In addition, in many of the examples used in the paper, referred to as Weberian "types," what were later called "stages" in the theory are, fundamental direction of his core insight. For example, to later findings and ideas, without changing the function, something Kohlberg would take over 20 years to correct in his scoring systems. The rather traditional academic writing style used in the paper is striking for Kohlberg's followers to read. He clearly was attempting to assure the reader of the research's academic respectability and its fit with the mainline of contemporary (1963) Piagetian psychology. Later papers would assume more of a combative and then pedagogic stance toward other academic points of view. Not far from the surface of the essay, however, is an academic passion in which he seeks to convince the reader that his concept of moral socialization is at least as compelling as that of the functionalist sociologists who saw moral socialization as a matter of "collective socialization" rather than "developmental interactionalism." Also of interest to those with knowledge of Kohlberg's work is the anticipation in the 1963 paper of later criticisms and applications of his later work. Of the latter there is, for example, an understanding of the implications of the type theory for an understanding of delinquency (Kohlberg and I, as well as others, spent 10 years applying developmental moral theory to the problem of prison reform) and the importance of social role-taking as a dynamic in social education. Kohlberg's last efforts were in the creation of school-based just communities in which social role-taking was used as an applied educational intervention technique.

In psychology, as in the other sciences, first steps are perhaps the most important ones in any scientific adventure. On one level, the paper is a promissory note (delivered upon over the next 25 years) in which the discrepancies with later findings are more fascinating because they revealed in Kohlberg an ability to accommodate his theory to research and clinical findings. On another level, the paper is a manifesto of a new direction in psychology, pioneering an interactive view of socialization and a moral perspective from which psychology is to be conducted. Throughout the paper is evidence of an almost stubborn doggedness that marked Kohlberg's life and that allowed him to relentlessly pursue a single question over a 25-year period.

Ironically, the paper is probably one of the least-read of highly cited articles. It was published in a then relatively obscure Swiss journal—I spent several days tracking it down in 1967 after hearing Kohlberg speak about it. I hope that in reviewing it, I have marked a friend and colleague's passing and have stimulated a dialogue on the contributions made by this unusual and brilliant individual to the social sciences and philosophy.