Educating for Religious and Moral Commitment in an Age of Encounter

ABSTRACT: I argue in this presentation that we face a crisis of religious and moral commitment today, and that an understanding of the existential dynamics of commitments can enable religious educators and other academic and pastoral leaders to recognize and respond to the crisis.

“This case, Tom Robinson’s case, is something that goes to the essence of a man’s conscience. Scout, I couldn’t go to church and worship God if I didn’t try to help that man. Before I can live with other folks, I've got to live with myself. The one thing that doesn’t abide by majority rule is a person’s conscience.” -Atticus Finch

Atticus Finch in the novel To Kill a Mockingbird is a paradigmatic example of a person of laudable religious and moral commitments. While Finch’s outlook on life is grounded in his local community and relationships with others, he is able to reflect critically upon and then act against dominant social norms. This presentation explores the dynamics of religious and moral commitment. It emphasizes how, in educating for the formation of such commitments, religious educators should strive to help people develop deep and firmly-held commitments, while at the same time teaching the art of critical reflection and guiding people to be open to the ongoing refashioning of their deepest commitments. In my experience there are many people like Atticus Finch, and many of our religious communities nurture viable religious and moral commitments. Still, I argue that religious educators should address the issue of education for moral and religious commitment because of a contemporary crisis of commitment. I explore this crisis in the following section.

Religious and Moral Commitments: Essential yet Problematic

Religious education in religious communities entails, in most instances, more than teaching about religion. It also forms people to embrace a commitment to live according to the beliefs and values of some particular religious community. In high school and college settings, even with a religiously diverse group of students, religion or theology courses can and, arguably, should go beyond teaching about one or more religious tradition and invite students to consider what they can learn from their study of religion that can shape their own religious and moral commitments. In any setting, if the study of religion and/or morality is to be more than an arid, pedantic exercise, it should connect with people’s lives, shape their worldviews, and help to form them to be persons of character who can make good life choices.

However, we face at the present time a crisis of religious and moral commitment. That is, we live today in an age of encounter, an age in which people of diverse religious and moral commitments are frequently in contact with one another. This is due in part to the many life
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choices available to people today, and the numerous ways contemporary individuals seek to construct a meaningful sense of life. Additionally, networks of local and global communication and travel lead people with diverse religious backgrounds and social, moral, and political commitments to interact and even live in proximity to one another. Hence, people encounter differences in religious and moral commitments more frequently than in the past, and they sometimes experience these differences as being a source of seemingly unresolvable conflict or as threatening or overwhelming. In extreme cases, people who feel that their religious and moral commitments are threatened by encounters with differing outlooks on life may try to protect their beliefs by lashing out violently against others. For instance, when he was on trial for setting off a bomb at the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta that killed one person and injured dozens of others, Eric Rudolf said that his actions were based on his Christian faith.\(^2\) Less destructively, differences in religious and moral commitments contribute to political gridlock in the United States, and create obstacles to civic discourse in many social contexts.

One common way of responding to the crises of religious and moral commitments is to call for tolerance. The word “tolerance” is from the Latin tolerare, which means to endure, especially that which is difficult or unpleasant. Those who call for tolerance of differences presume that all of us can get along if we each step back from our own commitments and agree to endure those whose outlooks on life differ from our own. Another response is to focus on the universal aspects of religious and moral commitments, while distancing ourselves from their particularity. Those who adopt this perspective presume that if we focus, for instance, on what Christians, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, and Jews have in common rather than what divides us, we can find ways to co-exist peacefully.

At the other end of the spectrum are those who respond to the crisis of commitment by trying to protect and defend their own core convictions. Those in this group often adopt a strategy that involves a combination of backing away from/minimizing and pushing against/confronting differences. Specifically, there are those who seek to distance or even wall themselves off from those with differing outlooks by retreating into or trying to forge seemingly-secure communities of people who think, act, and are otherwise similar to them. At the same time, when those who adopt this strategy cannot avoid contact with those who hold a differing outlook on life, they tend to pivot from efforts to back away from differences and, instead, adopt a confrontational stance. For example, as the marriage equality movement gained momentum in the United States, Christian groups who do not accept gay marriage often sought to prohibit discussion of it in their communities. However, once same-sex marriage began to become legal, these Christians often began to adopt a more oppositional stance. Some churches argued, for instance, that businesses that are run by their members should refuse to provide goods and services for gay marriage ceremonies and, instead, should speak out publicly against same-sex unions.

Now, these common ways of responding to religious and moral differences compound rather than resolve the crisis of commitment in contemporary, global culture. They place us in a position that is similar to that of Odysseus in the Odyssey when he was between Charybdis (a deadly whirlpool) and Scylla (a murderous monster of rock). While calls for tolerance and a focus on the universal are grounded in an admirable effort to show respect for all persons as persons, they require us to hold our religious and moral commitments lightly. These responses to differences presume that if we distance ourselves from our deepest commitments and limit the

ways in which they shape our perspectives and actions in our everyday lives, we can make room for others. We can live and let live. However, these frequently found responses are flawed because they fail to take into account that religious and moral commitments are life orienting and life propelling.

In morally charged situations our moral commitments help to direct our awareness to situations of injustice or moral harm. They may also propel us into reflection and guide us in deciding how we can and will respond. When we see, for example, white supremacists take to the streets, engage in hate speech, and threaten or even engage in violent attacks, we may react against their actions because of deeply held religious and moral commitments. For most of us, a passion for justice or for caring for people in need, or a belief in the importance of respect for the dignity of persons as person, or other moral norms provide an orientation for our lives and motivate us to seek what is morally good and true. Similarly, if we are to develop religiously our religious commitments are not convictions that can or should be held lightly. Rather, they must be central and life-orienting. Personally, for instance, the language of Catholicism was my first religious language, and my commitments as a Catholic have and forever will shape how I see the religious dimensions of life. I can connect with and learn from accounts of life transforming experiences of faith shared by followers of other religions because I have had life-sustaining and at times transforming experiences of faith through my relationship with Jesus.

Turning next to the two-fold strategy of backing-away when-possible/confronting-when-necessary, it is also flawed. In the past people could realistically seek a haven from the complexities of the world within communities of like-minded people. Today, in our contemporary global age, it is virtually impossible to avoid contact with people who hold differing religious and moral outlooks. Not even Boko Horan, an extreme militant, quasi-religious sect in Northeast Nigeria, has been able to separate itself from contact with its Muslim and Christian neighbors. On national or regional levels, policies that involve such things as travel bans, laws against wearing religious attire or presenting religious symbols in public settings, and efforts to restrict education so that children are only taught the beliefs of a dominant group, may slow or hide the intermingling of people with differing religious and moral outlooks, but they are unlikely to halt the constant flow of information and intermingling of people with diverse backgrounds in our contemporary, global age.

Hence, there are increasing incidents today of people encountering those who hold differing religious and moral outlooks and adopting a confrontational stance. In my experience many people who adopt such a stance begin with a sound grounding in their own religious and moral commitments. That is, their views are based on a sound premise: the insight that while religious and moral commitments are personal and specific, they are not wholly private. Rather, they have a public significance. As a Christian, for example, I believe that God is a God of life who wants abundant life for all God’s creation, especially for human beings who I believe are uniquely made in the image of God. I also believe that God, as made known through Christian Scriptures and traditions, has a special concern for the poor and oppressed. While these beliefs are grounded in my specific religious and moral commitments as a Catholic Christian, they lead me outward to involvement in society. Similarly, as I listen to people of faith discuss, for example, homosexuality, torture, gay marriage, human trafficking, abortion, immigration, and capital punishment, I recognize when the stances they take express the public significance of their religious and moral commitments.

However, as I listen to people address socio-moral issues based on their core life commitments, I frequently encounter some degree of unwillingness to be open to ongoing moral
growth and development, and to God’s ongoing presence, and creative and redemptive activity in
the world. In some of instances, people adopt what can be called a closed communal perspective
or a my-God-and-my-country outlook. For instance, a parish in which I was once invited to speak
has long-standing commitments to various social causes. The community is especially drawn to
supporting educational programs throughout the world. It is also willing on a limited basis to aid
refugees seeking asylum in the United States. My conversation with them reminded me of a
bumper sticker I saw in their community. It read: “Why the hell do I have to press 1 for
English?” The people of that community support educational programs that, essentially, teach
others to think and act like them. They are willing to offer assistance to refugees coming into the
United States, but only if they are willing to learn English and adopt a white, middle class,
American worldview. They are, essentially, not interested in genuine conversation with people
with differing outlooks on life. Instead, they want to colonize them. While this community
provides a somewhat extreme example of a trend within religious communities, I have
encountered similar attitudes among religious people throughout the world. They think of their
commitments as providing them with religious and moral truth as a fixed reality or product and
are willing to share this truth with others. Yet, they tend not to see others as people who have
something to share with them, to teach them. They also tend not to be open to exploring how
God is at work in the world beyond their closed community. They are primarily if not
exclusively interested in the god they have mentally constructed; a god who they envision as
blessing their country, their church, and their way of life.

I also often meet people and groups whose religious and moral commitments lead them to
see the world primarily in a negative light, and who adopt what can be called a closed
countercultural outlook. Among people in this group I often observe a two-fold pattern of
analysis. They articulate or presuppose that the dominant characteristics of the world are
unbridled consumerism and materialism, excessive individualism, moral relativism and/or other
negative social influences that have corrupted societies and diminished the quality of life.
Sometimes they characterize contemporary culture as a culture of death. Then, they look at
socio-moral issues in the light of their harsh critique of society. The immediate difficulty with a
closed countercultural outlook is that it is non-dialogical. Those with a closed countercultural
outlook are not usually open to conversation with those with whom they disagree. Instead, they
tend to judge them as being deficient, and then dismiss them. Those who adopt such an outlook
also neglect an often-difficult yet essential prerequisite for making sound social judgments: the
task of evaluating the complex intertwining of positive/life-giving and negative/death-dealing
influences within contemporary society. At a deeper level, they often fail to reflect on where God
is present in contemporary society, and how God may be acting within the world, working to
transform negative social realities. While there are many times when religious people should be
critical of social trends, when a negative social outlook and a countercultural stance become
default responses, religious and moral commitments are likely to become distorted.

In any educational setting, explorations of morality and religion(s) should connect with
people’s lives and help to shape how they see and respond to life concerns. Religious educators
should guide people in forming firm religious and moral commitments while at the same time
educating them to be open to exploring how God may be calling us to new ways of thinking and
acting, especially in and through dialogue with those who hold differing outlooks on life.
However, efforts to teach people to tolerate all religious and moral perspectives or to step back
from their personal and social commitment and to adopt a universal perspective are likely to lead
people away from understanding how deeply-held religious and moral commitments provide a
starting point for making sense of life, and standing up against injustice and other forms of immorality. Such strategies will in most instances also lead us to devalue the experiences of the religious or transcendent dimensions of life that provide a touchstone for being attentive to and understanding the ongoing presence of God in our lives, and discussing with others how God or the Transcendent is made known to them in theirs. Additionally, far too often today when people who hold firm religious and moral commitments seek to challenge or confront those who hold differing religious and moral perspectives, their outlooks on life and actions are problematic. At the core of these problematic responses there is in most instances a lack of openness to the ongoing creative and redemptive activity of God in the world and a failure to respect others as persons. Hence, before we can educate people to form viable religious and moral commitments we need, I suggest, to have a deeper understanding of the dynamics of making and sustaining commitments, and a clearer sense of how commitments can become distorted. In the next section I strive to offer such a deeper understanding of commitment, and in the section after that I will discuss more fully how commitments can become distorted.

The Paradoxical Character of Commitments

Based on contemporary research and my own pastoral and life experience, I suggest that the key to understanding commitments is to recognize that they have a paradoxical nature.3 On the one hand, in making commitments we are led to focus fully on the concrete conditions of our lives and what could bring us greater fullness of life. The process of forming a commitment is, thus, guided by a logic of personal and social involvement. It goes beyond the logic of inductive, deductive, and abductive reasoning by means of which we strive to understand something. For instance, there was a significant difference between considering and then asking a woman who had become the love of my life to marry me and, eight years before that, reflecting on the concept of marriage in an undergraduate theology course. From a Christian perspective, in making major commitments we must go beyond reflecting on an issue and strive to discern what God is making possible and calling us to do in our lives.

On the other hand, and paradoxically, the fullness of commitment is a fullness that is never full, never complete. Our commitments, such as the commitment to marry, bind us and close off other possibilities. We accept this binding because with it comes a fullness of life that would otherwise be absent. At the same time, commitments direct us to the future and create new possibilities in our lives, possibilities we could not have imagined before we made the commitment. For instance, after thirty-one years and taking into account the challenges my wife and I face in our marriage, I now experience a fullness within marriage that is even beyond what I experienced when I first joined my life with another. Moreover, when I have been asked by students to discuss issues concerning their marriages that are impacting their studies, I have turned for insight to my experience of my marriage commitment and how it has brought a fullness into my life. Yet, in discussing marriage with others I have sometimes been led by them to envision ways in which my marriage could expand and become even fuller.

Now, religious and moral commitments are *convictional commitments*. Such commitments become core beliefs or convictions that are constitutive of our sense of personal and social identity and as a result, the sense of fullness they bring to our lives is greater than the fullness of other commitments. When a person says, for instance, “I am a Christian” or “I am a Jew” or “I am a Muslim,” they are expressing the fullness of personal and social identity they experience because their religious and moral commitments have become foundational for their sense of self and their outlook on the world. As social beings we are also drawn to share with others within and beyond our religious communities the experience of fullness of life that is grounded in our religious and moral commitments. In religious terms, we may feel compelled to witness to our faith by sharing it through words and deeds. Moreover, we are drawn to stand against violations of moral and religious commitments in the social world. For instance, if we see someone being bullied, whether it is in our town or halfway around the world, we may feel drawn because of our convictional life commitments to consider what we might do to help the person.

However, because of the paradoxical nature of commitments, we must balance the firmness with which we hold our religious and moral commitment with an openness to even greater fullness. Hence, religious and moral commitment compel us to listen, as well as to speak. They lead us beyond ourselves to recognize the integrity, value, and sacredness of all creation, especially the sacredness of the human person. Overall, religious and moral commitments are dynamic rather than static aspects of human life. In order for these commitments to continue to evolve we need to learn to balance firm adherence to convictional commitments with a genuine openness to encountering the Other, even when such encounters are challenging. Anytime we think that the fullness of our religious commitments is a complete fullness, we may be tempted to allow our conception of God to become more important than our actual relationship with God, whose Fullness we can never fully grasp. Morally, any time we think we possess the fullness of truth and value, we are likely to fail to respect others and to be open to the ways they, based on their distinctive outlooks on life, can guide us to greater moral insight.

Today, we experience a crisis of moral and religious commitment because many people fail to appreciate the paradoxical nature of commitments and, consequently, do not recognize how religious and moral commitments can become distorted. In the next section I discuss this issue more fully.

A Crisis of Religious and Moral Commitment

Efforts to promote tolerance or calls to step back from our specific religious and moral commitments and adopt a universal perspective are often motivated by a praiseworthy desire to discover the fullness of religious and moral truth that is found beyond our specific outlooks on life, outlooks which are always limited and, hence, limiting. However, those who advocate for such initiatives often fail to recognize that commitments are more than reflective stances. They fail to appreciate that commitments are embodied ways of being involved in the world, and that our convictional commitments provide an essential grounding for our outlooks on life and our actions. Religious educators who teach tolerance or encourage students to try to adopt a universal religious and moral perspective ask students to set aside the convictional commitments that help them make sense of life and find their way in the world. Students who accept the teaching of such educators are left without a place to stand, and without something to share, when they encounter those who hold differing religious and moral perspectives.
In contrast, the back-away-when-possible-and-confront-when-necessary strategy is firmly grounded in a sense of the importance of our convictional religious and moral commitments. This strategy calls people to try to protect their convictional commitments and to defend them when they are threatened. However, there is an underlying deficiency to the strategy that can be illustrated by referring to a concept that some consider to be old fashioned: common decency. It refers to the conviction that we are bound by underlying socio-moral standards because of our common humanity, our shared human story. For example, there are numerous historical examples of political back-biting, such as Alexander Hamilton’s characterizations of Aaron Burr in early U.S. politics. Such characterizations have often been seen as lacking in common decency because they violate an unwritten political norm; specifically, that political opponents should not use derogatory nicknames or show disrespect for one another in other ways as well. The most interesting aspect of appeals to common decency is that they reveal how people can be socialized to have a strong sense of the importance of a convictional social commitment that is unwritten and not fully defined. More fully, in at least some social contexts today people are still socialized to internalize a convictional commitment to respect common decency so that disputes among people do not go too far and become personally and socially destructive. While this convictional commitment can be very firmly held, standards of common decency express the tacit, often unreflective conviction that within opposing perspectives there is a fuller sense of meaning and value that, while not fully revealed, could with effort be uncovered and provide a way for those who disagree to find common ground. Unfortunately, in social, political, and religious discourse today there is often a lack of respect for common decency, and religious persons and communities who adopt a back-away-or-confront strategy are among the most vocal violators of norms of common decency. An extreme example of such violations is found in the mean-spirited, homophobic, and often racist rhetoric and practices of the Westboro Baptist Church.4 However, less extreme examples are found in many religious communities today. When the default stance is to confront rather than to engage respectfully, one can be led to see others in an overly negative light. Religious educators who teach a back-away-or-confront strategy tend to promote an unhealthy sectarianism, even when they discuss the public significance of religious and moral commitments, because they lead their students to close themselves off from the potential for greater fullness within their own and others’ commitments. Moreover, they are inclined to turn away from the Fullness of God and to idolize some particular conception of the divine.

If we grant that we do face a crisis of commitment in our religious communities today, the question to raise is: How can we educate people to form firm religious and moral commitments and at the same time be genuinely open to others who hold differing commitments in our contemporary, global age? Rather than addressing this question abstractly, I suggest in the next section that it may be more fruitful for religious educators to explore it based on an understanding of the history and commitments of the Religious Education Association (REA:APPRRE).

The Commitments of Religious Educators and Educating for Religious and Moral Commitment
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William Rainey Harper and the other founders of the Religious Education Association envisioned the organization as a clearing house for both resources concerning practical efforts to educate in faith and research at the intersection of the various fields of religious studies/theology and education. The overall goal of the organization was to improve the quality of “religious and moral education.” At its 1903 founding convention, several major addresses focused on the universal aspects of religion. For instance, in his major address Edwin D. Starbuck stated that, “Religion is a part of life. It is not something tacked on, something which has come ad extra.”

In the address preceding Starbuck’s, George Albert Coe called religion “an essential factor of the human personality.” Coe urged those attending the convention to “learn more of Christian union” so that they could discover the “settled” “principles of the spiritual life” underlying all religions and then formulate a “unified ideal” for educating in faith. However, due primarily to Harper’s expansive vision, from the beginning the REA went beyond a concern for Christian union and welcomed religious educators from all religious traditions from around the world. Jewish educators in the United States, in particular, responded to REA’s invitations to join, and from the end of the first decade of the twentieth century onward have shaped significantly the REA and the field of religious education. Over time, the REA, now REA:APPRRE, became a more Christian ecumenical and interreligious organization, and in the second decade of the twenty-first century it has moved closer to becoming truly international and interreligious.

By the 1940s REA’s members had reimagined how they relate to each other, and the image of fellowship began to shape the identity of the organization. For example, in 1944 Coe stated, “I think of the Association, first of all, as a religious fellowship.” In this article Coe began by envisioning the REA as a group of learners who humbly accept that they have a limited understanding of the world. Thus, he signaled that he had given up the search for self-evident, unifying first principles for religious education. Coe then discussed the membership of the REA being united by a search for rather than the possession of truth. At the forty-first convention of the REA, the organization’s retiring president Ernest J. Chave voiced a similar perspective. He stated: “Perhaps in a united search for a fuller comprehension of truth, with mutual respect for each other, … we may move forward to more significant systems of faith and conduct.”

According to Chave, religious educators’ search for truth through research at the intersection of religion and education shaped the REA to become a “three-faith fellowship” whose members were united in service to humankind. Chave referred to systems (plural) of faith and conduct, thus recognizing that religious educators contribute to developing distinctive ways of providing
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religious and moral education in their respective religious communities. Moreover, he held that, “People should see varying concepts and practices set in vivid contrasts so that thought is evoked and interest aroused in a search for dependable growing concepts.”  

At the REA’s 1950 Biennial Convention, Harrison Elliott took a comparable stance. He described the REA as a fellowship of educators of various religious convictions within which there is more than “superficial tolerance” for differences. He claimed that, “We have believed that our own experience would be enriched and the common cause furthered by the contribution of these diverse viewpoints.”

I suggest that we can gain a fuller understanding of developments within the REA, by looking at them in the light of a conception of the dynamics of convictional commitments. In its early years the organization sought to discover the universal principles of moral and religious education by stepping back and reflecting upon education in faith within the various religious communities of the world. However, by its fourth decade its member understood the faults of this strategy. They recognized that “superficial tolerance” did not lead to fruitful exchanges because it deprived them of the ability to draw insight from their convictional religious and moral commitments in their conversation with one another. Then, because the members of the REA continued to seek ways of discussing their “diverse viewpoints” fruitfully, they discovered that when “varying concepts and practices (are) set in vivid contrasts” thought was “evoked and interest aroused” to such an extent that members of the organization could recognize their “common cause” of contributing to ongoing developments in education in faith in their respective communities and being of “service to humankind.” Essentially, the experience of being united by a “common cause” became a convictional commitment that has enabled the REA to develop as a fellowship or friendly association of scholars and practitioners with shared interests. At the same time, the REA and then REA:APPRRE developed an organizational culture in which its members seek to share their diverse perspectives with one another as a way of being open to the ongoing revelation of the greater fullness of meaning within their own professional and religious commitments, and the convictional commitments of REA:APPRRE as an organization. This has propelled the organization to look continually outward so that it has become an emerging international and interreligious fellowship.

The REA was founded to address what many at that time regarded as a crisis in religious and moral education. There is no less a crisis in religious and moral education today, albeit the present crisis is of a somewhat different nature in that it is the result of unsuccessful efforts to address challenges created by the emergence of a contemporary, global culture of encounter. Nevertheless, just as the REA addressed the early twentieth century crisis in religious and moral education, REA:APPRRE can draw insight from its heritage and present-day structure to address the contemporary crisis in religious education. Moreover, as an emerging international and interreligious organization, it has unique resource for addressing this crisis.

So, how specifically can the REA:APPRRE and its members help to educate people to form viable religious and moral commitments today? I suggest that we can begin by taking three steps. Due to space limitations, I sketch these only briefly.

First, I suggest that we need to embrace more intentionally and share more fully the history and vision of the field of religious education. In an age in which religious and moral
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commitments are becoming increasingly problematic, we as religious educators need to ensure that our work is grounded in the viable convictional commitments of our field. We can also share our story and vision as an example of how viable convictional commitments can be forged. In sharing our story we can draw attention to approaches to educating in faith and explorations of issues from religious educational perspectives that are informed by or presuppose an understanding of the paradoxical nature of religious and moral commitments.¹⁵

Second, as part of our commitment to focusing on religious education in religious communities I suggest that we should 1) include an emphasis on helping religious communities and their members learn to explore the public significance of their religious and moral convictions in conversation with those who hold differing commitments, and 2) strive to help religious communities develop language that can guide such conversations. Some religious communities and their members lack a language for distinguishing between differences and distortions in religious and moral commitments because they have focused on tolerance of all perspectives. In contrast, within communities that adopt a back-away-or-confront strategy there is a tendency to equate differences in religious and moral commitments with deficiencies. We need to develop richer languages of religious and moral encounter that can guide religious communities and their members to discover through conversations with those who hold other outlooks on life how differing commitments can sometimes be complementary (affirming the convictional commitments of the dialogue partners) and sometimes challenging (calling the dialogue partners to look outward to discover the fuller meaning of their commitments). At the same time, our languages of religious encounter should lead members of religious communities to reflect critically on possible limitations or deficiencies in their own and others’ religious and moral commitments.

Third, as part of its commitment to exploring the contribution of religious education to the common good in public life and the global community, I suggest that religious educators need to attend more fully to how the contemporary crisis in religious and moral commitment is having a negative influence on social and political life. We must consider how we as religious educators may be called to help people recover a sense of how religious communities can bring distinctive insights into public forums of discourse, while at the same time helping to expand those forums by showing how an openness to a fuller sense of meaning and valuing is made possible when people look at socio-moral issues in the light of an understanding of the transcendent aspects of life. Ultimately, religious educators can take a leading role in exploring what we can do to address socio-moral issues, while also helping us recognize our dependence on the grace of God.
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