

**Talking Past Each Other:
The Struggle Within ECUSA Over Sexual Orientation**

**Prepared by: Harry S. Coverston, Ph.D.
Instructor: Humanities, Religion
and Philosophy of Law
University of Central Florida**

**Prepared for: NEXUS
Religion and Nation Conference
University of Tennessee- Knoxville
April 8, 2006**

INTRODUCTION

There are few issues more contentious today in American society at large than questions about the place of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered and transsexual persons (LGBT). This is particularly true

in the context of American religious life where the issue of first class citizenship of LGBT persons has focused on two questions in particular: ordination to clerical roles and rites which would officially recognize same sex relationships.

In this paper I will discuss the current state of the struggle of LGBT Christians to gain full access to the rights and privileges of membership regarding the blessing of committed relationships in the specific context of the Episcopal Church of the United States of America (ECUSA). I will begin with a short history of that struggle within ECUSA and the larger Anglican Communion of which the American national church is a constitutive member. I will then proceed to a brief discussion of Kohlberg's stages of moral reasoning. Finally, I will argue that Kohlberg's stage analysis offers a useful means of analyzing the moral reasoning evident in the arguments being made within ECUSA and the Anglican Communion regarding same sex unions and thus an understanding of why resolution of those conflicting positions has proven difficult if not impossible.

It is important to note that this paper is designed to address a particular concern of the NEXUS conference: "examining the intersections of religion with politics, theory and art." While I will reference empirical studies which have been completed by others regarding moral reasoning and religious ideation, the purpose of this particular paper is to offer a theoretical model by which future empirical studies of the questions raised here could be conducted.

I. The Episcopal Church and Sexual Orientation

For nearly a half century, the Episcopal Church in the United States of America (ECUSA) has wrestled with issues of sexuality generally and homosexuality in particular. These struggles have primarily centered around two primary concerns: the ordination of LGBT persons to clerical and episcopal orders and questions surrounding same sex relationships.

The Episcopal Church conducts all its official business regarding church polity and doctrine at a triennial assembly of church laity, clergy and its episcopacy called the General Convention. Beginning in 1964, the Convention passed a resolution expressing the mind of the convention which cited "changing patterns in human action (which) have raised inquiries regarding the Church's position on sexual

behavior." The Convention authorized its Executive Council to gather data, formulate studies and make specific recommendations to the 1967 Convention.¹ Every convention since that time has ordered studies of these issues. Conventions in 1991 and 1994 directed parishes and dioceses to engage in intentional dialogue regarding issues surrounding the status of LGBT Episcopalians and to report their findings back to the succeeding conventions, directives which were observed more in the breach than with compliance.²

The result of this long struggle is a patchwork of seemingly contradictory positions. The initial statement of the Church on homosexuals *per se*, passed as a resolution in 1976, asserted that "homosexuals are children of God and have a full and equal claim with all other persons to the love, acceptance and pastoral care by the Church." A second resolution provided that gays and lesbians were entitled to equal protection of the civil and criminal law. But the same Convention readily manifested the ambiguity in its own positions when in rejecting a resolution which would have prohibited ordination of LGBT persons, it simultaneously passed another resolution which admitted to a "lack of agreement among theologians and among scientific study" regarding homosexuality generally.³

Since the bellwether 1976 Convention, the Church's governing body has periodically reaffirmed resolutions recognizing LGBT persons as "children of God" entitled to full civil rights while simultaneously resolving that "physical sexual expression is appropriate only within the lifelong monogamous union of husband and wife...(as) intended by God..."⁴ That such a position might appear inconsistent was acknowledged by the Convention's resolution recognizing the "discontinuity between this teaching and the experience of many members of this body."⁵ Indeed, the Convention's Commission on Human Affairs asserted that "the Church can't advocate for civil rights if it denies them within our own fellowship."⁶

In the 30 years since 1976, the treatment of LGBT issues by the General Conventions has been marked by a slow by steady movement toward full inclusion of LGBT Episcopalians in all the rights and privileges of the church. In 1994, the Convention changed its binding legal canons regarding ordination to state that access to the ordination process could not be denied on the basis of sexual orientation, a

change which reflected the practice of some but hardly all of the church's dioceses at that time. By the time of the 2003 General Convention, equal access had been extended to the rights, status and access of the laity to "an equal place in the life, worship, and governance of this Church."⁷ Church canons now officially prohibit bishops from refusing to admit priests chosen to lead parishes within their dioceses on the basis of sexual orientation. Similarly, bishops are restrained from prohibiting priests from other dioceses within the church from entering their dioceses to serve there solely on the basis of sexual orientation. When enacted, these laws reflected the actual practice of a portion but hardly all of the church's dioceses.

The movement toward equality for LGBT persons within the church reached a milestone at the 2003 General Convention at which the election of the church's first openly gay bishop, Gene Robinson, was ratified by both the Convention's House of Bishops and its House of Deputies composed of parish clergy and lay deputies. The election of an openly gay bishop has produced an explosion of negative reactions from national churches within the Anglican Communion, primarily in the so-called Two-Thirds World of the Southern Hemisphere.

At a meeting of archbishops of the Communion in Windsor, England, a Report was issued calling for a halt to ordination of gay clergy and the blessing of same sex unions occurring on an *ad hoc* basis in the Anglican Church of Canada, warning that if "call to halt" is ignored "then we shall have to begin to learn to walk apart".⁸ A leader of the southern hemisphere churches, Peter Akinola, the Archbishop of Nigeria, said, "The Episcopal Church and Diocese of New Westminster (Canada) are already walking alone on this and if they do not repent and return to the fold, they will find that they are all alone. They will have broken the Anglican Communion."⁹

Despite this thinly veiled threat, ECUSA shows little willingness to retreat from its decision to ordain openly LGBT persons, even though it must be recognized that bishops hold wide discretion within their dioceses and that equality in canonical principle has not always resulted in equality in ecclesial practice. Yet, the Diocese of California which includes the area immediately surrounding San Francisco

is set to elect a new bishop this year. Of the five candidates selected by the diocesan nominating committee, two are openly gay or lesbian.

If the issues surrounding access of LGBT Episcopalians to lay and clerical leadership roles have been largely resolved at the national policy level, issues surrounding how to respond to same sex relationships have only heated up. The 2003 General Convention passed a resolution acknowledging that "in [the Church's] understanding of homosexual persons, differences exist among us about ...what is, or should be, required, permitted, or prohibited by the doctrine, discipline, and worship of The Episcopal Church concerning the blessing of the same," However, the resolution went on to "recognize that local faith communities are operating within the bounds of our common life as they explore and experience liturgies celebrating and blessing same-sex unions."¹⁰ As of this year, seven dioceses have official policies in place authorizing the rites which bless same sex unions with two more dioceses working to develop policies.¹¹ One diocese, the Diocese of Washington, D.C., has created a liturgical rite for the "Blessing of a Covenant Relationship" and placed it on its diocesan website.¹²

The pending General Convention of the church scheduled for June in Columbus, Ohio, will undoubtedly feature a continuance of the struggle for LGBT full inclusion in the rights and privileges of membership in the Episcopal Church. Resolutions already filed for consideration include those which would prohibit the General Convention from meeting in states which prohibit domestic partner benefits¹³ as well as a number of conservative sponsored resolutions invoking the Windsor Report as a means of repudiating the church's move toward ordination of gay clergy and creation of same-sex union rites.¹⁴ From a distance, it would appear that the Episcopal Church, like many Christian and Judaic traditions in the early 21st CE, is mired in what seems to be an irresolvable conflict between those seeking full inclusion of LGBT persons in religious life and those who hold to a more conservative position consistent with what has until recently been the predominant understanding of Judeo-Christian tradition regarding such issues. What might explain this conflicted state?

II. Kohlberg and Moral Reasoning

Beginning in the 1960s, Harvard ethicist Lawrence Kohlberg and a team of researchers began publishing a series of longitudinal studies of moral reasoning which began with his doctoral dissertation work in 1958. Kohlberg saw his work as taking place at the intersection of philosophy and psychology, the former providing the basis for his understanding of the ultimate goal of moral reasoning - justice for all human beings - and the latter providing a means of empirically testing individual moral reasoning and its proximity to that goal. Kohlberg built upon the work of educational psychologist Jean Piaget whose research had identified maturational stages of successively more complex and comprehensive reasoning observable in children. Kohlberg used Piaget's cognitive structure as a basis to identify a theoretical model of the development of moral reasoning which posited three levels of moral reasoning, each broken further into two stages apiece.¹⁵ Testing the theory among subjects in the United States, Israel, Turkey, Taiwan and Mexico, Kohlberg determined that the development of moral reasoning occurred in universally recognizable patterns among human beings across cultural and socio-economic class lines.

The three levels of moral reasoning Kohlberg identified were labeled pre-conventional, conventional and post-conventional determined by the way in which the individual relates to conventional authority in deciding moral dilemmas. Pre-conventional reasoning is predominately self-focused and determines right or wrong based upon the possibility of punishment (stage 1, Punishment/Obedience) the instrumental advancement of self-interest (stage 2, Instrumental Relativist). Kohlberg's research found pre-conventional reasoning predominating among pre-adolescents with virtually all subjects developing into some stage of conventional reasoning by the end of high school. A primary exception to that pattern included persons in penal institutions many of whom continue to reason at instrumental/relativist stage 2.¹⁶ Where stage 1 reasoners ask the question "What must I do to avoid being punished,?", stage 2 is much more pragmatic: "What's in it for me?"

Conventional level reasoning is primarily determined by perceptions of what is expected by conventional authority located in the family, affinity group, social institution or nation. Such expectations are perceived as valuable in their own right regardless of consequences.¹⁷ Conventional reasoning is marked not only by "conformity to personal expectations and social order but of loyalty to it, actively maintaining, supporting and justifying the order and of identifying the persons or group involved in it."¹⁸

A primary criterion distinguishing the two stages of conventional reasoning is simply where the "they" one feels compelled to obey, as well as to whom one owes duties of caring, is located. For Stage 3 Good Boy/Nice Girl

Orientation, the social approval sought is found in one's significant others - family, groups to which one belongs, significant authority figures. For Stage 3 reasoners, "Good behavior is that which pleases or helps others and is approved by them. There is much conformity to stereotypical images of what is majority or 'natural' behavior....One earns approval for being 'nice'." ¹⁹ The question asked in Stage 3 is "What must I do to be approved by those whose opinions I value?"

At Stage 4 Law and Order Orientation, the scope of both authority and empathy expand to a broad conventional level often located in social institutions and the nation-state. Stage 4 reasoners exhibit a particularly positive though generally uncritical attitude toward "authority, fixed rules and the maintenance of social order." For Stage 4 reasoners, "right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority and maintaining the given social order for its own sake." ²⁰ While the incomplete quote "My country, right or wrong!" ²¹ readily demonstrates the nationalistic tenor of this stage's reasoning, the legalistic aspects are much better represented by the stage 4 question "What if everyone did that?"

Kohlberg found that most adults come to a resting point in development in one of the two stages of conventional level reasoning. It is particularly worth noting that religious institutions have long been recognized as the institutions *par excellence* of conventional social standards. Therefore, it is not surprising that conventional values and conventional moral reasoning dominate among religious adherents. Studies employing Kohlberg's stages theory have found that religious ideology exhibits a fairly consistent positive relationship with moral judgment. ²² While specific religious affiliations have not been found to be correlated to moral development, religious dogmatism and theological conservatism have both been shown to hold an inverse relationship to development beyond conventional reasoning, that which Kohlberg called post-conventional reasoning. ²³

Religious institutions are frequently strongly motivated to help human beings develop out of pre-conventional, egocentric moral reasoning. It is interesting to note that the Seven Deadly Sins articulated by Thomas Aquinas- pride, envy, gluttony, lust, anger, greed and sloth - are all arguably pre-conventional, egocentric behaviors all pointing to attitudes and behaviors which are self-serving, often at the expense of others. If a primary institutional imperative has been to help human beings develop into conventional reasoning and values, the mark of conventional religion has been conventionally constructed and maintained belief systems usually cast in legal terms: doctrine, dogma, creeds and confessions and ecclesial authorities to maintain and enforce the same.

Thus it is no accident that violations of conventional religious constructions have long been seen as sinful if not heretical. "[M]ovement from the conventional view is a questioning of 'society's view,' a questioning of the received traditions and standards of society in general....(resulting in) an orientation which is an 'outside of society perspective.'" The transition from conventional to post-conventional reasoning is often marked by skepticism, egoism (resembling that of pre-conventional egocentrism in some cases) and relativism. Such persons are frequently seen by conventional authorities as harmful mavericks. Thus the human being who, despite great social affirmation for remaining at conventional level reasoning and great resistance if not hostility toward movement out of the same, manages to develop past the conventional level, s/he may find him/herself "alienated from the tribe because of (his/her) beliefs,...intellectually and emotionally isolated." ²⁴

Post-Conventional Reasoning is also described as autonomous or principled level reasoning. Such reasoning marks "a clear effort to define moral values and principles which have validity and application apart from the authority of the groups or persons holding these principles..." ²⁵ For post-conventional reasoners, the locus of authority has returned from external, heteronomous sources of authority to an inner moral compass informed by but not restricted to conventional moral authority. At this level, principled questions of justice are defined in contradistinction to questions of legality or conventional moral affirmation. Inevitably post-conventional moral reasoning serves as an implicit critique of conventional reasoning and resulting values as well as their holders.

Kohlberg found that post-conventional reasoning rarely appeared before college (18-23).²⁶ Blondell Clouse noted in her discussion of "Moral Reasoning and Christian Faith" that less than 20 percent of the population ever reach post-conventional moral reasoning.²⁷

Kohlberg observed Stage 5 Social Contract Orientation to be marked by rule utilitarian overtones (greatest good for the greatest number) while defining right by virtue of autonomous, internal values. A concern for human rights, protected by social contracts such as the U.S. Bill of Rights, first appears at stage 5. ²⁸ It is also at stage 5 that legal strictures and the conventional values which inform them are observed to be in conflict with higher principles of justice. Movement to stage 5 results in questioning of received traditions with reason serving as the basis for judging the just ideal toward which societies should strive. ²⁹

Kohlberg's initial analytical model contained a sixth and final stage which he termed the Universal Ethical Principle Orientation. Later Kohlberg would become much more tentative in his assertions about the sixth stage

when empirical testing encountered difficulty in differentiating stage five individuals from stage six individuals. He continued to hold out the possibility of a stage six orientation based upon the writings of what he called "a small elite sample" chief among whose work was that of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Gandhi.³⁰

Later scholars developing Kohlberg's work included James Rest and his team of researchers at the University of Minnesota. Rest's revisions of Kohlberg's model which he called "neo-Kohlbergian" collapsed the stages Kohlberg had articulated back into three primary levels of pre-conventional, conventional and post-conventional reasoning. Rejecting the testing procedure of conducting interviews to evaluate verbal responses to moral dilemmas Kohlberg's model had developed, Rest created a multiple choice inventory called the Defining Issues Tests which ultimately sought to measure each subject's percentage of moral reasoning which was post-conventional or principled.

III. Application of the Model

What insights might Kohlberg's analytical model as adopted by Rest provide those who would seek to understand the polarization of modern religious bodies regarding LGBT issues? Proceeding on the recognition that however questions about LGBT concerns within religious bodies are articulated, they are at heart moral issues, there are three primary reasons this model could prove useful.

First, while a limited number of studies of religious ideation using Kohlberg or Neo-Kohlbergian analysis³¹ have indicated that moral reasoning is unrelated to religious ideation³² and one study indicated a positive correlation between moral reasoning and literal appropriation of scripture,³³ the bulk of such studies have found a negative correlation between conservative religious ideation and moral reasoning.³⁴

Conversely, a positive correlation between principled moral reasoning and liberal religious ideation, including reluctance to interpret scripture in a literal manner or defer to a received tradition in resolving dilemmas has been widely observed.³⁵ In short, one's level of moral reasoning appears to play a strong role in potentially shaping one's position on the issues at hand.

Second, the analytical criteria of Kohlberg's stages provide a valuable means of analyzing the moral reasoning underlying the rhetoric within this conflict. It is important to note that positions both favoring and opposing full inclusion of LGBT persons can be readily expressed at both pre-conventional

and conventional levels. At pre-conventional stage 1, the focus is on avoidance of punishment of powerless individuals in the face of powerful figures of authority. To wit: "God will punish us if we let gays get married;" or, "the ACLU will sue us if we use public moneys for faith-based programs to discriminate in hiring or benefits to those we serve." At pre-conventional Stage 2, the focus is on the self-serving individual whose motto is simply "What's in it for me?" That might play out as "It's no skin off my nose if gays get married or not."

Conventional reasoning, focused on law and order and the affirmation of the other in terms of social respectability, features an external locus of authority and an identifiable group to whom social and ethical duties are owed. A conventional Stage 3 reasoner might ask: "If the Bible plainly says homosexuality is a sin, how will other Christians see Episcopalians if we do this?" to which their parishioner might reply, "This is not just any gay person, it's Jim. So long as LGBT people lead respectable lives, they deserve the respect of this parish." At societal level Stage 4, the focus is on law and order and conventional values: "The long held understanding of the Judeo-Christian tradition is that homosexuality is a sin," or, "LGBT people have long served the Church well as clergy and lay leaders; they deserve to be treated with respect if not equality."

However, at which point moral reasoning moves to post-conventional levels, it becomes increasingly difficult to frame moral reasoning which would support the ongoing exclusion of LGBT persons from full membership in the Church. While Stage 5 social contract theory might well be employed to frame an argument that somehow including LGBT persons might somehow damage the "institution of marriage," the burden would be on the maker of such an argument to demonstrate how such damage would occur beyond mere speculation. Post-conventional reasoning's focus on human rights gravitates in favor of full inclusion of all human beings in a social institution's benefits and privileges and against discrimination based in sexual orientation.

The Episcopal Church carries a particular liability when it comes to principled reasoning v. conventional behaviors because at least a part of its stated ideals are post-conventional in nature. Not unlike the US government which cast its principled, post-conventional ideals of equality, justice and

protection of minority rights against the tyranny of the majority in a Bill of Rights, the Episcopal Church's 1976 Book of Common Prayer contains a post-conventional, principled Baptismal Covenant against which the Church's actions are readily judged.

Found in the rite for the sacrament of Baptism, the liturgy contains the following queries of those present at the rite: "Will you seek and serve Christ in all persons, loving your neighbor as yourself?...Will you strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being?" The response to each question is "I will with God's help." To paraphrase the 1976 Commission on Human Affairs observation, it is difficult for the Church with any integrity to pledge to strive for justice and respect the dignity of all human beings and at the same deny it within its own fellowship.

Finally, a third reason for using the model is found within Kohlberg's model itself. In studies leading up to his staged developmental model, Kohlberg observed that human beings progressed through the stages in an invariantly sequential manner. One could not skip from pre-conventional stage 2 to post-conventional stage 5, for instance. But perhaps more important for purposes of the current analysis, while persons are frequently drawn to reasoning at one stage above their own even if they are not able to reason there predominately, they rarely comprehend the arguments of those two stages removed from them. If that is true, the chances are that religious conservatives and religious progressives are essentially talking past each other in the current conflict.

What I present today is a theoretical model which could readily lend itself to appropriate empirical testing. I am not a quantitative analyst. However it would be my prediction that the use of the Defining Issues Test to measure the moral reasoning of the various parties within the Episcopal Church might show the following: Conservative arguments based in selective literal appropriations of scripture and/or church tradition made with indifference to modern science would be made from a stage 3-4 conventional level of reasoning. Institutional concerns such as membership, financial solvency and ongoing membership in the larger Communion which inform actions regarding the full inclusion of LGBT Episcopalians within the life of the church would be made from a stage 4 conventional level of reasoning. But arguments made for full inclusion of LGBT Episcopalians based in concerns for equal

justice, human rights and human dignity as found in the Baptismal Covenant would arise from a stage 5, post-conventional level of moral reasoning.

To the degree that justice-based principled moral reasoning drives the church's General Convention toward full inclusion of LGBT Episcopalians in its institutional life, it will be resisted by those operating out of conventional moral reasoning. For the stage 4 institutional protector, the primary concern will be whether such issues will split the American church or result in excommunication from the Anglican Communion even as many here will wrestle with the post-conventional appeal to justice. But for the stage 3 religious conservative, concerned about heteronomous authority manifest by a deference to both tradition and a selective literalism in appropriating scripture, the post-conventional call for justice in LGBT issues will be essentially incomprehensible. In short, stage 5 post-conventional reasoning and stage 3 conventional reasoning will be talking past each other with little points of contact while stage 4 conventional reasoning lies between the two, worrying about institutional preservation.

In closing, I remind my listeners that what I am offering here is a theoretical model by which future empirical studies of the questions raised here could be conducted.

I am also mindful that complex questions such as the one addressed herein frequently admit to more than one possible approach to analysis. I would welcome studies which would employ Kohlberg's model in analyzing positions regarding LGBT issues within religious bodies and offer my hope that this paper might prove helpful to such future endeavors.

End Notes

¹ *Journal of the 1964 General Convention*, (NY: Church Hymnal Corp., 1967), p. 365.

² Of the 132 dioceses in ECUSA, only 45 reported back to the Convention following the 1994 directive regarding the mandated Dialogue on Human Sexuality. "Report to the 1997 General Convention from the Committee for Dialogue on Human Sexuality, (1994-1997)," p. 4.

³ *Journal of the General Convention, 1976*, Resolutions C-108, C-109, C-110, C-111, C-112.

⁴ *Journal of the General Convention, 1991*, Resolution A104sa

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ "Report of the Human Affairs Committee to General Convention," *Journal of the General Convention, 1991*.

⁷ Canon 1.17.5. Rights of the Laity: "No one shall be denied rights, status or access to an equal place in the life, worship, and governance of this Church because of race, color, ethnic origin, national origin, marital status, sex, sexual orientation, disabilities or age, except as otherwise specified by Canons." *Constitution and Canons 2003*, (NY: Church Publishing Co., 2003), p. 51

⁸ Lambeth Commission on Communion, "The Windsor Report 2004" (London: Anglican Communion Office, 2004).

⁹ "Statement on the Windsor Report 2004 from the Primate of All Nigeria," Anglican Communion News Service, Report 3902, Oct. 20, 2004.

¹⁰ *Journal of the General Convention 2003*, Resolution C051, "Rites: Blessing of Committed Same-Gender Relationships"

¹¹ "Blessing Same Sex Relationships," *Integrity-USA* website, found at <http://www.integrityusa.org/samesexblessings/index.htm>

¹² "Blessing of a Covenant Relationship," Episcopal Diocese of Washington Liturgical Resources, on diocesan website found at <http://www.edow.org/parish/congregation/liturgy/Final%20-%20The%20Rite%206-5-04.pdf>

¹³ "FUTURE GENERAL CONVENTIONS NOT TO BE HELD IN STATES THAT PROHIBIT DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIP BENEFITS," Resolution 2006-07, Diocese of Newark Annual Diocesan Convention, Jan. 28, 2006.

¹⁴ The Diocese of Oregon's resolution called for an endorsement of the Windsor Report including "moratoria on election and consent to consecration of persons living in same gender unions; and the use of liturgies blessing such unions..." Resolution #2, The Diocese of Oregon Affirms and Endorses the Windsor Report," Diocese of Oregon Annual Diocesan Convention, Nov. 4, 2005.

¹⁵ A complete account of Kohlberg's theories, methodology and results is found in his *Essays on Moral Development, Vol. II: The Psychology of Moral Development, The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages*, (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 613.

¹⁷ Ronald Duska, Mariellen Whelan, *Moral Development, A Guide to Piaget and Kohlberg*, (NY: Paulist Press, 1975), 47.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 46.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ The complete quote is from an 1871 speech given by U.S. Senator Carl Schurz: "Our country right or wrong. When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right."

²² Irene R. Getz, "Moral Judgment and Religion: A Review of the Literature" April 1984: 106-7.

²³ *Ibid.*; see also Bonidell Clouse, "Moral Reasoning and Christian Faith," 13:3 *Journal of Psychology and Theology* (1985) 190-198; R. Olukayode Jegede, "Social and Personality Characteristics of Nigerian Medical Students," 108 *The Journal of Psychology* (1981) 155-163.

²⁴ Duska, 68-71.

²⁵ Duska, 47.

²⁶ Kohlberg, 612.

²⁷ Clouse at 195.

²⁸ A theological version of a post-conventional social contract is evidenced in the Baptismal Covenant of the Episcopal Church's Book of Common Prayer: *Celebrant* Will you seek and serve Christ in all persons, loving your neighbor as yourself? *People*: I will, with God's help. *Celebrant*: Will you strive for justice and peace among all people, and respect the dignity of every human being? *People*: I will, with God's help.

²⁹ Duska, 68-9.

³⁰ Kohlberg, 270.

³¹ An excellent overview of the literature regarding such testing is found in Irene R. Getz, "Moral Judgment and Religion: A Review of Literature," *Counseling and Values* (April 1984) pp. 94-116.

³² Wahrman (1981); Harris (1981)

³³ Brown and Annis (1978)

³⁴ For a comprehensive listing of the studies, see Getz, p. 109 - 113.

³⁵ *Ibid.*