

How to Provide a Christian Solution to Humanistic College Education for an Internet Hosting Charge of \$4,800 a Year

Gary North
June 5, 2021

The technical solution is Thinkific.com. It allows any organization to create online courses. There is no limit on the number of courses or the number of students. Cost: \$4,800 a year. (<https://www.thinkific.com/pricing>)

Consider the Khan Academy. It is technologically capable of providing an education to 10 million students or 20 million students. It is YouTube-based. It delivers a program free of charge to any student in the world. If Khan can do this, why can't we do it? This is not a rhetorical question. This is a practical question. It has a practical answer. We do not have the teachers.

There is a shortage of college-level Christian educators who possess a comprehensive worldview based explicitly on the Bible – a worldview which they have systematically applied to their academic disciplines over the past two decades.

There is no shortage of educators who insist that they possess such a worldview. There is a glut of them. Sadly, most of them have never published an article, let alone a book, on what exactly their worldview is. The handful who can define their worldviews offer definitions that are in conflict with definitions offered by other Christian educators. Next, none of them has written a textbook in his academic discipline that offers a systematic alternative to the humanist textbooks in the field. Then they assign humanist textbooks and monographs to their students.

The students face four years or more of intellectual schizophrenia. The content of the books their Christian professors assign is humanistic. Their Christian professors do not systematically inform these students of the conflict between what the Bible teaches and what the assigned books teach.

There is also a shortage of Christian educators who are sufficiently visionary to offer their teaching time for free, once in their careers, in order to produce free courses that can educate a million or more students in their field.

This is not a new problem. It began no later than the twelfth century. The students are taught in Jerusalem by men who have imported materials written in Athens.

This is funded by naive parents who imagine that their children will receive lifetime employment after they receive their certification.

This system of education needs to be reformed. But reforming a system that began in the twelfth

century, and which had its roots in Israel during the age of Hellenism, will not be easy.

If those doing the reforming are unsure which part of the curriculum comes from the Bible and which comes from Athens, the reform will prove to be futile.

I speak metaphorically. None of the curriculum comes from Athens these days. Athens went out of style in 1890, after Harvard adopted the elective system. Today, it comes from Königsberg (Kant's home town).

A. A Conventional College Program

In order to earn a bachelor's degree, a student must enroll in courses totaling 120 semester credit hours. A one-semester course generally counts for three semester credit hours. He takes ten one-semester courses a year.

A typical one-semester course involves the following:

1. Three 50-minute lectures a week
2. Two hours of homework for each lecture
3. 15 weeks per course

The total number of hours per week per course is under nine hours. The student takes five courses. He therefore puts in a total of fewer than forty-five hours.

In the first week of my freshman year at Pomona College in 1959, we listened to a speech by a bureaucrat in the administration. Pomona College, then as now, was rated in the top ten four-year colleges in the United States. There was no graduate school. It was committed to teaching undergraduates. The speaker made the most important pedagogical point that any educator ever made in my career. He said that the college expected us to put in a work week comparable to what our fathers put in at their jobs. This seemed reasonable at the time. It still does.

A typical college student today is asked to put about the same work week that a typical American worker is asked to do. Yet most of them do not put in this much time. They cut corners. They goof off. They party. They play video games.

This is nothing new. Not much has changed since the twelfth century.

Second, and far more important, is this fact: **in the first two years of college, the typical student learns nothing academically.** This has been known for a decade. The evidence appears in a book, *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*, published by the University of Chicago Press in 2011. A review of the book appears on the Inside Higher Ed website: <http://bit.ly/LearnNothingReview>.

The book produced no visible reforms. As we say, it sank without a trace. The efficiency of higher education has not changed. Tuition fees have risen faster than the rate of price inflation. There has been no student revolt. There has been no parental revolt. It is still business as usual.

Most parents of college students are unaware of this book. Those few parents who are aware of its findings do not cut off the funding. **The system of higher education does not change because the economic sanctions do not change.** The money still rolls in.

Whenever sellers find a product that they can deliver to customers who are unwilling to shop elsewhere, and who do not care about the quality of the product, nothing changes. In this case, the product is a graduation certificate from an accredited college or university. So, there is no incentive to change the system.

Consumer demand shapes economic production. This is the supreme fact of free market economic theory. This fact is expressed in this phrase: “You get what you pay for.” I would add this: “and nothing extra.” As long as customers – parents – pay to maintain this system, it is a waste of time and money for anyone inside or outside the system to attempt a comprehensive reform that will in any way change it.

There is a famous phrase in American life: “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” The higher education system is not broken from the point of view of the people paying to support it. It is also not broken from the point of view of those who profit from providing it: humanist professors who control all phases of it.

Parents don’t care about the content of higher education, and they have not cared ever since the twelfth century. This is why college education looks pretty much as it did in the twelfth century: boring lectures to bored students, reading assignments that students do not complete, and degrees awarded at the end of four years. The only major change is that it takes five years these days: 20% more than parents funded in my day.

Funding has increased from the state, beginning around 1870. State funding has accelerated dramatically in the United States immediately after World War II: “the G.I. Bill of Rights.” Returning servicemen were offered federal money to attend college. College became a mass-market industry.

Legislatures do not impose any controls over the content of education. They accept the professors’ demand of “academic freedom.” The humanistic faculties insist on the separation of church and state. Legislatures go along. So does the U.S. Supreme Court.

The system ever since 1945 has also been heavily funded at the graduate level by research grants from the U.S. government. The U.S. government cares nothing about what is taught in classrooms.

This is why all calls for a comprehensive reform of American higher education from inside the system without a complete change in its funding are utopian. **The system is not going to change until its funding changes.** The basic structure of the university has not changed in nine centuries. Why should anyone expect it to change now?

I therefore offer this suggestion: **Do not try to change the system. Work around it.**

B. Discount Colleges

I produced a YouTube video for American parents in 2007. I presented a plan to enable students to earn a college degree from an accredited institution for a total expenditure of \$11 a day. With an expenditure that small, the typical student can pay for his college education by working part-time in a fast-food restaurant. The video is here: <http://bit.ly/DiscountCollegeProgram>

A few years later, a teenager in my church adopted this strategy. He figured it out by himself. He had not seen my video. I did not know him. (It was a large church.) He was the oldest child in a family of ten. His parents told him early that they could not afford to pay for his college. His mother homeschooled him.

Beginning in his freshman year of high school, at the age of 13, he began to implement the educational strategy that I recommend. He took CLEP exams. These exams are substitutes for college courses. They are administered by the College Board, the non-profit organization that administers the SAT exam. He was able to complete his first two years of college in his first two years of high school. His out-of-pocket expenses were in the range of \$2,000. He paid for this himself. He had a lawn mowing business. (He also had enough spare time to become an Eagle Scout by age 18.) He continued with his program for two more years. In the month before his 18th birthday, he completed a degree in business from an accredited online college. His total cost was under \$12,000.

I interviewed him about his strategy. The video is here: <http://bit.ly/CollegeDegreeAt18>

This academic strategy is not available to people living outside of the United States unless they are in one of the military services. They cannot take CLEP exams. Yet in the United States, few students take full advantage of it. Their parents do not care. The students would rather have their parents pay \$100,000 dollars to \$250,000 to send them to college for five years, where they party, party, party. Even Christian parents pay for this. It is described in a recent essay on the satirical website, Babylon Bee. I recommend that you read it: <http://bit.ly/CollegeSatireBB>. If it were not so accurate, it would be funny. It is not funny.

It is possible for students living outside the United States to take partial advantage of this strategy, but they cannot use CLE P exams to pay for the first two years of college. They have to pay a retail price for the first two years. This means that they can earn a bachelor's degree from

an accredited online college for under \$30,000 through Western Governors University. It is still possible for a student to pay for his college education by working part-time. He lives at home, works four hours a day, and earns his degree in four years.

This is not hypothetical. This is reality. Yet very few families take advantage of this system. This is what makes the system possible. If a million students overnight heard about these programs and enrolled, this would overwhelm the few universities that offer these low-cost online programs. They could not possibly meet the demand. They would have to hire too many professors.

In American life, this is called a catch-22 situation. In order to beat the system, you have to adopt a plan that would shut down the system if everybody adopted the plan. (The phrase comes from Joseph Heller's 1961 novel, *Catch-22*.)

For the vast majority of Third World students, this is far too expensive. It is utopian. It does not solve the problem of earning a college degree.

When you face a problem that cannot be solved conventionally, think unconventionally.

The key to the humanists' control over higher education is accreditation. Humanists control the accreditation system. They eliminate competition. This control is weakening. As artificial intelligence spreads, college degrees will be worth less. Practical knowledge will be more important than the kind of knowledge that is certified by mass-produced college degrees.

Practical knowledge is available for no money on the Internet. This is irreversible. The humanists' control over education is weakening. It will continue to weaken.

This offers Christian educators an opportunity to produce an educational alternative for Christian families. If they can reduce the money price of a marketable education to zero, they can beat the existing educational cartel.

Salman Khan has shown that Christians can do this technically. The Christian educational reformers' main task today is to persuade humanist-certified Christian educators inside the cartel to do this . . . for free. This will not be easy.

To be an accredited university, you have to provide full-time instruction by accredited professors. The professors have to grade papers and examinations. In lower division, graduate assistants have to do this.

Education in this form is increasingly obsolete. Most education can be provided through online videos, reading assignments, true-false examinations, multiple-choice examinations, and other performance standards that can be graded electronically. Very few professors assign term papers any longer. It is too much work. They have to spend time reading the papers. They ceased doing

this a generation ago. The only real-time work the professors provide today is reading examination papers. As artificial intelligence progresses, this will no longer be necessary. This means that, in terms of actual performance, professors in most fields within two decades will no longer be necessary at the undergraduate level.

This will make possible to offer college-level education free of charge. Once the videos are online, and once the digital programs provide the grading, most professors will no longer be necessary. There is no reason why these services will not be provided free of charge. Digital information systems are inexpensive, and they are getting lower.

When this digital day of reckoning arrives, the key to education will be the content of the education.

Conclusion: educational revolutionaries need to be patient. The day of deliverance is fast approaching.

This means that serious educational revolutionaries should concentrate now on developing the content of the education. They should not spend time or effort in devising grand schemes of capturing the present system. **The present system is doomed.**

When the cost of delivering a college education falls to zero, only the accreditation system will serve as the last barrier to massive cost-cutting and the widespread delivery of top-flight education to the masses of the world.

C. Accreditation and Humanism

The vast majority of college students are going to enroll in a humanistic university. To save money, most students attend a tax-funded university. There is no way to offset this. This is reality. Most Christian parents are not going to send their children to small, economically struggling Christian colleges, which are more expensive than tax-funded colleges.

The few parents who do pay for a Christian college demand that the college be accredited. To receive this accreditation, a Christian college assigns the same humanistic textbooks that are used in tax-funded secular universities. Parents are therefore paying huge amounts of money for their children to get compulsory chapel services and perhaps a few lectures in classrooms that in some unoffensive way challenge the worldview presented in the textbooks that the professors assign. This has been going on for a century. It is not going to change.

Any revolution in Christian higher education must deal with the reality of the present system. This system is entrenched by the accreditation system. It is also entrenched by tax-funding of most education. Parents demand accreditation. They do not care about the content of what is taught in the classrooms. They do not go into the college bookstore when they bring their

children as high school seniors to investigate the academic programs offered by tiny, economically struggling Christian colleges.

To get accreditation, the colleges have to hire people with Ph.D. degrees. These degrees are universally humanistic. This revolution was funded by John D. Rockefeller, Sr.'s organization, the General Education Board, which began in 1903. The GEB began donating money to colleges on this basis: they were required to hire professors with Ph.D. degrees. These degrees were rare in 1903. Woodrow Wilson had one, but not many other college professors did. The professors who had these degrees had been trained by humanists. Only a tiny handful of universities in the United States offered the Ph.D.

The first American university to offer a Ph.D. was Johns Hopkins, which awarded Wilson his degree. Johns Hopkins brought Darwin's bulldog, Thomas Huxley, to deliver the university's inaugural lecture in September 1876. That lecture set the tone for higher education in the United States. The president was Daniel Coit Gilman, a dedicated humanist who had been the second president of the University of California. This is from the Wikipedia entry on Gilman.

At Yale he was a classmate of Andrew Dickson White, who would later serve as first president of Cornell University. The two were members of the Skull and Bones secret society, and traveled to Europe together after graduation and remained lifelong friends. Gilman was also a member of the Alpha Delta Phi fraternity. Gilman would later co-found the Russell Trust Association, the foundation behind Skull and Bones.

White was as self-conscious in his hatred of Christianity as Gilman was. He wrote a legendary pack of lies, *History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896). In the Introduction, he referred to his lecture of 1874.

In all modern history, interference with science in the supposed interest of religion, no matter how conscientious such interference may have been, has resulted in the direst evils both to religion and to science, and invariably; and, on the other hand, all untrammelled scientific investigation, no matter how dangerous to religion some of its stages may have seemed for the time to be, has invariably resulted in the highest good both of religion and of science.

If I were going to write a critique, I would title it *Enormous White Lies*.

The story of the humanists' capture of higher education in America is best told by Calvinist historian George M. Marsden, *The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief* (Oxford University Press, 1994). As a preliminary to this book, you should read his earlier book: *Fundamentalism and American culture: The Shaping of Twentieth Century Evangelicalism 1870–1925* (Oxford University Press, 1980). (Marsden and I met very briefly in September 1963 at Westminster seminary in Philadelphia. He was about to

go on to grad school. I was coming in as a beginning student.)

There was only one great opportunity to reform Protestant higher education over the last nine centuries. It could have been done by the Puritans. On this missed opportunity, read the book by John Morgan, *Godly Learning: Puritan Attitudes towards Reason, Learning, and Education, 1560–1640* (Cambridge University Press, 1986). It is depressing reading.

D. Lower Division

I begin with this verified fact: **very few students learn anything new during the first two years of college.** When I say that they do not learn anything new, I mean academically.

Lower-division college today is what used to be called finishing school. A finishing school in the nineteenth century was a substitute for college for young women. It was not taken seriously by male educators.

What lower-division students learn today is the humanist worldview. Most of them have been educated in this worldview in tax-funded state schools. This is true in every Western country. This indoctrination process began on a systematic basis in the late eighteenth century in Prussia. It spread into the French educational system under Napoleon. It became dominant in the United States, beginning in the state of Massachusetts in the mid-1830's. Massachusetts imported the Prussian system. Rushdoony covers this in chapter 3 of his book, *The Messianic Character of American Education* (1963).

In the first two years of college, students receive their final round of preliminary indoctrination in humanism. This is before they choose their academic majors. The means by which the students are indoctrinated is the textbook. These are so expensive that some students rent them.

An author writes a textbook manuscript so that it passes through a screening process. A committee of scholars in the field is hired by a publisher. The committee guesses about whether the content and design of a prospective textbook will be acceptable to academic departments: more committees. The departments are filled with warring factions of scholars who do not agree with each other on the basics, except on this point: organized religion – especially Christianity – is irrelevant to higher education.

Having been screened by several sets of committees, textbooks are bland. They must satisfy all schools of opinion within a particular department. Bland textbooks are a major weakness of humanistic higher education. They do not discuss the epistemological presuppositions of humanism: the autonomy of man. They also do not discuss the presuppositions of the disciplines' methodologies, which are based on conflicting factions within humanism. They do not discuss the vulnerability of every academic specialty to opinions from outside the educational establishment. The crucial book on this is Thomas Kuhn's 1962 monograph, *The Structure of*

Scientific Revolutions (University of Chicago Press). This book created something of a scientific revolution. It served as the epistemological Bible for the revolt of graduate students and younger professors in American universities, a revolt that began in the fall of 1964 at the University of California, Berkeley: the free speech movement. (Ironically, there is no free speech today on campuses. Hate speech is banned. Hate speech is anything that offends radical students.)

Kuhn's book provides a hand grenade to be used against all formal learning. It implied, but refused to say openly, that there is no universal truth. There are only opinions that are dominant inside specific academic guilds (establishments). These opinions change over time. They change because of critics from outside the establishment guild or from the younger members of the guild.

The agreed-upon worldview within any academic guild governs upper-division courses and then graduate courses. The guilds screen students who are granted access to upper-division courses. Guilds do this by means of lower-division courses. These are one-year courses. They are designated by the numeral 1: economics 1, political science 1, English 1, etc. Upper-division courses are designated 101. Here, textbooks are much shorter. Education is more by monographs that show a student how to apply the principles that he learned in his lower-division textbook.

This screening process has a major problem. It rests on lower-division textbooks. These textbooks are used by departments to prepare students to major in the respective fields. The professors in each field want to keep their jobs. To maintain full employment, professors must persuade lower-division students to major in the professors' fields. Therefore, the professors assign introductory textbooks that prepare students to perform effectively as specialists when they begin their upper-division education.

Lower-division textbooks are recruiting tools for academic specialties. They are screening tools for these specialties. This means that they are not written to teach the principles of the academic field in such a way that these fields will be remembered by the many students who do not go on to upper-division work in the field. Put differently, lower-division textbooks are not used as tools to persuade the broad majority of students regarding **the importance to society** of each academic field. A textbook that did this would not be suitable as a training device to prepare students entering their junior years to major in the field. It would not be filled with jargon and formulas to memorize. It would not focus on departmental concerns.

This is why a freshman-level textbook does not provide information on the importance of the field to civilization. It provides a narrow focus: success in upper-division courses. A chemistry textbook is all about chemistry. It is not about the contribution of chemistry to the modern world. It is also not about the scientific mindset's contribution to the modern world.

Parents are told that their children will get a liberal arts education. This lie has been a major selling point for over nine centuries. In fact, students are not taught about liberal principles of education. They are taught specifics that will enable a small percentage of them to advance to upper-division courses.

Professors are paid more to teach upper-division courses than they are paid to teach freshman courses. A professor who teaches freshman courses is probably not on a tenure-track. Professors hate to teach freshman courses. They avoid teaching them if they possibly can.

So, freshman courses are taught by young professors who are not respected in their fields. Also, students are often required to attend discussion sessions which are taught by graduate students. The best and brightest professors do not teach the broad student population about how their fields apply in society. The students get no sense of the contribution of any academic discipline to the broad structure of modern life. Everything is geared to training students to become specialized technicians in a field.

Lower-division education is assembly-line education. Students sit in classrooms filled with hundreds of other students. They are also taught by graduate students in discussion groups. They do not hear senior professors lecturing. Yet the universities generate most of their money per student from these large classes, called **mega-classes**. The best book on this is by Charles Sykes, *Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education* (Regnery, 1988). Anyone contemplating the reform of higher education needs to read this book. Twice.

In post-World War II American higher education, only one professor at the very top of his field gained widespread recognition and respect by teaching freshmen: CalTech's Richard Feynman. He was one of the physicists who developed the atomic bomb. He was a genius. He was also a superb teacher. Out of his lectures came the textbooks that are still used by major universities. They are online for free. They are legendary. But that was long ago: 1961–63.

This highly vulnerable system of lower-division education offers a tremendous opportunity for top-flight Christian scholars. They could produce free PDF textbooks and free online lectures, just as Feynman's lectures are given away for free by CalTech. These explicitly Christian textbooks could give a Christian interpretation of each academic discipline.

They should be integrated within the whole of an explicitly Christian university curriculum. They must be systematically biblical, systematically Christian, and yet at the same time explain the importance of each field for the development of a Christian culture. The targets of these educational materials are non-majors.

There must also be a second set of textbooks and lectures in each field that are designed to train freshman and sophomore students in the specifics required to perform well in upper-division courses. Only a relatively small number of students will ever read these textbooks or listen to these lectures: those students who have decided on a major, and who are devoting themselves to mastering the technical vocabulary and methodology of a particular discipline.

Nothing like this has ever been proposed. It constitutes a true revolution in education. This is what every Christian college needs.

The closest thing to what I am proposing is the “great books” curriculum of the two St. John’s College campuses. These are very expensive private schools. They are almost pure Athens. They are anachronisms.

I am proposing a very different curriculum. It is based on Christendom, not Athens. It is liberal arts in this sense: the Bible as the foundation of liberty, not Athenian speculation, which was divided between communist Plato and Aristotle, the teacher of Alexander. Both men were statisticians. They both believed in political redemption. This is made clear chapter IV of Rushdoony’s book, *The One and the Many* (1971): “The Unity of the Polis.”

Today’s college students do not get a liberal arts education. This is why they do not understand how and why modern culture is the product of a broad inheritance – philosophically, ethically, and academically. They have no understanding of Western civilization. They also have no understanding of Christendom prior to 1750, which was a weak version of Christendom in 1350.

Today, few colleges require a course in Western civilization. This requirement began at Yale University immediately after World War II. When I was an undergraduate in the early 1960’s, every serious university offered at least a one-year course in Western civilization. It was required for graduation. I took that course in my sophomore year. Later, I was a teaching assistant in Western civilization in the second half of the 1960’s. That tradition is now gone. We can date its demise with the student revolt at Stanford University in 1988. Here was the mantra of the students: “Hey hey, ho ho, Western civ has got to go.” It went. (<http://bit.ly/Stanford1988>)

A systematic Christian college curriculum would explain what is called Western civilization as the humanists’ attempted replacement of Christendom. This civilization is now in the process of decline. The great book on this is Jacques Barzun’s *From Dawn to Decadence: 500 Years of Western Cultural Life: 1500 to the Present* (Harper/Collins, 2000). I have reviewed it here: <http://bit.ly/Barzun2000>

E. A Digital Solution: A Shadow University

YouTube and other video hosting services are free of charge. Salman Khan took advantage of this, beginning in 2006, to teach math to his cousins. The public began viewing these videos. This soon developed into the Khan Academy. This organization teaches more students every day than any educational institution in history.

It is technically possible to create a shadow university that provides a systematically Christian education in every academic discipline. But there will be a price to pay: no accreditation. To gain accreditation, professors must be graduates of accredited graduate programs. They have to be paid a lot of money to serve as professors. A professor cannot grade the written exams of more than 150 students per semester. Few professors grade this many. It is therefore not possible to provide professor-graded programs for tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of Christian

students.

Within two decades, none of this will be true. Artificial intelligence will steadily replace faculties. Today in many colleges, true/false and multiple-choice exams predominate. These are graded electronically. This means that only the grading of written examinations requires professors. These exams are used in the humanities and social sciences. In two decades, AI programs will read and grade essays. In any case, written exams are not required for education. They are merely traditional. They can be abandoned.

For now, however, colleges need faculties, and faculties are costly. College is therefore costly.

Consider a shadow university, beginning with lower-division courses. It would exist online in the background. It would grant no degrees. It would challenge the academic content of humanist education at every step.

Students would be introduced to a freshman course by means of supplemental readings and video presentations, such as screencasts. (<http://screencast-o-matic.com>) Course providers would show the students the importance of a particular academic discipline in creating the modern world. They would talk about the Christian origins of these fields. They would talk about the creationist and biblical basis of all knowledge. They would apply this biblical worldview to the specifics of a particular academic discipline.

There would be two sets of presentations for freshmen. One presentation would be general, which would target every college student who decides to take a particular lower-division course. This presentation would not be geared to training students to major in specific departments. This presentation would be geared to teaching the students the weakness of humanistic presuppositions in the field, the errors that result from such presuppositions, and the biblical basis of such academic disciplines. The instructors would go into the details of the importance of these academic disciplines in modern civilization. These freshmen courses would provide what parents have long been promised that the universities will provide, but which the universities have not provided: a liberal arts education.

The other set of shadow courses would train students in their majors. They would teach students the jargon and outlook required for success in upper division.

This would mean double work or even triple work for lower-division students. They would have to learn the official humanist party line through the standard textbooks. They would then have to read alternative materials and listen to alternative lectures that expose the weakness of these humanistic textbooks. Students would be given a Christian worldview in a supplemental, confrontational form.

Not all Christian students would take the extra trouble to do this, but that is how the revolution must begin. It must begin with a minority of dedicated students who will go the extra mile to find

out that the Bible offers alternatives to the accredited classroom indoctrination – what is wrong both in theory and practice with the textbooks they have been assigned by their humanist professors.

How could this be done? One model is Mark Skousen's book, *Economics on Trial* (1990). He went through the ten major first-year economics textbooks assigned in American universities. He dissected them. He showed how they took an anti-free market line in many areas. Students reading his book could then get through an economics 1 course without becoming Keynesians. This book should serve as a model for professors in every academic discipline. They should write a similar textbook, and they should produce screencast lectures that support the monographs. The students must be inoculated against the textbooks. Skousen later wrote an excellent textbook from an Austrian School economic standpoint. But he wrote his critical book first.

Professors in the shadow university program must produce online materials that systematically expose the weaknesses and misrepresentations of humanistic higher education. The designers of this free online shadow university should initially focus on the departments in which most students enroll in as majors. Most American students today enroll in business courses. The humanism here is much less intense. The courses that are most consistently humanistic are these: sociology, anthropology, economics, philosophy, political theory, and English. These are the shadow lower-division courses that must be produced first. These are the courses in which students' Christian faith is most at risk.

The fact that Christian students have to submit themselves to the teaching of humanists is unfortunate, but it has been going on since approximately the twelfth century. Christian professors have always imported humanistic presuppositions. Until the late seventeenth century, the presuppositions were Greek and Roman, mainly Aristotelian, although prior to the twelfth century, this was Platonism. The students were never given a systematically Trinitarian and covenantal worldview by which to critique Greek philosophy and Roman law. Then came Newtonianism in the early eighteenth century, and Kantianism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

In the long run, it will be necessary to create shadow courses in every field of higher education. But we have to start somewhere. We must start with critiques of the most widely assigned lower-division textbooks in those fields that are most systematically humanistic, beginning with those fields in which the highest percentage of students major.

The goal of Christian educators should be to make available antidotes to the humanism of higher education to the largest number of Christian students who attend college. Reformers do not have time to waste. We are talking about hundreds of thousands of students. No Christian college can enroll 100,000 students in a year or two. Even if it could, it would lose its accreditation. No college could hire a sufficient number of well-trained, Ph.D.-holding professors who are self-consciously Trinitarian and explicitly biblical in their teaching of their academic disciplines. No one has taught this way in the past.

This is a revolution. **Revolutions do not begin with large numbers of academically accredited professors.**

Initially, there must be operational models for the other shadow professors to imitate. The revolution therefore must begin with a small cadre of hard-core professors. In each major academic discipline, there must be at least one professor with a comprehensive knowledge of his field. He must produce a PDF book and a series of forty or fifty lectures dissecting and refuting the errors found in the half dozen major textbooks in his academic discipline. **This will help inoculate students against the virus of humanism.**

If there are no people to do this, then the revolution must be delayed.

Then comes upper division. Here is the rule: **you can't beat something with nothing.** There must then be a shadow curriculum for upper-division courses. A positive Christian worldview with specific answers must be provided free of charge. It is not sufficient to show what is wrong with humanism in each academic discipline.

The number of well-trained professors who are capable of doing this in their academic disciplines is highly limited. Whether they will donate their time free of charge to the shadow university is also questionable. I have my doubts.

Forget about raising money. Money will not buy visionary educators. It takes time to cultivate them. They have to be academically courageous. They have to be good writers. They have to be excellent lecturers. They have to be able to communicate the basics of their disciplines to 18-year-old students who have been trained in humanistic, tax-supported high schools.

It took me around 20,000 unpaid hours to develop a systematically Bible-based economic theory. It also required an additional 15,000 hours of unpaid work to write the newsletters that raised the money to publish the materials. I began in 1960. I finished the project in January 2021. Writing the 31 volumes of economic commentaries took me from 1973 until 2012. That project was just getting the homework completed.

This is no overnight operation. We have to start from scratch. Persuading a man who has spent three decades teaching his discipline on the basis of humanistic textbooks and upper-division monographs is not a likely candidate to re-think his presuppositions, his methodology, his conclusions, and all of the academic training that he survived in order to earn his doctorate.

Do not worry about raising money. Focus on identifying visionary teachers in specific academic disciplines who have published extensively in their fields, not in terms of the humanistic presuppositions of their fields, but in terms of the Bible. Look for men and women who have publicly renounced the humanism of their academic fields, and who have produced books, articles, and videos that demonstrate how the field must be restructured and rethought in order to make it conform with the Bible.

The creation science movement has been doing this since 1961, but you cannot find any of them who have branched out into the social sciences and humanities. They restrict themselves to geology and biology. There was one attempt three decades ago to create a scholarly journal on creationism in the social sciences. It ceased publishing in 1994. (<https://creationism.org/csshs>)

F. Assembling a Faculty

Here is the rule: **first things first**. To launch an educational revolution without a publicly developed worldview is futile. I recommend this as the starting point: Rev. Joseph Boot's book, *The Mission of God* (2016). Second, volume 1 of R. J. Rushdoony's book, *The Institutes of Biblical Law* (1973). Third is my short book on the five-point covenant mode: sovereignty, authority, law, sanctions, and the future. (<http://garynorth.com/covenants.pdf>) These books must screen the cadre.

How can a revolutionary movement recruit a hard-core cadre? It must set high standards.

Every faculty recruit must be able to present the case against humanism in his discipline. He must also be capable of presenting a positive Christian reconstruction of his field. A negative critique is insufficient.

He must already have produced online articles, PDF books, and teaching videos that demonstrate that he has begun the task of reconstructing his academic discipline in terms of the Bible. If he has presented nothing online, then he is a journeyman, not a master. He is not ready to lead.

He must also be able to write clearly and persuasively: grammar, logic, and rhetoric. He must be able to speak effectively: grammar, logic, and rhetoric.

Revolutions begin with dedicated, sacrificing visionaries. They do not begin with salaried, tenured time-servers.

Conclusion

The problem is not a lack of money. The problem is the absence of qualified instructors who are self-conscious in their biblical worldview, and who can articulate this worldview for teenagers. These pioneers must prove that they can apply this worldview to their academic disciplines. Then they must be persuaded to produce materials that counter the textbooks in the universities. They need to become founders in an online shadow university.

They must volunteer their time. This is an evangelism program. A person who will not volunteer his time for free is not serious about the revolution. He is not a visionary. He is a time-server for Jesus. Skip him.

The first step is to identify those professors anywhere in the world who have systematically refought their academic disciplines in terms of the Bible, and who have published materials indicating how these disciplines must be restructured.

The second step is to persuade these people to produce, free of charge, online courses targeting freshman and sophomore college students.

If you can find these people, you can use Thinkific to host free courses for students located anywhere in the world. That will cost \$4,800 a year.

I end with a quotation from my mentor, Robert Nisbet. In his crucial and long-ignored book, *The Degradation of the Academic Dogma* (1971), he made this profound observation. It offers hope to Christian academic revolutionaries.

There is no inherent, self-sustaining, irresistible majesty in the university; only the majesty that is conferred upon the university by a social order that, for whatever reason, has come to believe that there is something distinctive, something precious, something profoundly important in the university that is to be found nowhere else in society – not in factory, not in foundation, not in government agency, not in media, not in church, not in mental health clinic, not anywhere else. And when this belief is allowed to erode, majesty erodes with it.

The greatness that is Harvard and the glory that is Berkeley can perish in but a few years, their presently celebrated degrees the object of ridicule, their halls untenanted by any of the illustrious, their mission degraded to the caring, the feeding, and the policing of the young. Not even the young, though, will long choose to stay at Harvard and Berkeley once word gets around that history has passed the universities by, that when the universities have to offer is no longer valued deeply either by those inside the university or those outside. History is filled with degrees, titles, ranks, and diplomas that were once thought to be important but that became in due time, after their functional importance had disappeared, mere curiosities or relics (pp. 235–36).