

Humans vs. Robots: The Value of Liberal Education in the Fourth Industrial
Revolution

Research Institute for Liberal Education, Yonsei University

Seoul, Korea

November 20, 2018

Lynn Pasquerella

It is such an honor and privilege to be here with you this evening, and I want to begin by thanking Professor Hong for his gracious hospitality and for the opportunity to visit the Research Institute for Liberal Education at Yonsei University.

In his book *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen*, philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah begins with the question “What were they thinking?” when applied to our ancestors, knowing that a century from now our descendants will ask the same thing about us (Appiah 2010: xvi). Appiah’s pondering about which past practices, once regarded as morally acceptable, will strike individuals in the future as the strangest prompted my own thinking. Contemplating the likely candidates, I could not help but focus on the human capacity to tolerate extreme poverty, locally and globally, and to ignore the profound impact this phenomenon has on future generations. Yet, underlying this tolerance is an entrenched and persistent belief in a hierarchy of human value, raising questions about who is

allowed into our moral community, and the limits of treatment toward those we exclude.

This is what started me thinking about the US dystopian television drama “Westworld,” based on the 1973 Michael Crichton movie. When the show premiered last season, no one anticipated that it would overtake “Game of Thrones” as the most watched first season of any HBO original series. Westworld is a futuristic theme park inhabited by robot hosts who are indistinguishable from their genetically human counterparts. Because they follow the rules of their programmers, the first of which is that “a robot may not injure a human being or, through inaction, allow a human being to come to harm,” visitors to Westworld may do to them “what people do when they think no one is watching.”

However, this cycle is broken when one of the robots begins gaining consciousness, signified by confronting a choice about whether to escape Westworld or return to find her daughter, trapped in a reality doomed to repeat itself. Like the K-drama “I am Not a Robot,” in which robots are developed to read human emotions and acquire empathy, the series raises fascinating questions about the qualities of consciousness, the identity of persons, the compatibility of free will and determinism and the nature and scope of morality. Interestingly, these philosophical conundrums are highlighted by former US statesman Henry

Kissinger in a piece earlier this year in *The Atlantic*, lamenting that “in every way—human society is unprepared for the rise of artificial intelligence” (11).

Kissinger describes his concern as arising from the discovery three years ago and subsequent fascination with machines that could train themselves, exceeding the skills of their human programmers, to master the strategy game “Go.” As an historian, he wondered “what would be the impact on history of self-learning machines—machines that acquired knowledge by processes particular to themselves, and applied that knowledge to ends for which there may be no category of human understanding” (12). Ultimately, he asked, “How will we manage AI, improve it, or at the very least prevent it from doing harm, culminating in the most ominous concern: that AI, by mastering certain competencies more rapidly and definitively than humans, could over time diminish human competence and the human condition itself as it turns into data” (13).

In the future, we will not be able to continue to side-step the ethical and policy issues inextricably linked to the use of technology. Scientific advancements will render questions of free will and determinism and individual and social responsibility unavoidable. We get a glimpse into what some have referred to as this post-human future in the new video game “Detroit: Become Human,” released by Quantic Dream last summer. The premise is based on the fact that machine

intelligence accelerates at a far faster rate than human intelligence, and that emotions emerging from androids are feasible. The setting of Detroit, Michigan in 2038 represents old and new tensions arising from race, the lasting impact of deindustrialization in the city and a growing resentment toward robots, who have been designed to serve human needs.

While Kissinger briefly entertains science fiction scenarios like the ones in *Westworld* and “Detroit: Become Human,” where AI turns on its creators, he is much more focused on the capacity of AI to develop slight deviations from human instructions that could cascade into catastrophic departures (13). The potential for catastrophe he cites is enhanced by the fact that AI can be expected to make mistakes at a faster and greater magnitude than humans and optimize situations in ways that differ from human optimization, leading to the question, “What will become of human consciousness if our own explanatory power is surpassed by AI, and societies are no longer able to interpret the world they inhabit in terms that are meaningful to them?” (13). Kissinger notes that “The Enlightenment started with essentially philosophical insights spread by a new technology,” in that case, the spawn of the printing press. He maintains, however, that “Our period is moving in the opposite direction, it has generated a potentially dominating technology in search of a guiding philosophy” (14). Therefore, Kissinger makes an urgent plea

for the creation of a national vision exploring the transformation of the human condition that has been prompted by AI—one which connects the rise of technology in relation to the humanistic traditions.

Of course, it is a vision needed for more than AI—something I am cognizant of every day in my work as a medical ethicist. One of the most compelling cases I encountered early in my career centered on a physician’s self-described moral distress over a case brought to us for retrospective analysis. It involved a 60-year old woman who had been in failing health over the previous two years. Diagnosed with multiple vague symptoms, a final panel of tests revealed terminal liver cancer. When her primary care physician met with her to discuss the diagnosis, he found the patient understandably shaken, but seemingly accepting of her fate. She made plans for the eventuality of her death by signing a Living Will, expressing her wishes to have life-sustaining treatment withheld if the burdens of treatment were likely to outweigh the benefits. Further, she made clear that she did not want to be resuscitated if death were imminent and she suffered cardiac arrest.

A copy of the patient’s advance directive was on file in her doctor’s office and in the emergency room when she was brought in by ambulance the day after she met with her doctor. Her husband discovered her in bed, unconscious and

blood soaked, after swallowing a bottle of tranquilizers and cutting her wrists with a butcher's knife.

The family physician, who happened to be on call in the emergency room when his patient was brought in, was the one who brought the case to us. He had known this patient for years and was absolutely convinced that she would not want to be resuscitated. In fact, he was concerned that if she survived, she would have him charged with battery for going against her wishes by trying to save her life. On the other hand, he was cognizant that if he failed to treat her aggressively, he could be charged with assisted suicide, which is a felony in the state in which this occurred. He thought it might be in his patient's best interest if he did nothing, since she likely had no good days ahead of her. In the end, however, he knew that Living Wills were not binding in responding to acts of attempted suicide and took the steps necessary to try to save her life. He performed CPR when she went into cardiac arrest, had her intubated, and stitched her up.

As he suspected, when his patient regained consciousness, she was furious. She tried to rip out the tubes and demanded that all treatment be stopped. A psychiatric consult was brought in to assess the patient's competency, she was deemed competent to refuse treatment, was extubated, and died six hours later. Though at first convinced that he had ultimately done the right thing under the

circumstances, the physician regretted his part in prolonging his patient's suffering. In this case, he thought prolonged existence might actually bring about more harm than would death.

The doctor believed in order to meet his obligation to his patient based on a professional duty to first do no harm and to relieve suffering, he would have to go against his own self-interest in violating a legal code. In weighing his self-interest against the interest of another, he was forced to come to grips, not only with his patient's, but with his own humanity.

It was perhaps acknowledging the commonality of experience that enabled the physician to engage in a consideration of this case from a variety of perspectives, including a feminist perspective, when we were discussing it in the committee. By doing so, he came to understand how imbalances of power that are based on gender play themselves out in medical practice and in the theory surrounding that practice. As a result, he became aware that the moral distress he experienced was, in part, due to the realization that his patient's right to refuse life-sustaining treatment as an expression of the right to autonomy needed to be considered in the broader context of a society in which women are conditioned to be caregivers and may be psychologically pressured into choosing death rather than risk being an economic or emotional burden on family members.

After the patient's death, the doctor wondered, in the long run, whether a law allowing for physician-assisted suicide would have given this woman the assurance she needed that she would not be forced to suffer needlessly if death were imminent—a type of assurance that may have prevented her from ever having taken the steps to actively end her own life, with or without the assistance of another.

The “well-dying law” in South Korea is an attempt to address these same issues. Nine out of ten Koreans over the age of 65 report that they would not want to undergo treatment to extend their lives if they were diagnosed with a terminal illness. Faced with an increasingly aging population and high suicide rates among the elderly, the goal is to promote palliative care and discussion about end-of-life issues that have been prevalent in the US since the 1970s.

However, just as Koreans are embracing patient autonomy and the concept of death with dignity through the law, many in the US are moving in the opposite direction. I kept thinking about this trend on a visit to my family practitioner. While sitting on the examining table, clad in my paper gown, I waited as the doctor finished typing notes in my record. Without turning around, he said, “Let me ask you something. You are still on the ethics committee aren't you? My partner has this case, and I'm wondering if the committee might help.” He went on to describe

an 88-year old post-stroke victim who was hospitalized repeatedly for congestive heart failure, diabetes, recurring pneumonia, open wounds and staph infections. Each hospitalization involved a three to four-week stay. Throughout these stays, the patient was intermittently conscious and incompetent to make decisions for herself. Since she was unable to swallow, she was fed using peripheral intravenous lines.

The patient's daughter, who would leave her mother's side only occasionally to sit in her car, insisted that everything be done to keep her mother alive. It was during the most recent hospitalization, when a mass was discovered in the patient's lung, that questions of futility arose. The daughter demanded that a biopsy be performed and wanted surgery if the mass turned out to be cancerous. The medical team was convinced that the patient should be allowed to die, yet the daughter was intent on doing everything possible to sustain her mother's life.

"What's frustrating," my doctor confessed, "is that the staff feels like we are torturing this poor woman, but the last time we were able to have the next of kin declared incompetent to make medical decisions, the hospital lawyers insisted that we do everything to keep the patient alive anyway."

Side by side, these cases illustrate the type of radical change that has emerged as ethics committees confront end-of-life issues brought forward by

physicians. There has been a movement away from cases involving the right to refuse life-sustaining treatment toward those addressing futility. “Right to Die” legislation has been usurped by “Right to Try” laws that have been enacted in 41 US states and by the federal government. These laws allow terminally ill patients to participate as subjects of experimental treatment, though there is no obligation on the part of physicians or drug companies to make the treatments available.

The shift in the US away from patients refusing technological interventions in order to exercise the right to die a natural death with dignity toward patients and their families demanding that everything be done to keep them alive, at all costs, illustrates the type of radical change that has emerged as ethics committees confront end-of-life issues brought forward by physicians. Yet, in both instances there is a type of moral distress that arises from a common source: we live in a world in which technological advancements have preceded thoughtful reflection regarding the ethical, legal and social implications of the use of that technology with respect to when and how patients should be allowed to die. Thus, questions that policy makers need to address in an open discussion include: How should we allocate scarce medical resources? Can individualism be excessive in matters of life and death? How can we balance the values of pluralism and tolerance on the one hand against principles of fairness to all on the other? And most importantly, should death continue to be viewed as a failure.

These questions take on a new sense of urgency when considered in relation to Siddhartha Mukherjee's latest book, *The Gene: An Intimate History*. Mukherjee invites readers to engage in a thought experiment in which we “could comprehensively sequence the genomes of one hundred thousand children” (or a limitless number) “prospectively— i.e., before anything is known about the future of any child and create a data base of all the variations and combinations of the functional elements of each child's genome.... Imagine now creating a ‘fate map’ of this cohort of children: every illness or physiological aberrancy identified and recorded on a parallel database.” He describes this map as a human “phenome,” a complete set of attributes, features and behaviors of an individual, and goes further in asking us to imagine a computational engine that mines data from the gene map/fate map pairs. What is extraordinary about this fate map, according to Mukherjee, is that,

[I]t can be as wide and detailed as we would like it to be. It could include the low birth weight of a child, a learning disability in pre-school, the transient tumult of a particular adolescence, a teenage infatuation, an impulsive marriage, coming out, infertility, a midlife crisis, a propensity for addiction, a cataract in the left eye, premature baldness, depression, a heart attack, an early death from ovarian or breast cancer (488).

Mukherjee insists that while such an enterprise would have been inconceivable in the past, that “nearly all of the predictive power of the genome can, in principle, be determined and computed”—identifying both actual conditions and tendencies toward disease. Given the capacity for pre-natal genetic screening, gene therapy and genome manipulation, how do we negotiate between genetic emancipation, or the freedom from hereditary illness, and genetic enhancement, rewriting one’s future diary? Mukherjee speculates that “Illness might progressively vanish, but so might tenderness. Traumas might be erased, but so might history. Mutants would be eliminated but so would human variation. Infirmities might disappear, but so might vulnerability. Chance would become mitigated, but so, inevitably, would choice” (492). For this reason, like Kissinger, Mukherjee calls for a hitch-hikers guide for a post-genomic world.

So, how have we arrived at this point, and how do we best prepare students for the future? Understanding the dangers of creating a hegemony of one tradition over others and an exaggerated trust in the efficacy of the methods of natural science applied to all areas of investigation, nearly five decades ago, Paul Feyerabend warned against a lapse on the part of scientists into scientism in his book *Against Method*. Scientism is a doctrine according to which all genuine

knowledge is scientific knowledge, reifying the scientific method as the only legitimate form of inquiry.

Despite Feyerabend's admonition, science's success in explaining the world has led to a cultural misappropriation in a way that has conflated science with scientism. The profound societal impact of this conflation has led astrophysicist Adam Frank (2013) to challenge defenders of scientism by calling for a clarification of how scientism manifests itself in order to "help us understand the damage it does to the real project that lies ahead of us: building space for the full spectrum of human beings in a culture fully shaped by science." Taking up Frank's charge to consider how scientism manifests itself, and in particular how the metaphysics of consciousness offers the tools necessary for building the space to which he refers, we need to ask, "What would we lose, if anything, by reducing all learning and engagement to practices only rooted in the sciences?" This is precisely the question we need to be asking in designing a curriculum for the 21st century.

In response, what needs to be contrasted is not science and the humanities, arts, and social sciences, but rather scientism as a competing ideology to a liberal arts sensibility that we bring to all disciplines, including the sciences. This fact is highlighted by philosopher Mark Kingwell (2013) in his Harper's article, "Beyond

the Book,” which focuses on the future of the book—given the burgeoning of technology—and more importantly, on the future of reading as a matter of human consciousness.

Kingwell points to the rise of the educated reading public as inextricably linked to the emergence of democratic liberalism (15). Likewise, he highlights the development of the novel as conjoined with the idea of open public discourse and rational, critical debate. Yet, most compelling is Kingwell’s unpacking of Marshall McLuhan’s contention that books offer “a psychological mode of introspection or inner direction.” Through literature, readers are able to “substitute the consciousness of a (fictitious) other person for their own. This doubling and suspension of consciousness is, paradoxically, essential to enriching one’s own sense of interiority or inwardness. Reading offers a heady way of identifying with another, mirroring and reinforcing the self” (Kingwell 16).

For Kingwell, reading “objectively summons a subjectivity that belongs to each one of us,” making printed books and the democratized culture of reading, in his view, the most significant development in human consciousness since the advent of writing (Kingwell 17). Individual human consciousness will dictate the presence of what he refers to as “long-form reading,” not because books make us better people but because they “give...respite from the incessant noise of existence”

(Kingwell 19). He maintains that this type of humanistic engagement provides a necessary, even if illusory, hypothetical narrative of the self.

The illumination of human consciousness through literature, philosophy, music, and the arts enriches the experience of individuals alone and as members of a community, allowing us to flourish fully as human beings. The illumination and the inquiry are themselves intrinsic goods that thwart the notion of scientific knowledge as singularly capable of responding to the world's challenges, exactly because they may turn out to be just as valuable in fostering a capacity to grapple with complexity that cannot be resolved through the scientific method.

As Feyerabend reminds us, true scientists are not scientistic—they possess a much more nuanced and complex understanding that sensibilities cannot be gained through scientific practices. Science is a tool for investigating metaphysical and epistemological claims. But, there is also value that comes from reflecting on experiences in a way that arouses the very sensibilities that enable us to deal with the metaphysics of being human and conscious of living in the world. The liberal education we offer to our students is a sensibility rather than a group of subjects. Good critics of literature can bring us into a sphere of experience that combines allusions to the past with what is happening in the world right now. Like philosophers, artists, and historians, they are capable of speaking to a universality

of experience, and it is unnecessary to measure how many people were illuminated to understand the impact of what they offer. In the end, it is this phenomenological engagement with the liberal arts that is incapable of being translated through scientism.

Therefore, we must offer a curriculum in which assignments make clear the relationships among areas of knowledge, ensuring that students do not see academic disciplines as separate and disconnected silos of learning, but rather as varied approaches to the same enlightened end. This conclusion was validated in a report, *Branches of the Same Tree*, issued last May by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in Washington, DC. I served on the committee, a project of the Board of Higher Education and the Workforce, which was directed to examine whether the integration of arts and humanities with science, engineering, math and medicine can improve learning outcomes for all students. The title of the report was taken from a quote by Albert Einstein, who in a letter written in 1937 amidst the backdrop of burgeoning fascist power in central Europe, expressed consternation over “the dangerous implications of living in a society, where long-established foundations of knowledge were corrupted, manipulated, and coerced by political forces.” Einstein maintained that “all religions, arts, and sciences are branches from the same tree (9).

The report found the need to “achieve more effective forms of capacity building for twenty-first century workers and citizens,” through the acquisition of broad-based skills from across all disciplines “that can be flexibly deployed in different work environments across a lifetime.” It concludes that “In a world where science and technology are major drivers of social change, historical, ethical, aesthetic, and cultural competencies are more critical than ever. At the same time, the complex and often technical nature of contemporary issues in democratic governance demands that well-educated citizens have an appreciation of the nature of technical knowledge and of its historical, cultural, and political roles in American democracy” (54). For, “truly robust knowledge depends on the capacity to recognize the critical limitations of particular ways of knowing,” and “to achieve the social relations appropriate to an inclusive and democratic society” (54).

Einstein’s sentiments and the type of integrative learning advocated in *Branches of the Same Tree* have been cornerstones of the Association of American Colleges and Universities Liberal Education and America’s Promise initiative, and our mission of advancing a liberal education, equity and quality in undergraduate education in service to democracy. Indeed, at AAC&U, we are convinced that fulfilling the promise of American higher education requires a curriculum that emphasizes essential learning outcomes (knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world, intellectual and practical skills, personal and social

responsibility, integrative and applied learning) as necessary for all students' intellectual, civic, personal, and professional development and success. On this model, disciplinary work remains foundational, but students are provided with practice connecting their discipline with others, with the co-curriculum, and with the needs of society in preparation for work, citizenship, and life.

It is unquestioningly because employers place a premium on innovation in response to rapid change that they emphasize these students experiences rather than narrow technical training. This is why Frank Levy and Richard Murnane in their monograph *Dancing With Robots* predict a future in which preparing students to do the jobs computers cannot do will require us to “re-focus our education system around one objective: giving students the foundational skills in problem-solving and communication that computers don’t have.”

Recent research conducted by AAC&U confirms this perspective. Our 2018 Employer Survey of 501 CEOs and 500 Human Resource Managers asked what skills and experiences employers value most when hiring college graduates. Four out of five employers say that the skills matter the greatest to them are oral communication, ethical judgment, teamwork, the ability to work independently and critical thinking and analytical reasoning. While 81percent of employers think that it is very important for recent graduates to be able to apply knowledge and skills in

real-world settings, only 36 percent of employers think that students are well prepared to do so. Hence, they were especially interested in graduates who had experiences connecting curriculum to career. Ninety-three percent said they preferred to hire employees who had held internships, 81 percent noted a preference for those who had engaged in collaborative research projects, and 78 percent were looking for graduates who had completed senior projects or capstone experiences.

Interestingly, employers are looking for students to showcase their skills in new ways. Only 50 percent of those surveyed found transcripts very or somewhat useful, but 80% found ePortfolios very or somewhat useful. As one hiring manager commented, “The skills you are taught in college, including responsibility for your actions, accountability, earnestness, dedication, determination, and dependability are all assets in the corporate world.”

Therefore, the dominant narrative that one’s undergraduate major is all that matters and that only some majors will prepare students for success in the workplace obscures the reality. Employers agree that “a graduate’s ability to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve complex problems is more important than their undergraduate major.” Such cross-cutting skills can be developed in a wide variety of chosen disciplines if the courses are well-designed. A student’s

undergraduate experience, and how well the experience advances critical learning outcomes matters most. A liberal education for the 21st century requires replacing traditional curricular models that follow previous patterns of depth and breadth by those that provide hands-on experience with unscripted, real-world problems across disciplines.

Developing this type of deeper-level understanding across subject areas, connecting knowledge to experience, and adopting a holistic approach to evidence-based problem solving that incorporates diverse, sometimes contradictory points of view, is more important than ever and is one of the best approaches to cultivating the perception, intellectual agility, and creative thinking necessary for them to thrive in a globally-interdependent, innovation-fueled economy.

Yet, most importantly, it recognizes that decision making must be grounded in the ethical principles of respect for persons, justice, and beneficence. Seventy-eight percent of the employers surveyed value experience in the community, including working with people from different backgrounds, service learning and study abroad. The ability to engage and learn from experiences different from one's own and to understand how one's place in the world both informs and limits one's knowledge is inextricably linked to the crucial capacity to understand the interrelationships between multiple perspectives, including personal, social,

cultural, disciplinary, environmental, local, and global. This understanding is pivotal for bridging cultural divides, necessary for working collaboratively to achieve our shared objectives around solving the world's most pressing problems, which is all the more reason colleges and universities need to redouble our focus on world citizenship and the interdependence of all human beings and communities as the foundation for education.

Philosopher Martha Nussbaum offers a compelling defense of this type of global education for the future, observing,

One of the greatest barriers to rational deliberation in politics is the unexamined feeling that one's own current preferences and ways are neutral and natural. An education that takes national boundaries as morally salient too often reinforces this kind of irrationality, by lending to what is an accident of history a false air of moral weight and glory. (Nussbaum 1994)

Nussbaum argues that placing a community of human beings above national boundaries will bring us closer to solving global problems that require international cooperation, but it will necessitate the revision of curricula in support of the recognition of a shared future and the fostering of global dialogue grounded in the

geography, ecology, traditions and values of others. It is one in which our deliberations are, first and foremost, “deliberations about human problems of people in particular concrete situations, not problems growing out of a national identity that is altogether unlike that of others” and in which students not only “recognize humanity wherever” it is encountered, but also “understand humanity in all its ‘strange’ guises” (Nussbaum 1994). When every human being becomes part of our community of dialogue and concern, and our political deliberations are founded on that common human bond, it becomes more difficult to be dismissive of the well-being of others.

These lessons are more important than ever as we prepare graduates for the ever-shifting landscape of tomorrow. Students must be asked to demonstrate an understanding of complex and overlapping worldwide systems, how these systems are influenced and constructed, operate with differential consequences, affect the human and natural world, and perhaps most importantly as we have seen, how they can be altered. Students should be asked to apply an integrated and systemic understanding of the interrelationships between contemporary and past challenges facing cultures, societies, and the natural world on the local and global levels. Integrative learning and thematic pathways that address grand challenges across disciplines and within the major, requiring students to integrate and apply their knowledge to new problems, is an imperative for a 21st-century curriculum.

By asking all students to address big questions and grand challenges, we lead them to test the edges of their own ambition. In the process of learning across difference and connecting their courses with issues and communities beyond the classroom, they develop enhanced ethical reasoning and judgment, a sense of responsibility to self and others, acquire empowering knowledge, and gain new levels of agency. Sociobiologist E. O. Wilson’s cogent observation that contemporary society is “drowning in information, while starving for wisdom” was accompanied by his prediction that “the world henceforth will be run by synthesizers, people able to put together the right information at the right time, think critically about it, and make important choices wisely,”¹ Wilson’s comments highlight both the value of a liberal education and the ideal of an educated citizenry in an age when the democratization of information through the Internet has given rise to a new wave of anti-intellectualism—one steeped in the denial of reason and the distrust and disdain of experts.

The result has been increasing polarization and an entrenched refusal to countenance opposing points of view, contributing to a marketplace of ideas at risk of falling prey to those who have the resources to control the shaping of public opinion and policies. In this arena, asserted claims become orthodoxy despite the absence of evidence and in the face of enduring questions. In this ostensibly post-truth landscape, addressing the misinformation and incivility resulting from the

debilitating impact of a rhetoric-for-hire that has challenged both research expertise and the value of higher education is more urgent than ever. It is time for leaders in higher education to reassert the role that liberal education can play in discerning the truth and enhance the reputation of our institutions by emphasizing big-picture, problem-centered inquiry and students' active engagement in experiential learning, with increasing rigor, across all disciplines, in transformational partnerships with other colleges, universities and communities around the globe.

If we fail to do so, I fear that Appiah's question, asked at the outset, "What were they thinking?" will be asked of us as we preserve the traditions of the academy solely for the sake of didacticism and risk losing the battle during the robot revolution. For as Joseph Aoun points out in his book *Robot Proof: Higher Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, there is a false dichotomy between "learning to live versus learning to earn a living, or between the value of a liberal arts education versus the value of a "practical" course of study that promotes employability" (147). The jobs of the future, he insists, will command higher-order cognitive skills that are often associated with a liberal arts education, especially creativity. And the capacities that will prepare people to succeed professionally are the very ones that will enable them to live lives of meaning and purpose, leading to the conclusion that "when people are given education, they may still be astonished

by the changes and mysteries that the future holds, but they will see these as opportunities rather than threats.” This, of course, is our responsibility as educators—to ensure that our students dwell in possibilities by finding their best and most authentic selves.

Thank you.

42 minutes