over downstream through licensing competing external providers of secondary school curricula that base their content on the branded packages through the use of common shared language and basic concepts.

-The content of core branded packages spills over upstream into competing schools of thought offering post-graduate education, including research components.

-Teams offering competing schools of thought are encouraged to experiment continuously with content, teaching styles, and the cultural environment. Administrative support is also offered via a competitive model, where functions like IT and HR are offered by competing teams.

-A unifying content philosophy of "do what you say; say no more, do no less" is upheld in all academic teams, implying that everything that is taught must be consistent (within reason) with the behaviour of the teacher, and that the community practices what it says it believes. This philosophy is embedded into the oversight activities provided by the community. It is a radical truth speak, which enforces reflection and consistency.

-The undergraduate curriculum is taught on campus and in person, where a strong emphasis is placed on the physical and mental health of students and staff. All community members are expected to engage in sports and/or dance activities, immersive field studies, the promotion of a positive community self-image, maintaining a culture of self-reliance and self-optimisation, ongoing investments in emotional and relationship skills, co-ownership of the cultural space, and the designation of social media and mobile phone use on campus as hard drugs.

## Introduction

These blueprints sketch the main problems with modern mainstream Western academia, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world, and then set out an alternative first in broad outlines and then in greater detail. We finish with practical details, including timelines and what is needed to begin. Throughout, we focus especially on social science, as this is what we ourselves know best, but also consider the broader university structures within which a new social science faculty would sit.

The university sector in 2023 presents real opportunity. The problems with academia [have long been known and debated](#), including by Allen Ginsberg in his excellent 2011 book “The Fall of the Faculty.” We ourselves have frequently discussed the economics and politics of the deterioration of the [institutions](#) and quality of university research culture, but we did not previously believe it was realistic to propose radically new models for universities.

In the wake of the destruction of school systems by covid policies and the ongoing erosion of freedom of speech and Western self-confidence, we now believe that the moment for renewal has come. The culture within universities, including the top ones, has become extremely toxic for both staff and students, as attested by the harrowing story ‘Diversity and Exclusion’ of Lindsey Sheppard (2021), a student hounded out of university for organising debates on campus about pronouns. As evidence for a demand for change, consider that in the US, where [public school has collapsed](#), the number of American children being homeschooled has doubled. That implies a growing market to support the creation of more independent curricula and examinations. Home-schooling ‘resistance’ families, as well as independent school communities that are aligned with our values and mission, form a natural reservoir of students and parents interested in a brave, free university whose academics and administrators are invested in the ideas of freedom, progress, and critical thought. In a word, we see the opportunity today to build New Enlightenment universities.

In this document, we sketch why a new university is needed, what it could look like, how it would function, and what its core points of differentiation would be.

## Problems with the modern university

We observe the following problems with academia today. Each problem hampers universities’ ability to deliver on their mission to curate free and critical thought, produce new knowledge, and graduate students prepared to serve the needs of their communities.

1. *Bureaucratic bloat.* Universities today are administratively bloated, a phenomenon that self-perpetuates via national and international bureaucracies. It naturally expands and expands, costing the time of academics and students. While a 2014 paper found US universities in 2010 functioned perfectly well with an administration-to-faculty ratio of just 1 to 3, the typical ratio observed was at least 5 to 3 in 2010, and getting worse. Yale is now reporting that it has as many administrators as it has students. This bloat represents easily 50% of all expenses in a

university and perhaps more than that in terms of lost productivity, which includes both additional expenses and the production prevented by over-regulation.

An example of how this bureaucracy is self-perpetuating is seen in the process of accreditation. Accreditation agencies, whether private or public, largely measure the presence of administrative staff, policies, and requirements (processes, procedures, KPIs, progress reports, databases, ethics committees, and so on). In turn, accreditation is used as a pre-requisite for student access to state loans, for purposes of fulfilling job requirements, or for academics to be able to apply for research grants from state agencies. Research income is then used as advertising for students and to pursue higher levels of accreditation. In this way, the university bureaucracy is both mandated and protected by the associated national and international institutions around accreditation, research grants, state job applications, and state loans. Only institutions with large endowments (either private endowments, as in the States, or state subsidies via free public land or other state-provided resources) are able to keep up and become known as high-status universities in this bureaucratic race.

Administrative bloat has many other consequences, amongst which is that many university functions now follow bureaucratic rather than academic logic, ignoring the purely academic benefits to activities and focusing instead on finding and privileging reasons for the bureaucracy's own existence. This leads to a perennial search for problems that can be exaggerated and turned into a justification for more administration (e.g., 'is there a problem I can pretend to solve by creating an additional compliance problem?'). A clear example of this is seen in human subjects ethics policies, which today involve many committees and result in the strange reality that social science academics, whose job it is to do research about humanity, are bound by rules that in no way bind millions of businesses and government departments that treat people far worse than they are treated in most research involving human subjects. The bureaucracy has created a kind of administrative ritual, justified by the need to be careful when doing research with human subjects, that demands yet more administration, goes far further than the law of the land, and naturally crowds out individual responsibility.

*2. Universities as businesses.* The modern university has become a business run for the personal glory and profit of its management, rather than an institution serving a public-good function that reflects the desire for knowledge in a whole community. Universities are now large property owners, suppliers of visas, organisers of consultancy services and places where business and management careers are made, all of which feed a commercial but not necessarily a community mission. Universities today play a real 'game of mates' (Murray and Frijters, 2022).

This new orientation has many consequences. One is an inability to effectively care-take the physical and mental health of students, because the question of 'what good could we do' is not the starting point nor built into the self-image of the university anymore. A second is the loss of a positive community story, leaving a vacuum that is now filled with self-hatred and divisive doomsday stories. A third is that relevant research has been replaced by performative research. Fourth, truth is no longer treated seriously, having been replaced by feel-good promises. Fifth,

public lectures have reduced in importance and publishing is increasingly seen as a pure status game, leading to territorial issues. Worst of all perhaps is the demise of the university as a place where people try to solve community problems.

3. *Mediocrity and cowardice.* Second-rate and disconnected teaching, based on what students with limited understanding enjoy hearing, is coupled in today's universities with disconnected theories that are largely for sale (e.g., content for schools of medicine influenced by Big Pharma, theories on taxation and private property pushed by billionaire think tanks, and old textbooks rehashing tired theories that dominate the market and from which disciplines cannot escape). With mass teaching have come low-quality students, dragging standards down, but also the reality that university activities become relevant to institutions (including the state) wishing to manipulate whole populations – reducing universities' independence.

Immersive teaching and travel are seen today merely as risks, rather than core activities, by university managers who do not weigh the risks versus benefits of university activities with respect to fulfilling a community service role.

The result of these trends, coupled with broader social trends over the past generation, are alarming. Cognitive outcomes and several indicators of university success in the West are now visibly suffering relative to a mere 20 years ago. Not only do our children have lower IQs and a reduced capacity to think abstractly, but the mobility of young people is lower and the ratio of college premium to college costs is low.

These problems feed into each other and mutually reinforce a bad equilibrium for the system as a whole. The incentives are strong for university staff who are low-quality and demotivated to find ways of avoiding higher-quality demands or demands to reduce bureaucracy (which would lead to layoffs). A peer review system that has metastasized into a mechanism of punishment of real innovation and reward for super-specialists by established territories will spawn textbooks and academic societies reflecting those territories, creating more barriers to real renewal. The increased importance of research status signaling makes all of this worse, as 'winning' on the terms of the existing system becomes more important, punishing innovation and broad thinking even more.

Joy and spiritual meaning have been replaced in today's universities by dull low-quality mass teaching and mass research. Strong lock-in effects make escape for existing universities nigh impossible. As early as 2012, we observed that any Australian university wanting to do something about quality or bureaucracy would upset the unions, the existing students, the local politicians, and even the alumni (who would suddenly hear from their own university that the degree they thought was great was in fact not great). New entrants would face extreme pressures to copy the basic failed model, both due to demands for bureaucracy by accreditors and students, and due to the need to look good on signaling measures (rankings, research income, etc.). A pessimist might think the only way to change is for the whole system to eventually lose legitimacy and then implode as the demand for education finds substitutes abroad and in external institutions, like home schooling.

With great upheavals, making a portion of the population lose faith in the state and in the many institutions associated with power and money, come new opportunities. The signs that we may be at such a juncture now are seen in the rising percent of people who have lost faith in the news and in local politicians, the prevalence of beliefs that standards have fallen, and the rising percent of people opting out by home-schooling or paying for private education rather than trusting the state.

### **Basic design principles**

Our design intends to combine the best of the universities 100 years ago with new insights about effective learning and the possibilities offered by modern technology. We envision a new, aggressive, ambitious entrant to the higher education sector that can outmuscle existing institutions in a short space of time and can operate as a franchise model.

Our core design principles are as follows.

1. *Avoid competing on the terms of the current mainstream.* The biggest problem to avoid is the black hole of bureaucracy, including what is required to satisfy the current accreditation and quality-signal systems. Instead, a radically alternative strategy of lower administration will be coupled with the adoption of a public-good ethos and a positive community spirit, minimising the key disadvantage of foregoing the many subsidies of the state.

2. *Prioritise co-ownership by and nurturing of students and the community.* Capitalise on the other weaknesses of mainstream universities: that they neglect the physical and mental health of students and ignore community needs. Make the university's governance and content co-owned and directed by a larger community through the use of participatory democracy tools in decision-making and appointments. Prioritise disruption-free, beautiful common workspaces and nurture institutional pride. Embed market-based incentives for academic staff to keep investing in their work and in institutional public goods even after a few years, while avoiding the traditional tenure system that allows for unlimited discretion over a long period of time and hence high levels of free-riding and shirking. Make job security time-limited and dependent on community approval, and prohibit large endowments that morph into non-community-based control mechanisms and barriers to innovation over the longer term. Provide incentives for public goods production within the communities linked to the institution (e.g., media production, production of institutional reputation, and production of research about the communities) while minimising rent-seeking by bureaucrats.

3. *Embed participatory and experiential learning approaches.* Modern universities often make grand claims about their use of experiential learning, but the reality we observe is a far cry from what is needed, even by smart students, to see the decision situation in which concepts are useful and proceed to deeply understand them. Good teaching involves expanding the set of concepts and stories students use to understand the world layer by layer, using as a starting point the experiences and stories they already know. High-level abstract teaching is simpler to teach and feels more universal to the originator, but it is a slow and often ineffectual form of teaching that simply means students never really 'get it', while also making the material

vulnerable to intellectual decoupling from the real problems of the communities served by universities. Genuine experiential learning involves the use of artificial environments, experiments, study trips, reflection, and ongoing student involvement in experiments. New technology can be exploited in this area, as dangerous social experiences can be simulated in an artificial environment, something impossible for the academia of old. Combining the best of conceptual teaching with experiential teaching is a dynamic undertaking, involving continuous experimentation and renewal as the stories and concepts new students come in with change over time.

4. *Cater to a fragmented market using a platform-based, modular approach to content presentation.* The basic market served by the social science faculty we envision is scattered and diverse. It includes small groups of rebels, small religious groups, and groups facing diverse state education systems. To service this fragmented market requires constant search and adaptation, which can be facilitated by situating content on a platform that enables returns to scale to be captured. A platform model for curricula would provide certification and examination services for many downstream (e.g., home-schooling) communities, and would be coupled with a modular approach to teaching provision, allowing small communities to slot in their own particularly cherished elements, like teaching local religious beliefs. This model also facilitates content being found by local curriculum innovators and education providers downstream and upstream (i.e., in pre-university and postgraduate education). The starting point would be a basic suite of content designed to be suitable for one clear market segment.

5. *Use the power of the market and of experimentation to drive content quality.* Take advantage of returns to scale in reputation and curriculum development by funneling material, through a competitive process, into the creative commons of the whole institution, while continuously experimenting with what works in education and with what gets closest to useful truth in research. All potential developers of curricula will be allowed to compete with what is already offered on the platform. A mixture of demand and community valuation will determine the quantity of contracts for each modular offering.

6. *Draw on existing knowledge.* Specific design decisions will draw on insights from behavioural economics, design theory, psychology, pedagogy, network theory, and modern management practices. The two core designers have about 50 years of teaching and organisational experience between them, including as roles of directors of education, founding directors of various academic and freedom-oriented institutions, and advising governments in three continents on optimal institutions.

### **High-level description of the model, with examples of innovative elements**

Our model is for a new university providing the core services of teaching and research that would minimally house a faculty of social science, although partnerships with other disciplinary groups would be possible if such groups were ambitious and shared our goals of improving learning, building institutional identity, representing the community, and escaping the ills of social media and modern academia. We envision an institution providing a modern social science curriculum from bachelors through to postgraduate levels, an immersive student

experience, pre-university curricula suitable for home schooling at primary school and high school, and community-oriented social science research. The longer-run ambition is to become a role model for how academia and society as a whole should function.

The main teaching objective of the new university would be to develop critical thinkers who can succeed in society at large, while the main research objective would be to develop perspectives on current developments that are useful to the community being serviced. The new university would be completely separate from the state and from current Western academia. It would be elite in the sense of offering a high-level immersive program unsuited for the majority of the population, and requiring complete dedication of students for successful program completion.

The new university would be highly innovative compared to 'regular' existing Western universities both in terms of its programs and activities and in terms of governance. Following the basic but radical philosophy of "do what you say – say no more, do no less", every major initiative would need to be thought through for its consistency with the content taught, and theories taught would be expected to be adhered to by staff and students. Practicing through internal governance the content that is taught means running the university itself in the ways it teaches students that large organisations can be optimally run, and also means changing course when that view changes with new insights. The same basic requirement will be made of students: that they implement in their own life what they say they have come to believe about life and society. This basic rule enforces a radical honesty and a genuine tolerance for other truths, both within life at university and in the curriculum.

#### *Examples of core innovative features*

1.. If a particular group of academics is responsible for a suite of highly related education services (say, 12 masters courses in Artificial Intelligence for Management), then that group is seen as a sub-community. It organises itself and sets up its internal reward system however its leadership sees fit, but would also as a group be liable for ejection from the university if there is insufficient demand from the students or the serviced communities. These communities (or 'citizenry') would include alumni, feeder communities like schools, churches and home-schooling groups using its pre-university curricula offerings, and ex-staff. Whole sub-communities can be outcompeted by other sub-communities, with 'academic disciplines' themselves sub-communities that would continuously have to prove themselves via the relevance of their teaching and research activities to the community.

2.. Students will be involved in experimentation embedded within all major elements of university life, including rules on social media use, the curricula, and governance structures. A joining student would need to accept the reality of being continuously experimented upon. It would be seen as normal for courses developed in established brands to split their classes into several groups which are then graded and taught the same material in different ways, simply to find out what works best. No principle would hold that every student is treated exactly equally or is given exactly the same chances. Fairness is aimed for, but completely standardised treatment is not. Risk-taking, personal responsibility, open debates, excursions, the hosting of outside guests, and active research on involved communities



would all be encouraged for students to help them discover useful truths. Similarly, institutional features like titles, public lectures, and advertising would all be the focus of perennial experimentation aimed at discovering optimality. The fallibility of all perspectives and the incredible complexity of business and social life would be continuously experienced and displayed in order to breed humility and an appreciation for useful perspectives.

3.. In order to signal quality while avoiding involvement in mainstream accreditation systems, the university must engage in alternative mechanisms of revealing the quality of its teaching and its research. It could directly challenge existing universities in student debates, spin off new companies founded by students (which would have to prove themselves in general competition), or closely track the success of alumni. Research and teaching quality in social science could also be signaled by open prediction competitions for academics and students: new predictions would be made on a rolling basis for what is going to happen in, say, 6 months' time, in their private life, their local community, and a world event situation. Predictions would then be checked against reality, leading to a formal self-reflection and updating session (what did someone miss or get right? What was expected or unexpected?). Academics and administrators would also be involved in predictions relating to their own areas of expertise and activity, and some open prediction competitions would involve anyone who wished to play. Predictions would be announced and analysed after the fact to show students how even very experienced people get most predictions wrong. Topics for predictions could be determined largely by student input, and integrated with public lectures and open writings.

4.. University governance would transition from a founding-parents model to a participative democratic model wherein key decisions are made by citizen juries and committees drawn from the university's emerging 'citizenry'. Key posts in both the administrative branch and the executive branch of the university would be appointed via citizen juries. Contracts and quality control would involve standing committees of the same citizenry, again with appointments of key leadership via citizen jury.

5.. While it remains the case that health science research holds that physical activity and a good diet are good for individuals' physical health, then those elements will be implemented at the university. Community sports and dance would be seen as healthy and desirable individual behaviours, and part of what is graded. The same would hold for mental health, implying that based on present knowledge, the constant distractions and addictive messaging issued from social media are considered hard drugs, so social media and smartphones will be banned from campus: a choice to join the university would entail a choice to forego these distractions and thus find community 'off line'. Similarly, good mental health habits, including a suite of activities aimed at increasing emotional and relationship skills, would be part of regular community life. Few distractions, positive community self-image, and an inspirational physical environment would be seen as important public goods. Improvements would be continually sought to avoid assaults on any of them, each actively involving students. As an example, mass emails would be seen as a grab of a common good (the attention of everyone) and thus unwanted, even if sent out by university

administrators. Instead, anything worth saying to many others should be said at regular communal events. To limit email abuse, the internal email system could feature credit points for each user, akin to postage stamps: sending messages to many others would require many credits, and users with no credits left could be required to perform free pro-community service to earn some, under the essential philosophy that the attention of the community is a valuable good that one should hence pay for via services that benefit the community. Internet usage too could be confined to particular hours. Aesthetics would be important and should involve students – e.g., via regular communal poetry readings and campus beautification activities organised by students. Positive stories would be propagated about the communities from which students come, by both students and the citizenry, with self-hatred and doom-saying seen as social bads. Celebrations of the community and its history would be common elements of communal events.

6.. Administration services would be minimal and contestable: with no administrative tenure, administrative teams (like academic teams) would need to continuously prove their value to the communities served via regular community-led audits of existing services. Administrators would also be directly involved in experimentation activities within their realm of expertise, and in the co-ownership of campus culture. Direct communication and antagonistic collaboration would be used to deliver critical reflection on plans or past activities. Paperwork and formal processes would be considered second-best to self-regulation within a 'caveat emptor' (buyer beware) risk management culture.

## **Resource needs and practicalities**

### *Quick Pitch*

To start up a new Enlightenment university along the lines sketched above, the required ingredients are a physical venue to teach and for accommodation (a campus), an administrative system (to handle enrollment and HR), a set of local education producers, an initial potential market, a few key backers to provide money and networking services, and some clever marketing to build brand recognition. A building, grounds, and a workforce of around 100 staff would cost an estimated \$30-35 million.

A downstream business would offer platform-based pre-university curricula, exam-checking tools, networks with potential customers, certification services, and an ability to write contracts to license material, providing a legal basis for operations. A few million dollars on top of the initial investment in the university itself would suffice to start this downstream arm.

Upstream, a business to provide postgraduate and research services in social science would require several groups of academics, each producing both ongoing disseminated truth (research) and an education track into their perspective and its latest insights (i.e., postgraduate teaching). A system of dissemination would be required along with some method of signaling quality (perhaps via rolling prediction systems, where an academic group that makes more correct predictions than others has the stronger signal of quality) or at least the contestability of quality, where space and support are provided for critique across groups. As with the

downstream arm, starting up this upstream arm would cost a few million more beyond the initial costs of setting up the university.

#### *Practicality 1: Where?*

To be effective in transforming lives, the university we envision needs to be a physical space with an active community life. It cannot be established or engaged in online, part-time, or for just a few weeks a year: it needs a physical campus with accommodation space within it or close by.

Major considerations in deciding on a suitable location include the attitude of local politicians and populations towards the endeavour, and the accessibility, affordability and quality of life offered by the location.

In the US, these requirements are best fulfilled by places in the south (e.g., Florida, Texas), mid-west, or in rural areas with favourable social climates.

#### *Practicality 2: Who?*

To signal credibility, one would have to start with a core of at least 10 academic staff, of whom a minimum of 4 would locate in the center and 2-3 would locate in each of 2-3 initial spokes. All must be high-profile and disillusioned with present-day universities, eager to build a new school of thought. Someone like Jordan Peterson would be aspirational, but not outside the realm of possibility. The two authors personally know a large pool of potentially interested academics who would in principle be good enough. Yet, the whole idea is to have competing schools of thought on campus, so to optimise the initial staff list it would be advisable to reach out in collaboration with sponsors to particular academics targeted on the basis of their profiles, their commitment to building something that supersedes existing academia, and their ability to be a team player in the wider endeavour.

#### *Practicality 3: Optimal size and pricing*

High-level education in an immersive environment with a shared cohesive culture has historically worked for student communities numbering between 5,000 and 10,000 in total. A reasonable size target for the new university's steady-state student body would be 8,000. A teaching faculty of around 500, a total faculty of no more than 1,000, and a total number of university workers (including all groundspeople, janitors, cooks, cleaners, and administrative staff) of no more than 2,000 would produce a total campus community size of 10,000. If this is exceeded, then a subgroup of faculty should split off, as sketched above. This size would imply the need to charge around 40-50K USD in tuition per student each year in order to break even. The more that the research activities of the university help feeder and post-degree communities that reciprocate, the lower the tuition fee can be.

#### *Practicality 4: Boot camps and pro-community service*

To help new undergraduates kick bad habits associated with mobile phones, social media, negative self-image, and low physical activity, the university would need to provide an

immersive bootcamp of at least one month in which new habits are explained, demonstrated, and experienced long enough for new undergraduates to know whether they like it and whether they can function in line with expectations.

The common space and positive culture of the university can be invested in (via beautification, public activities, arts, social organisations, reading groups, etc.) or, alternatively, disrupted (via mass emails, auditory or visual vandalism, denigration of self or others, etc.). All campus members would be expected to contribute community service (say, 100 hours per person per year) in order to embed the notion of community and to create a sense of co-ownership over the commons. Part of the boot camp, apart from lectures, social activities, positive community self-image stories, and getting used to living without mobile phones and social media, would be to help improve the commons and thereby begin to contribute.

#### *Practicality 5: The initial market and initial steps*

A brand is needed in order to attract students, staff, and supporters of the endeavour. The optimal path would be to use brands associated with the post-covid new Enlightenment, and expand them into the education space.

Once branding is decided upon, the next steps are to establish a minimum curriculum, to rent a location (ideally with an option to buy), and to recruit students and a minimum staff, all with a view to being up and running within 12 months. Pitches would be made not only to target prospective faculty but directly to prospective students, both those totally new and those studying but disenfranchised within existing universities. Pitches to students, parents and communities would be made largely via existing new Enlightenment networks.