

## Pulled Up Short with Stanton Wortham

# Is Faith More Reasonable Than Reason?

*Featuring Thomas Groome with Stanton Wortham (host) and Belle Liang (commentator)*

Original Air Date: March 29, 2021

**Stanton Wortham** 00:08

Welcome to Pulled Up Short. This is a podcast that's devoted to a particular kind of activity, where we're told some new perspectives on things that cause us to stop to be pulled up short and think a little bit about something that we believed but which turns out not to be true, or at least that we need to reconsider based on some new information that we've been given.

This is an important thing to do. It requires that we recognize deeply held presuppositions that we entertain the possibility that our typical ways of understanding are incomplete or distorting, we need to be open to questions and alternative formulations of basic issues that we tend to take for granted. We have to be willing to consider alternative ways of thinking. This requires a commitment, imagination to seeing the world in new ways, a commitment to systematically inquiring based on evidence and reason wherever it leads, a commitment to being open to moving beyond dogmatism, and considering alternative beliefs and practices, a commitment to conversation to listening deeply to others and inquiring jointly.

So in each episode, we're going to hear from someone who has an insight or something we don't typically think about that requires us to be pulled up short, to rethink something that we tend to take for granted. And we hope that you will enjoy.

Thanks for joining us today, everybody, on another episode of Pulled Up Short. Today, we're very pleased to have with us as our guests, Thomas Groome, a professor of theology at Boston College, also with expertise in theology and education. Tom has written many books, sold hundreds of thousands of copies, has many admirers around the world on issues of faith and formation and education. We're very pleased that he's been willing to take the time to speak with us today. We also have with us, Belle Liang, who is a professor of counseling psychology at the Lynch School of Education and Human Development at Boston College. And we're grateful to Belle for joining us. She will come in with

questions once Tom has finished introducing the issues for us. So Tom, thanks again for being with us.

**Tom Groome** 2:27

Thank you, Dean Wortham. Thank you for the invitation, and welcome Professor Liang. I look forward to the conversation with you both, and I'm honored, indeed, to be included in this fine venture.

**Stanton Wortham** 2:36

So Tom, I know that you're going to talk with us today about a way of being pulled up short that is becoming increasingly important in the contemporary post-modern world, arguing that it seems as if we're not making the transition to a post-religious world the way some people had hoped. That increasingly, we have folks who are highly rational and attend to reason and evidence as much as anyone else, who are starting to embrace religious, faith-based perspectives on how to understand human experience. It would be great if you could tell us how you've been thinking about this important issue.

**Tom Groome** 3:19

Yes. And I think the wonderful phrase of Gadamer, being pulled up short, describes what is happening in our contemporary era. Just to put it in a broader perspective, Dean Wortham, the transition from modernity to postmodernity hasn't gone as successfully or as smoothly for the atheists, as they presumed it would. It looks as if, in fact, they're going to be pulled up short, by the kind of sentiments that are emerging now within the postmodern era. I think atheists are at least being invited to revise their assumptions, especially their naive assumptions about the rationality of their unbelief.

There are a lot of accusations against believers that they are without reason, and that the non-believer is the rational one whereas the believer is, in fact, irrational. That assumption of modernity basically thought that enlightenment, as Taylor would say, would extract religion out of society by the power of critical reason. That religion and faith are basically fading away; this was the expectation of enlightened people who use their critical reason regarding the empirical data of life, as Bacon might have it. Such empirically-based reasoning would surely conclude that faith is simply unreasonable, and it's something you have to accept or reject without reflection – on authority. And so faith is to be rejected on the basis of view of reason. The enlightenment attitude was that faith is simply wishful thinking. It's a kind of an inherited naivete, reflecting the superstitions of our grandparents, if you will. Many devout pious atheists would claim and insist that the only intelligent and reasoned stance towards life is one of nonbelief in any kind – of Transcendent Horizon or notion of "God." If people

depend on critical reflection about empirical data, then they will reach reliable deductions and well-reasoned conclusions to favor nonbelief. There will be no further faith in an ultimate realm or a transcendent horizon to our lives. In a sense, the atheist and the philosophical movement of modernity would have claimed that if you're an enlightened, intelligent, educated person, then you cannot be anything but an atheist.

I think that now, unbelievers and their modernist thinking is being deeply brought up short by what is an emerging consciousness now in postmodernity – which is, ironically, much more open to the possibility and the rationality of faith and belief. One sign of this new openness is the students on our campus here (at Boston College), many of whom will tell you that they're spiritual, but then they'll immediately add that they're not religious. But at least they're basically saying, "Hey, I'm a person of soul. There is a spirit to me. It's not just 'Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow, we die.' There's much more. There's some kind of a reach, a transcendent allure, as Rahner might say, to my life." I taught undergrads here for 35 years. I would say that the undergrads of 30 years ago weren't as disposed to faith as the contemporary students are. In a sense, there is a pulled up short happening for all of us in regard to belief and unbelief, with each on more level ground now, even by way of critical reason.

**Stanton Wortham** 6:51

I certainly recognize that attitude that you're describing... the attitude that says, "Reason demands that we treat religious belief as just a matter of superstition." Before I came to Boston College, I taught and worked at several other universities. It was a common thing at those universities for people to assume that all members of the faculty, all members of the community, were not religious. It was common, in fact, for faculty members to disparage religious faith in class. That was something that religious students would sometimes tell me that they encountered. So atheism was taken as the default position for any reasonable, educated person, and it's interesting to see that you think that's crumbling a little bit as an ideology.

**Tom Groome** 7:37

You have well described what was the general assumption. When you stop and think about it, all the great architects of modernity were atheists: Nietzsche, Marx, Feuerbach, Freud, and so on. Whereas by contrast, many of the thought leaders of our postmodern era, often described by people like Taylor as a "secular age." And yet, many of their great thought leaders are themselves critical believers, like Gadamer, Ricoeur, Levinas, Kristeva, Taylor and maybe Irigaray. All kinds of great thinkers of our time are themselves believers, people who believe in God, to use that name for what, in fact, is ultimate Mystery. There's a growing conviction among contemporary thought leaders that atheism and theism

are both perspectival spins, “takes” as Taylor would say. They’re chosen stances towards life, personal perspectives. There’s nothing more rational about disbelief and irrational about faith. In fact, they’re both equally reasonable. And I would add, they’re both equally naive. They both entail a leap, a gamble – as Pascal might say. So it is not that one posture is objective – the atheist – and non-perspectival and the other ‘biased.’ They’re both chosen stances or spins on life, and each one equally reasonable.

Beyond that, I think there’s a growing recognition of the inadequacy of reason alone to make sense out of life. Of course reason is imperative to the affair of faith. Faith without reason is dangerous. Faith always needs the critical monitor of reason. If you don’t believe that, then look at the morning papers or newsfeed. In my Catholic tradition, people like Aquinas, Augustin, Julian of Norwich - the great thinkers of my tradition - readily recognize the partnership of faith and reason. But in today’s context, it is fascinating to find an old avowed atheist (at least I always presumed he was and he proclaimed himself as such) Jurgen Habermas, with him now arguing for a well-reasoned faith. This is not the sentiment of the “early” Habermas. And I love the fact that he’s putting the two together – faith and reason – and recognizing them as an urgent partnership for our time. Habermas and postmodern authors like him are arguing that for a public ethic to be effective and entice people’s compliance, it must have a spiritual grounding. In other words, for a society to work well, people need an ethic that is more than Immanuel Kant’s categorical imperative. A purely philosophical grounding of ethics can enable us to recognize what is right from wrong, but it does not dispose us to do what is right; that requires a spiritual rationale. A philosophical ethic may clarify for people what to do, but it doesn’t inspire them to do it. So, it’s fascinating to hear people like Habermas arguing the need for a well-reasoned faith, even for the successful functioning of the public realm.

### **Stanton Wortham** 10:59

This is a very interesting development. Before you pointed this out to me, I really had no idea. I hadn’t thought about it. But you really are right that we have many highly respected thinkers over the past several decades who are leaders of what you’re calling the postmodern moment, leaders of thinking through how we should imagine reason and science going forward in the contemporary world. And many of these folks are themselves religious believers. I also agree with you that Habermas is a particularly striking example, being the heir of a tradition: the Frankfurt School, which was highly critical and was not at all interested in religion. And yet here he is telling us that religious faith is a reasonable thing and something that goes well with reason in order to help societies move forward and become better, both in terms of their effectiveness and in terms of their ethics. So could you help me understand why this is happening? Why is it that the earlier generation (you mentioned of the 19th and early 20th century) of skeptics were all anti-religious or non-religious, but now we have people

who are leading intellectuals, who are not themselves coming directly out of religious traditions, but turned out to be religious believers and are welcoming that as a public part of their identity?

**Tom Groome** 12:19

Well, I think our human spirit prompts us to ever go on wondering, to always imagine and hope that maybe there is more to us than the purely empirical, the rational, the data, as it were. I think the traditional atheism of modernity is being pulled up short by the fact that ultimately, we still have to face the final questions, the great questions of life. Modernity and its rationalist, empirical epistemology is tremendously powerful in helping us to understand the 'what?' and 'how' of life and creation. It can analyze the 'what' of life and collect the data about creation and figure out how it works. But it ever avoids the question, 'why?' And all the great 'why' questions... the ultimate 'why?' question, of course, is 'Why is there anything rather than nothing?' The courage of believers to face those ultimate 'why' questions, in some ways, makes faith actually more reasonable than atheism, which adamantly chooses to avoid those questions. The only way you can be a devout, practicing pious, committed atheist is to avoid the 'why' questions of life, like, as I said, 'Why is there anything rather than nothing?' For an atheist to reasonably and honestly face those ultimate question will challenge their disbelief.

**Stanton Wortham** 14:15

Yeah, I see. So the committed atheist rationalists had this notion that religion tried to explain stuff, and it's inadequate. Enlightenment and scientific explanations are going to replace the religious explanations, and religion isn't necessary anymore. But you're arguing that actually, there are certain questions and issues that enlightenment and scientific rationality just ignores. So it's not that it can explain everything better, it's that it explains some things well, but there are other things that it requires us to not look at or not engage with. Can you help me understand a little better what those 'why?' questions are that you're talking about, and how can we approach a 'why' question rationally?

**Tom Groome** 15:04

Well, let me give a personal example. I recently had my own pulled up short moment. I was in the throes of a period of serious doubt about my own faith stance toward life. So note that first. Both atheists and theists have our doubts. For all of us, belief and disbelief are ever a leap. The pressing sources of my disbelief was the immensity of the universe – with its billions of galaxies and planets and how “my God” on this little speck of planet could be the God of it all. It was something of a faith crisis, or at least a deep anxiety. It lasted a number of days and was lingering on. In a sense, the pressing source of my doubts was simply becoming aware of the universe – of which planet earth is an infinitesimal speck.

Now that may sound like a strange thing to say, but many of us are only growing out of a cosmos attitude or understanding of life and creation towards a universe, and the universe is this immensity of space, the galaxies that are billions and trillions of light years away. How do you then begin to think that, "My God, the God of this little speck of a planet is the Creator and Sustainer of all of that?"

In the midst of my doubts, I was out for a walk one afternoon, and I stopped to say hello to a neighbor. We entered into this incidental conversation about her, a beekeeper. As she talked about her little charges, she was describing what I perceived to be amazing design in the life of the beehive. All of them – drones and worker bees, and the queen (there's no king) – are fulfilling extraordinarily complex, and what at least would appear to be intelligent functions. And all of this to produce what is likely the most delightful elixir of life - none sweeter, than honey.

As my neighbor talked on, my precise pulled up short moment was when she explained that her little charges actually can recognize her voice and her face as their caregiver. And as a result, they don't attack her and sting her. If a neighbor or a visitor comes, she always has to warn them not to go near the beehive, because the bees will sting them. But she could go into that beehive and do everything, clean it out and collect the honey, and they never sting her because they recognize her voice and face. In other words, these little characters have the ability of recognition. That's extraordinary.

Now you could say, "Yes, and that evolved - all evolved." But to me, there was suddenly again what I might claim as a transcendent horizon that reaches into that instance of creation that lends design even to the life of bees. And then one can go on, how far more amazing, how we have evolved. And yet, it would seem, by design, by some intelligent designer. Think for example of the function of the eye that sees the words in the page or the ear that hears the words that other people are speaking and can reflect upon them and understand them. Now, let me add, I respect completely the perspective of people who believe that everything, this whole universe and all of our capacities within it, simply evolved by its own innate dynamic. But you know what? I find it actually more reasonable to believe that the extraordinary design of creation is the work of God – which is, simply our favored word for ultimate Mystery. Such faith, I'm convinced, is eminently reasonable and helps to make me a believer.

### **Stanton Wortham** 19:11

So this is a very interesting twist on the argument. You know, often we hear defenders of enlightenment rationality who are skeptics about religion say, "Religion doesn't make sense of anything. It's all superstition. Science is going to explain it all." We've gotten clear that that is not

something that would be a reasonable take, because in fact, defenders of reason and science choose not to explain or engage with certain sorts of things.

But you seem to be going even further in your argument. You're not willing to allow folks who defend enlightenment rationality to divide the world up, as if there are things that science can explain and then there's stuff you just have faith in. You're claiming something more radical, I think. You're saying that in fact, faith is connected to reason, that people who follow religious traditions believe in things about the world because it's reasonable to believe in such things, not because they just accept it because somebody told them. But it is rational for folks to believe things, like about the design that led those bees to recognize that beekeeper. So that means that there's not really a qualitative distinction where, when you're religious, you just accept stuff because somebody tells you, and when you're rational, you insist on reason and evidence. You're saying that everybody has to believe some things, whether they be religious or not. And rationality goes together with faith in order to make beliefs possible, to allow them to make sense of our experience. So that means that religious belief is involved with rationality. It's a reasonable thing, right?

**Tom Groome** 20:51

Absolutely. To go back to a point I mentioned in passing earlier, there's nothing more dangerous than blind faith; faith without critical reason can be enormously destructive. This is where people of faith can get pulled up short by the inadequacy of their faith and the need to push beyond its present limits. Let me clarify something here that I'm uncomfortable with in how the discourse is normally transacted. We constantly refer to either belief or unbelief. And I think those terms are too narrow. Belief is a very thin word, really. It's reflects something purely rational and based on reason alone. I prefer the word *faith*, because faith is much more holistic and engages the whole person. Faith is not just what you believe, it's also your relationships, your commitments and your ethics. Faith is one's whole way of being in the world. From that perspective, it can't be simply limited to the mind alone (although I will come back and say yes, but it definitely has to include the mind. It can't leave it out). My favorite poet William Butler Yeats had a wonderful verse in his "Poem for Old Age." It reads, "God, save me from those thoughts men think in the mind alone. They that sing a lasting song think in the marrowbone."

So faith requires us to think in the marrowbone of our lives, in the heart, and with our emotions, with our memories, and our imaginations, and so on. And it also invites us to think with critical reason. Bernard Lonergan wisely argued that faith entails lifelong conversion, and that includes intellectual conversion, as well as moral and religious conversion. In other words, faith should shape a person's ethic and the affairs of their heart and soul. For Lonergan, faith is ever conversion that which is

intellectual, moral, and religious. So faith is not a naive attitude toward life at all. It's very holistic and discerning and constantly inviting us beyond our present limits.

**Stanton Wortham** 23:31

I really like that idea, that our understanding of the world is a matter of the whole person, that it's not just an intellectual exercise, it's something in the marrowbone. As you put it, it's something that connects to other dimensions of who we are. That points out something that we've known about enlightenment rationality for a long time, that if you pursue just that rational view, that more atheistic view of the world, you miss an opportunity to engage with all these other dimensions of life: emotional, relational connections to the natural world. There's something sterile about a purely rational approach that just deals in reason and evidence. I continue to be very interested by this argument you're developing about how religious stances towards life include serious rational, intellectual engagement, along with faith and these other dimensions of a whole person. Could you tell me a little bit more about this amalgam of how faith and reason work together?

**Tom Groome** 24:34

Well, it's a great question. Without each other, both faith and reason are impoverished. Our faith has to continue to evolve as we find ourselves in new circumstances of life. And we often come to realizations and recommendations of the deep inadequacies that have often marked our previous faith, the errors of our ways, and God knows, we've had lots of errors and heresies within our Catholic faith, which at times were official teachings of our churches. Indeed all people of the Judeo Christian faith have to recognize our deep complicity in racism across the centuries. We approved a race-based slavery, often quoting the Bible and the curse of Ham (Genesis 9), to justify such slavery – which is horrendous as we think about it now. And then people of Christian faith have been collaborators in multiple injustices of varied kinds; I think of a deep sexism, a dreadful misogyny, and sometimes bordering on hatred – our homophobia. Our discrimination against LGBTQ people continues well into our own day; when will we cease and repent.

Now, I would immediately say that our Christian faith has been no more erroneous than the secular philosophies that have given rise to Naziism and Fascism and now a dangerous kind of nationalism, and so on. So I'm not blaming faith for those errors – although it often encouraged collaboration in such ideologies. I'm simply saying, that over the centuries our faith communities very often have been no more wise than the cultures in which they found themselves. So when it found itself in a culture that blessed slavery, my Catholic church found ways to bless slavery and even to cite the Bible to legitimate its position. As Shakespeare said, "Even the devil can cite scripture to the devil's advantage." And in our contemporary world, we have a whole new growing consciousness around the dignity and



inclusivity and equality of LGBTQ people and the welcome and inclusion they should experience in all communities of faith. Add, too, our contemporary consciousness about the environment – a new awareness for us. So, back in the 1500s, was the church talking about care for the environment? No, it was not because it didn't need to talk about it; the environment was not under dire threat. But now that we have the potential to destroy the earth, and the air, and the water, and the ozone layer over at all, and we've had this beginning with the Industrial Revolution. Now, however, for people of Judeo-Christian tradition, when we go back into our sacred texts, for example to the book of Genesis, we find the clear mandate there from God to be good stewards of our creation. Genesis 2:15 explicitly appoints us to be good stewards and partners together in caring for creation.

In other words, our faith continues to develop and unfold – including to correct its previous mistakes and false teaching (like approving of slavery). People of faith were pulled up short by the unfolding of human history that can alert us to our errors, but also at times enables us to reclaim even deeper truths than what we knew already, as for example, an ecological consciousness for our time. So people of faith are constantly mandated and invited to an examination of conscience. Our Ignatian spirituality might well say an "examen of consciousness." In other words, we need to recognize the positives but also the negatives in our faith tradition, or as Ignatius used to say in traditional language, we are invited to constantly discern the good spirits from the bad spirits. We have to constantly try to avoid the bad ones and embrace the good ones. In this light, faith is a lifelong and unfolding journey.

**Stanton Wortham 28:45**

That's great. You certainly gave me several different brought up short moments here. There's the realization that we confront new avatars, exemplary thinkers in the postmodern era who themselves are people of faith. I hadn't realized how many of them spoke openly about their religious belief. So that's one pulled up short moment for me here. Another one is the insight that even enlightenment rationality and science are things that don't explain everything, but systematically exclude certain kinds of questions and don't try to make sense of things that many reasonable people would like to make sense of. And this last point, I think, is particularly interesting about how we need to understand better how people of faith and people who do not subscribe to religious traditions all engage in this amalgam of presuppositions or assumptions that they take on faith together with reason. So all of us are operating in a world that involves reason and evidence and faith and other aspects of our humanity that are together allowing us to navigate and make sense of our experience. So thanks very much to Professor Groome for these ideas. I'm very pleased that we have with us today to help us discuss this further Professor Belle Liang. So, Belle, please do you have some questions?

**Belle Liang** 30:14

First, thank you so much, Dean Wortham, for this opportunity to think about some of the mysteries of life, to come out of our mundane moments of life as we just try to make it through 2020, to just really be encouraged that there's much more than meets the eye. So my first question is, you said something that I found really interesting when you said that faith needs reason, and that, in fact, faith is dangerous without reason. I wonder if the reverse is also true. When we think of ourselves as whole people, does reason and faith require each other in both directions? Do you think that fully formed faith requires believing in something that you both find rationally and intellectually credible, as well as something though, that is emotionally and existentially true and satisfying?

**Tom Groome** 31:10

Let me see if I get your question fairly precisely, essentially, you are asking how do we manage to do both/and? How do we manage to honor reason and faith as well? Am I getting your question correctly?

**Belle Liang** 31:29

That's absolutely right. Because I think that, you know, we can so much rely on the reason part, and miss this whole other world of what is so emotionally and soul satisfying about faith.

**Tom Groome** 31:43

My honest answer to your good question is that I don't know, because there's such a mystery here. But let me make a proposal to you and see what you think. An awful lot depends – and this is going to sound a little ridiculous – on our epistemology. I think one of the great and increasing deficiencies of Western consciousness is our epistemology. We've limited the ways of knowing, the reliable ways of knowing (beginning with Descartes and Bacon) to the empirical and rational, to a kind of disengaged reason – from the everyday “knowing” that comes with life. This technical rationality assumes that the more the person is disengaged – personally – from an affective or a personal perspective, the more objective you are and the more reliable the knowing.. Here Husserl is a good example, saying that you've got to bracket out all of your emotions and prior experiences, and only then will you really know.

That type of “objective” epistemology is a lot of baloney. There's no real objectivity at all to it. Our knowing is typically and deeply biased and prejudiced in all kinds of ways and precisely because it limits the capacity of the person for reliable knowledge to critical reason alone. And so the emotive, and the affective, and our bodily knowing was excluded as unreliable. In fact, there are times when our tummy talk is more reliable than the stuff going on in our head. So we typically exclude our body-

knowing. And how ironic, that very word 'biography,' bios graphia, literally means 'what is written in our bodies.' In many ways, the wisdom of life gets written in our bodies, but we don't listen to it. We don't listen to our emotions. We don't listen to her affectivity. We don't listen to our soul and to our desires and our aspirations and our imagination. The darn enlightenment limited us to critical reason alone as the only reliable way of knowing. And contrary to Augustine's advice, it recognized only one function of the mind – reason – ignoring the memory and the imagination. Descartes argued that the imagination is unreliable and leads us astray. The Irish poet William Butler Yeats has a great verse at the end of his "Poem for Old Age" : "God save me from those thoughts men think in the mind alone. He that sings a lasting song, thinks in the marrow bone" The whole Enlightenment movement wasn't just a limiting to the mind alone but to reason alone, leaving out memory and imagination. I think when we look backwards over our lives, we're more likely to be believers or people of faith, than when we try to look forward. When we look forward, the fears arise and the anxieties. So the limiting of knowing to critical rationality really backs us into a corner, denying a whole aspect of ourselves that is vital and is just as reliable. My heart is as least as reliable as my head.

**Belle Liang** 35:12

If you don't mind, I have one more question. So you shared that there have been a lot of criticism about faith being complicit in social injustice. How can reasoned faith actually be an answer for the pathway forward in social justice today?

**Tom Groome** 35:36

I think we have to dig back into our traditions, our sacred texts, our Hebrew Scriptures, our New Testament, the Holy Quran, whatever is our sacred book. I think we've got to go back and re-read them with a contemporary consciousness. Of course, we also have to situate them in their historical context. To read them out of context is definitely to misread them. So you have to read the text in its context, but then you have to read it for our context and with our perspective and our consciousness. This is how, for example, that we can become aware of racism and sexism – and rather than being legitimated by our faith, such social practices are antithetical to faith. When we go back to our sacred texts with a contemporary consciousness, we find things that we never saw before.

In other words, when you bring a contemporary consciousness to current issues and reread the texts of tradition with our contemporary consciousness, we see things that we had never seen before. Christian faith has many "subversive memories," as Johann Baptist, the great German theologian calls them – subversive memories that can upset and change our present attitudes. For example, to go back again to the first story, the first chapter, the first book of the Bible, it says very clearly, "And God created humankind, in God's own image and likeness." And then to make sure we got the point of that, "And

created them male and female." In other words, we're radically equal in the eyes of God and in the intentions of God. Then, the second story is about becoming partners with God and each other. Yes, to be real partners as men and women, and women as helpers – as has often been mistranslated. The text makes clear that Eve was to be an equal partner with Adam. You come then to the great prophetic literatures of Isaiah and Jeremiah and Amos and their call to justice in every age. As Micah 6:8 well summarizes, "This and only this is what I asked of you oh humankind." Note immediately that in Micah 6: 8, God is addressing all humankind, not just Israel. So, "humankind, this what Yahweh/God asks of you, and only this: that you live justly, love tenderly, and walk humbly with your God." In many ways, Micah 6:8 summarizes the whole prophetic tradition of Israel, a great summary of how we are to live our lives. So any semblance of injustice, as a person of faith, I'm under command to oppose it. It's not an option that I be consciously committed to social justice. My faith demands that I be in favor of women's rights or gay rights or human liberation or economic justice. Micah 6:8 is a mandate for all to so live.

**Stanton Wortham** 38:29

That's great. Well, thank you so much, Professor Groome and Professor Liang. We really appreciate you being with us and sharing these insights. We wish you well as we all move forward through this complicated year.

**Tom Groome** 38:41

Thank you, Dean. Thank you, Professor Liang. And thank you, Samantha, blessings to all of you.

**Belle Liang** 38:47

So grateful. Thank you, everyone.

**Stanton Wortham** 38:52

Thanks for listening to this episode of pulled up short. We hope it's provided an opportunity to reflect on unexamined assumptions and consider alternative ways of thinking about and being in the world. Hope to have you with us next time.