

Chapter 1 : Religion - Wikipedia

*Many say the etymology of religion lies with the Latin word religare, which means "to tie, to bind." This seems to be favored on the assumption that it helps explain the power religion has to bind a person to a community, culture, course of action, ideology, etc.*

What is the definition of evil? Evil is usually thought of as that which is morally wrong, sinful, or wicked; however, the word evil can also refer to anything that causes harm, with or without the moral dimension. The word is used both ways in the Bible. Anything that contradicts the holy nature of God is evil see Psalm Evil behavior includes sin committed against other people murder, theft, adultery and evil committed against God unbelief, idolatry, blasphemy. From the disobedience in the Garden of Eden Genesis 2: Essentially, evil is a lack of goodness. Moral evil is not a physical thing; it is a lack or privation of a good thing. As Christian philosopher J. It is goodness spoiled. You can have good without evil, but you cannot have evil without good. And an absence of love manifests itself in unloving behavior. The lack of these godly qualities in anyone constitutes evil. That evil then manifests itself in behavior that is unmerciful, unjust, impatient, etc. As it turns out, we lack a lot: Moral evil is wrong done to others, and it can exist even when unaccompanied by external action. Murder is an evil action, but it has its start with the moral evil of hatred in the heart Matthew 5: Committing adultery is evil, but so is the moral evil of lust in the heart Matthew 5: Those who fall into evil behavior usually start slowly. Paul shows the tragic progression into more and more evil in Romans 1. It starts with refusing to glorify God or give thanks to Him Romans 1: Only by the grace of God can we be set free. Physical evil is the trouble that befalls people in the world, and it may or may not be linked to moral evil or divine judgment. Sometimes, physical evil is simply the result of an accident or causes unknown, with no known moral cause; examples would include injuries, car wrecks, hurricanes, and earthquakes. Many times, God warned Israel of the calamities that awaited them if they rebelled: In all cases, God works through the situation to bring about His good purpose Romans 8: God is not the author of moral evil; rather, it is His holiness that defines it. He wills our sanctification 1 Thessalonians 4: In repentance and faith in Christ, we have forgiveness of sin and a reversal of the moral evil within us Acts 3:

**Chapter 2 : Utilitarianism: The Greatest Good for the Greatest Number**

*A good action creates good karma, as does good intent. it is found in every religion adopting the premise that God has a plan, or in some way.*

On this view we can more accurately, and less perniciously, understand and describe morally despicable actions, characters, and events using more pedestrian moral concepts such as badness and wrongdoing. By contrast, evil-revivalists believe that the concept of evil has a place in our moral and political thinking and discourse. On this view, the concept of evil should be revived, not abandoned see Russell and Someone who believes that we should do away with moral discourse altogether could be called a moral-skeptic or a moral nihilist. Evil-skepticism is not as broad. Evil-skeptics believe the concept of evil is particularly problematic and should be abandoned while other moral concepts, such as right, wrong, good, and bad, are worth keeping. Evil-skeptics give three main reasons to abandon the concept of evil: The monsters of fictions, such as vampires, witches, and werewolves, are thought to be paradigms of evil. These creatures possess powers and abilities that defy scientific explanation, and perhaps human understanding. Many popular horror films also depict evil as the result of dark forces or Satanic possession. Some evil-skeptics believe that the concept of evil necessarily makes reference to supernatural spirits, dark forces, or creatures. Evil-revivalists respond that the concept of evil need not make reference to supernatural spirits, dark forces, or monsters. The concept of evil would have explanatory power, or be explanatorily useful, if it were able to explain why certain actions were performed or why these actions were performed by certain agents rather than by others. Evil-skeptics such as Inga Clendinnen and Philip Cole argue that the concept of evil cannot provide explanations of this sort and thus should be abandoned. According to Clendinnen the concept of evil cannot explain the performance of actions because it is an essentially dismissive classification. To say that a person, or an action, is evil is just to say that that person, or action, defies explanation or is incomprehensible see Clendinnen , 81; see also, Pocock Joel Feinberg also believes that evil actions are essentially incomprehensible. But he does not think that we should abandon the concept of evil for this reason. Similarly, Cole believes that the concept of evil is often employed when we lack a complete explanation for why an action was performed. For instance, we might wonder why two ten-year-old boys, Robert Thompson and Jon Venerables, tortured and murdered two-year-old James Bulger while other ten-year-old boys with similar genetic characteristics and upbringings cause little harm? Cole believes that the concept of evil is employed in these cases to provide the missing explanation. However, Cole argues that the concept of evil does not provide a genuine explanation in these cases because to say that an action is evil is just to say either that the action resulted from supernatural forces or that the action is a mystery. To say that an event resulted from supernatural forces is not to give a genuine explanation of the event because these forces do not exist. To say that an event is a mystery is not to give a genuine explanation of an event, but rather, it is to suggest that the event cannot be explained at least with the information currently available , 6â€”9. Evil-revivalists have offered several responses to the objection that the concept of evil should be abandoned because it is explanatorily useless. Another common response is to argue that evil is no less explanatorily useful than other moral concepts such as good, bad, right, and wrong Garrard , â€”; Russell , â€” Thus, if we should abandon the concept of evil we should abandon these other moral concepts as well. Eve Garrard and Luke Russell also point out that even if the concept of evil cannot provide a complete explanation for the performance of an action, it can provide a partial explanation. For instance, Garrard argues that evil actions result from a particular kind of motivation. Call this an E motivation. Thus, to say that an action is evil is to say that it has resulted from an E motivation. This provides a partial explanation for why the action was performed. Bush made it more likely that suspected terrorists would be mistreated and less likely that there would be peaceful relations between the peoples and governments of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea and the peoples and government of the United States. But should we abandon the concept of evil because it leads to harm when it is misapplied or abused? So why do they believe that we should abandon the concept of evil? An evil-skeptic might reply that we should abandon only the concept of evil, and not other normative concepts, because the concept of evil is particularly dangerous or susceptible to abuse. We can

discern several reasons why ascriptions of evil might be thought to be more harmful or dangerous than ascriptions of other normative concepts such as badness or wrongdoing. Furthermore, it is reasonable to assume that evildoers not only deserve the greatest form of moral condemnation but also the greatest form of punishment. Thus, not only are wrongfully accused evildoers subjected to harsh judgments undeservedly, they may be subjected to harsh punishments undeservedly as well. For instance, some people believe that to say that someone performed an evil action implies that that person acted out of malevolence see e. Given this ambiguity, it might be unclear whether an attribution of evil attributes despicable psychological attributes to an evildoer, and this ambiguity might result in an overly harsh judgment. For instance, on some conceptions of evil, evildoers are possessed, inhuman, incorrigible, or have fixed character traits See Cole , 11; Russell , , and ; Haybron a and b. These metaphysical and psychological theses about evildoers are controversial. If evildoers have these traits, and thus will continue to perform evil actions no matter what we do, the only appropriate response might be to isolate them from society or to have them executed. But if evildoers do not have these fixed dispositions and they are treated as if they do, they will likely be mistreated. Thus, while most theorists agree that the concept of evil can be harmful or dangerous there is considerable disagreement about what conclusion should be drawn from this fact. Evil-skeptics believe that because the concept of evil is harmful or dangerous we should abandon it in favour of less dangerous concepts such as badness and wrongdoing. Evil-revivalists believe that because the concept of evil is harmful or dangerous more philosophical work needs to be done on it to clear up ambiguities and reduce the likelihood of abuse or misuse. Card and Kekes argue that it is more dangerous to ignore evil than to try to understand it Card and ; Kekes For if we do not understand evil we will be ill-equipped to root out its sources, and thus, we will be unable to prevent evils from occurring in the future. But his reasons for thinking that the concept of evil is dangerous are different from those discussed above. Nietzsche believes that the concept of evil is dangerous because it has a negative effect on human potential and vitality by promoting the weak in spirit and suppressing the strong. In *On the Genealogy of Morality: A Polemic*, Nietzsche argues that the concept of evil arose from the negative emotions of envy, hatred, and resentment he uses the French term *ressentiment* to capture an attitude that combines these elements. He contends that the powerless and weak created the concept of evil to take revenge against their oppressors. Nietzsche believes that the concepts of good and evil contribute to an unhealthy view of life which judges relief from suffering as more valuable than creative self-expression and accomplishment. For this reason Nietzsche believes that we should seek to move beyond judgements of good and evil Nietzsche and Instead, she argues that judgments of evil often indicate a healthy recognition that one has been treated unjustly. Card also argues that we have just as much reason to question the motives of people who believe we should abandon the concept of evil as we do to question the motives of people who use the concept. She suggests that people who want to abandon the concept of evil may be overwhelmed by the task of understanding and preventing evil and would rather focus on the less daunting task of questioning the motives of people who use the term Card , According to this line of argument, it is hard to deny that evil exists; and if evil exists, we need a concept to capture this immoral extreme. A second argument in favour of the concept of evil is that it is only by facing evil, i. A third reason to keep the concept of evil is that categorizing actions and practices as evil helps to focus our limited energy and resources. If evils are the worst sorts of moral wrongs, we should prioritize the reduction of evil over the reduction of other wrongs such as unjust inequalities. For instance, Card believes that it is more important to prevent the evils of domestic violence than it is to ensure that women and men are paid equal wages for equal work Card , 96. A fourth reason not to abandon the concept of evil is that by categorizing actions and practices as evil we are better able to set limits to legitimate responses to evil. By having a greater understanding of the nature of evil we are better able to guard against responding to evil with further evils Card , 78. However, philosophers have considered the nature and origins of evil in the broad sense since ancient times. Although this entry is primarily concerned with evil in the narrow sense, it is useful to survey the history of theories of evil in the broad sense since these theories provide the backdrop against which theories of evil in the narrow sense have been developed. Philosophers and theologians have recognized that to solve the problem of evil it is important to understand the nature of evil. One theory of evil that provides a solution to the problem of evil is

Manichaeism. According to Manichaeism, the universe is the product of an ongoing battle between two coequal and coeternal first principles: God and the Prince of Darkness. From these first principles follow good and evil substances which are in a constant battle for supremacy. The material world constitutes a stage of this cosmic battle where the forces of evil have trapped the forces of goodness in matter. For example, the human body is evil while the human soul is good and must be freed from the body through strict adherence to Manichaeism. The Manichaean solution to the problem of evil is that God is neither all-powerful nor the sole creator of the world. God is supremely good and creates only good things, but he or she is powerless to prevent the Prince of Darkness from creating evil. For more about Manichaeism see Coyne and Lieu. Since its inception, Manichaeism has been criticized for providing little empirical support for its extravagant cosmology. A second problem is that, for a theist, it is hard to accept that God is not an all-powerful sole creator. For these reasons influential medieval philosophers such as Saint Augustine, who initially accepted the Manichaean theory of evil, eventually rejected it in favor of the Neoplatonist approach. For instance, the evil of disease consists in a privation of health, and the evil of sin consists in a privation of virtue. The Neoplatonist theory of evil provides a solution to the problem of evil because if evil is a privation of substance, form, and goodness, then God creates no evil. For instance, it seems that we cannot equate the evil of pain with the privation of pleasure or some other feeling. Pain is a distinct phenomenological experience which is positively bad and not merely not good. Similarly, a sadistic torturer is not just not as good as she could be. She is not simply lacking in kindness or compassion. These are qualities she has, not qualities she lacks, and they are positively bad and not merely lacking in goodness. See Caldera; Kane. See Anglin and Goetz and Grant for replies to these objections. Instead, Kant equates evil with having a will that is not fully good. According to Kant, we have a morally good will only if we choose to perform morally right actions because they are morally right. Kant, 4: There are three grades of evil which can be seen as increasingly more evil stages of corruption in the will. First there is frailty. A person with a frail will attempts to perform morally right actions because these actions are morally right, but she is too weak to follow through with her plans. Instead, she ends up doing wrong due to a weakness of will. Kant, Bk I, 240. The next stage of corruption is impurity. A person with an impure will does not attempt to perform morally right actions just because these actions are morally right. Instead, she performs morally right actions partly because these actions are morally right and partly because of some other incentive, e.

**Chapter 3 : Religion Quotes - BrainyQuote**

*This video is a part of The Religion Teacher's Catholic Social Teaching Activity blog.quintoapp.com get the graphic organizer to accompany this video as well as more than a dozen other worksheets, login to The Religion Teacher, buy the activity pack, or become a premium member.*

Religion Dictionary Search Dictionary: It is a broader term than "member" because the latter refers to an official status that varies according to congregation or denomination. A season of preparation for Christmas , more characteristic of Western Liturgical Churches. Churches originating from founder William Miller in the late 19th century. Miller taught that Christ would soon return to earth and that Saturday, rather than Sunday, should be observed as the Christian Sabbath. Affiliation Change, Measure of: A survey measure of whether an individual has changed religious affiliation as an adult. One of the largest black denominations in the United States. The denomination broke off from the Methodist Episcopal Church in In , it was officially founded by Richard Allen in Philadelphia Prothero The fate of humans after death Smith and Green Descriptions of the afterlife will differ by cultural, historical and geographical context see Egyptian Book of the Dead and Tibetan Book of the Dead. In Eastern religions, such as Hinduism or Buddhism , reincarnation is an afterlife concept. A philosophical position neither affirming nor denying belief in a deity. Agnostics believe the question of whether God exists must be left open and unanswered. The concept comes from David Hume , who questioned the idea of causality, and by extension the historical accuracy of biblical miracles. The term "agnostic" was coined by Thomas Huxley , and was used as a method more than a belief system, claiming that one should seek truth until a certain point where the evidence becomes scarce or non-existent Reid et al. A term in Hinduism , Buddhism , and Jainism that is often translated as "non-violence," referring to not harming or wishing to harm. In Jainism, nonviolence is considered the highest moral duty, as Jain ascetics even attempt to avoid the injury and death of insects. Ahimsa also influenced Gandhi and his nonviolent campaign in India Prothero One of the most important caliphs in Islam. He was cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet Muhammad , founder of Islam. Ali was brutally murdered in CE by an assassin. In addition, Shiite Muslims trace the lineage of the imams through him Esposito A feeling of estrangement from society as a whole, or from its dominant institutions, but not necessarily estrangement from all local religious groups Dean ; Neal and Rettig A feast celebrated in the Western Church on the first of November to commemorate Christian martyrs and all those who have led conspicuously holy lives. A term in Islam , meaning "God" in Arabic. In the Koran , Allah is viewed as merciful and compassionate along with being all powerful Prothero Richard Allen was an influential black minister who established the African Methodist Episcopal Church in , the first black denomination in the United States. For more information on Richard Allen, click here. An international terrorist organization founded by Osama bin Laden in the s. The organization seeks to establish a transnational Islamic empire that strictly adheres to Islamic law. The group is most famous for the attack on the World Trade Center on September 11th, The leader, Osama bin Laden, was killed on May 2, by U. Navy seals and CIA operatives Prothero A Christian theological position that the thousand-year reign of Jesus Christ is symbolic, not literal, and is a period between the ministry of Christ and the Second Coming. It emphasizes the present reality of the Kingdom of God, and that the perfect age will not arrive until the establishment of the new heaven and the new earth. See Premillennialism for more. A group of the Mennonites who broke away in the late seventeenth century, led by the minister Jacob Amman. He supported a strict interpretation of discipline and the practice of avoidance, shunning excommunicated members. They arrived in America in the early s, and have retained a fairly separatist environment from modern culture ever since, preferring to cultivate a community more representative of the late seventeenth century Melton Moreover, it stresses the community. The analogical imagination contrasts with the dialectical imagination , which stresses the individual and the belief that God has withdrawn from the sinful world. This concept was developed by Andrew Greeley , who believed that Catholics tend to have analogical imagination, while Protestants tend to have dialectical imagination. Cousin and disciple of the Buddha who lived in the sixth century BCE. He also is known for his support of female disciples Smith and Green A Buddhist doctrine denying the reality of a

permanent, immortal soul as the spiritual center of a human. The term means "no self," and it is meant to teach that all things are connected and there is no separate existence Esposito et al. The worship, feeding and petitioning of the souls of dead ancestors at home altars, temples and graves. This practice is most common among East Asian religions Esposito et al. A superhuman intermediary between the divine and human realm. Angels exist in Judaism , Christianity and Islam. Theological discussions of the nature of angels vary by tradition Smith and Green Some view the Anglican Church as a "middle way" between Catholicism and Protestantism , since both traditions have influenced Anglican theology and practice Mead et al. For more information on the Anglican family, click here. The belief in an inner soul that represents the main identity for all humans, animals, plants and places. It places a large emphasis on ritualistic activities Esposito et al. Anomie can be interpreted in terms of the values and norms of society, both of which may be established and supported by religion Stark and Bainbridge In Christian literature, the Antichrist is an evil figure that deceives people into thinking that he is holy. In the end-times , according to the Christian tradition, Jesus will come back and defeat the Antichrist Smith and Green In Islamic eschatology , there also is an Antichrist figure that is depicted in the Hadith as a one-eyed monster from the East who rules the earth for a period of time before Jesus comes to vanquish him Hinnells The famous "Antinomian Controversy" took place in the s, where Anne Hutchinson was brought to trial in Massachusetts for claiming to follow her direct revelation of the Holy Spirit instead of Scripture alone. She was banished from the colony in Reid et al. Unreasoning hostility toward and discrimination against the Jews. It can range from a formal doctrine and from mild antipathy to active efforts to kill the Jews. German writer Wilhelm Marr coined the term in to distinguish between secular hatred for the Jews as a people and hatred toward the Jewish religion , although the modern usage of the word denotes hatred for the Jews and Judaism in all forms Smith and Green Catastrophic end-times battle between good and evil, in which good will triumph over evil. The Greek term refers to "hidden things. A collection of books or chapters of books not included in the Hebrew Bible , but present in various Christian versions of the Old Testament , mostly in the Catholic and Orthodox traditions. These traditions see the Apocrypha as authoritative, whereas Protestantism does not. Protestant Bibles either exclude the Apocrypha or create a separate section for it found in-between the Old and New Testament. Traditions that include this collection of terms prefer the term "deuterocanonical" books, not the Apocrypha. This collection of books is not to be confused with the pseudepigrapha or the Christian Apocrypha , which are not regarded as authoritative by any major branch of Christianity Smith and Green The argumentation or defense on behalf of a certain religious faith. It is usually directed toward those outside the faith community, but the audience is usually those within the faith community Reid et al. Famous apologists include Orestes Brownson and Francis Schaeffer. One who engages in apologetics see Apologetics. Departing or falling away from a religious faith. In Christianity , it is the complete renunciation of the faith through either words or actions Reid et al. It refers to both the mission and representational authority of someone sent on a mission by a superior. In Christianity , "apostle" refers to the authoritative mission conferred to Christ on his disciples, with special emphasis on the Twelve Apostles and other specific people, to continue his mission on earth after his resurrection-ascension Reid et al. The bishop of an Archdiocese. Catholic Churches , Eastern Orthodox Churches , and Anglican Churches maintain these hierarchal positions, although the jurisdiction, positional rank and specific role of the archbishop differs by tradition Reid et al. A large diocese overseen by the Archbishop. Since the fourth century CE, neighboring dioceses have been grouped into provinces, and the most important province has been designated as the archdiocese, while the others are called "suffragan dioceses. One who has attained the final stage of enlightenment in Theravada Buddhism. Over time, a distinction arose between arhats and bodhisattvas , and some Mahayanists came to malign arhats as a selfish and inferior enterprise, lacking in the compassion of the bodhisattva. There has been some debate as to whether only monks and nuns or laypeople can be arhats, and whether arhats still exist today Smith and Green A term referring to the battle between god and evil in the last days. The term itself only appears once in the Bible in Revelation When many Methodist missionaries fled back to England during the American Revolution, he stayed behind and continued spreading Methodism. For more information on Francis Asbury, click here. The complete renunciation of physical pleasures and other bodily desires in order to foster spiritual development. This practice is common in many religious traditions,

including Buddhism , Catholicism , Eastern Orthodoxy and classical Hinduism Smith and Green The first day of the Lent in the Western calendar, where individuals spread ashes on their forehead as a sign of penitence or mortality Smith and Green Jews originating from central and eastern Europe. This group adopted Yiddish , a language based on medieval German. One of the largest Pentecostal denominations in the United States. As the Pentecostal movement began to flourish in the early 20th century, several diverse regional constituencies of the Reformed tradition desired to combine their efforts into one movement.

**Chapter 4 : What is the definition of evil?**

*Religion may be defined as a cultural system of designated behaviors and practices, worldviews, texts, sanctified places, prophecies, ethics, or organizations, that relates humanity to supernatural, transcendental, or spiritual elements.*

Revision History Introduction There are two ways of thinking about ethics, which manifest themselves as two clusters of concepts and language, or domains of discourse, used to recommend or command specific actions or habits of character. They may be called the Good and the Right. The good has to do with achievement of goals; the right, with laws and rules. The goodness paradigm recognizes that people have desires and aspirations, and frames values in terms of what enables a being to achieve its ends. The rightness paradigm recognizes that people live in groups that require organization and regulations, and frames values in terms of duty and conformance to rules. Many ways of thinking about ethics focus on whether specific actions are good or bad, or right or wrong. They help one decide what he or she should do in a particular case or class of cases, or evaluate after the fact actions that someone else has done. Another approach, Virtue Ethics, focuses on qualities of character and motives for action. Within Virtue Ethics the distinction between the good and the right is also applicable. Questions about what sort of character traits one should cultivate can be answered on the basis either of what is good or of what is right. Compassion and insight are typical goodness virtues, and a disposition of conscientious obedience is a typical rightness virtue. The Good and the Right each have their area of applicability; they often get confused; and their confusion causes no end of trouble. In this chapter I compare and contrast the two in order to promote clarity of thought. In addition, I give reasons for preferring the goodness paradigm over rightness.

The Good What is good has to do with benefits. Something that benefits something or someone else is called good for that thing or person. We can think of this instrumentally or biologically. Instrumentally, a hammer is good for pounding nails, and what is good for the hammer is what enables it to do so well. Biologically, air, water, and food are good for living beings. Instrumentally, what is good for a thing enables that thing to serve its purpose. Thus, a hammer is good for pounding nails, and nails are good for building things such as furniture or housing, and we build furniture and housing because we want the comfort and utility they afford us. The instrumental usage is expressed in terms of usefulness, of utility for achieving a purpose or intention. Some hammers are better than others in that they have better heft or weight or balance and thus can be used to pound nails more effectively. The instrumental usage leads to the biological usage. Why is it good for human beings to have comfort and utility? Because comfort and utility nourish us and keep us alive. Unlike the instrumental usage, the biological usage does not require reference to conscious purpose or intention. The biological usage is expressed in terms of health and well-being. Biologically, what is good for an organism is what helps it survive and thrive, what nourishes it. Some things are better for us than others in this respect. For instance, a diet of whole grains and vegetables is better, in the sense of providing better health for humans, than a diet of simple carbohydrates and fats. The good, in this sense, is that which enables a thing to function well. The instrumental usage intersects the biological when we consider what is good for something that is itself good for a purpose or intention. For instance, keeping a hammer clean and sheltered from the elements is good for the hammer; if it gets too dirty to handle easily or too rusty to provide a good impact on the nail, it is not useful as a hammer. So we can talk about what is good for the hammer in a way that is analogous to what is good for a living being. The good, in this sense also, is that which enables a thing to function well. The approach to ethics that emphasizes goodness is called the teleological approach, from a Greek word, telos, that means "end", "purpose", or "goal". Biologically, what is good for an organism helps that organism survive and thrive. Just as good is defined in relation to an end, the value of the end is defined in relation to another end. For instance, a hammer is good for driving nails. Driving nails is good for, among other things, building houses. We build houses to have shelter and warmth. And we desire shelter and warmth because they sustain our life. This chain of goods and ends stretches in both directions from wherever we arbitrarily start looking. A hammer is good for driving nails. So what is good for the hammer? Whatever enables it to perform its function. It is not good to leave it out in the rain; it is good to handle it carefully, swing it accurately with grace and force, and put it away safely. That whole grains are good for humans means

that the effect of eating them is healthful. That a hammer is good for pounding nails means that using it for that purpose is likely to have the effect you want, namely that the nails go in easily and straight. The Goodness approach to ethics uses the terms "good" and "bad" and their variants and synonyms to evaluate actions, things, people, states of affairs, etc. That some plants need full sunlight to thrive and others need shade means that full sunlight is good for the former and not so good for the latter. I am very skeptical of claims there exists something absolutely good, that is, something alleged to be good without reference to its effects. Also, there is no end to the chains of goods and ends, no summum bonum highest good in which all chains culminate or from which all goods are derived. The world is a web, not a hierarchy. The only ultimate good would be the good of the entire universe and all that is within it, not an abstract entity or concept apart from it. An ethic "a set of moral principles or values" based on goodness applied to concerns about choices between courses of action will ask questions about the anticipated or hoped-for benefits of one course of action as opposed to another. The Right What is right has to do with conformance to rules or regulations. This is easy to see in non-ethical situations. For instance, the right answer to "What is 37 divided by 9? In ethical situations, we apply a moral rule to determine what the right course of action is. The moral rule in this case is "it is wrong to keep something that does not belong to one. We could also call this a rules-based approach. That characteristic is its conformance to a rule. Morality is concerned with identifying and obeying moral rules. It is right to obey the rules and wrong to disobey them. Any particular act can be judged right or wrong according to whether and to what extent it conforms to the moral rules. A central concern, then, is to identify the rules so one can make sure one is acting in accordance with them. The language associated with this school uses the terms "right" and "wrong" to evaluate actions. Some synonyms for "right" are "proper," "legal" and "correct. Humans seem to have an innate sense of morality, of right and wrong; but, notoriously, the actual set of rules they espouse varies from culture to culture. Philosophers have proposed numerous ways of determining what the rules are, such as divine command, the dictates of pure reason, and using an intuitive moral sense to apprehend an unseen but existent world of values. So far, there is no agreement on which of these is correct. Often one does not need to do what is best. Fitting, appropriate, in harmony with the way things are. This sense is more akin to the goodness paradigm. This is an uncritical usage and is the least useful. I mention these for completeness. Confusion Between the Good and the Right All too often people confuse the notions of good and right. The confusion is understandable. Both concepts apply to what one should do, and often the debate is really about persuading someone to act in a certain way. Clarity of language and conceptual rigor seem to be less important than rhetoric. Here is an example: Here is another example: All would benefit, and innovation would accelerate appropriately. Unfortunately, it appears the GPLv3 is finding new ways to rip the innovation fabric in half. Why It Matters If someone says something is good, one can always ask "good for what? That something is in accordance with a moral rule does not make it good. Making the distinction between Good and Right is important because it promotes clarity of thought. I do not argue that clarity of language is a necessary condition for clarity of thought, but it certainly helps. Some people think more in pictures than words. I know artists who can get a little confused about words but create absolutely stunning works of art. Clear thinking enables one to survive and thrive. It consists of two parts, often called Normative ethics and Meta-ethics. Professional ethics, the consensus in a profession as to what constitutes appropriate behavior, is a subset of normative ethics. The goal of normative ethics is to figure out what to do. This ranges from defining broadly-applicable maxims or rules for conduct to making specific decisions in response to particular circumstances. Normative ethics reasons from general principles to decisions about what to do in specific cases. Questions about the nature of the general principles are the province of meta-ethics. For instance, the languages of Good and Right are ways to formulate the general principles, and the choice of which language to adopt is a meta-ethical question.

**Chapter 5 : Karma - Wikipedia**

*The good, in this sense also, is that which enables a thing to function well. The approach to ethics that emphasizes goodness is called the teleological approach, from a Greek word, telos, that means "end", "purpose", or "goal".*

What do they mean by that? The service and worship of God or the supernatural; commitment or devotion to religious faith or observance; a personal set or institutionalized system of religious attitudes, beliefs, and practices. The editors of the Merriam-Webster dictionary wrote these definitions in a broad way so that the wide variety of religions on earth would be included in the definition. In fact, for all I know, you could make a case that this definition would cover non-theistic belief systems such as Wicca and the existence of aliens. Christianity is a monotheistic system of belief involving faith and worship, so it would seem to qualify as a religion according to the dictionary definition. Talk about deflating our credibility in any conversation or debate. Religion has a long, honorable history as an English word, and for centuries nobody complained when someone stated that Christianity was a religion. Watch out for those liberal intellectuals who are changing the meanings of all the words! How did Webster define religion in ? According to Webster almost years ago, Christianity is absolutely a religion. He even refers to a Bible verse in the definition see under sense 2. Take a look for yourself: This word seems originally to have signified an oath or vow to the gods, or the obligation of such an oath or vow, which was held very sacred by the Romans. It therefore comprehends theology, as a system of doctrines or principles, as well as practical piety; for the practice of moral duties without a belief in a divine lawgiver, and without reference to his will or commands, is not religion. Religion, as distinct from theology, is godliness or real piety in practice, consisting in the performance of all known duties to God and our fellow men, in obedience to divine command, or from love to God and his law. What other common English words do Christians sometimes assign strange or nonstandard meanings to? This expression is often associated with evangelicals see various citations. For the expression to be interpreted correctly, the word religion must be understood in a specific way that is markedly different from how dictionaries typically define the word. Christians who use this expression are using a definition of religion along the lines of this one: Since Christians are saved by grace and not by works , Christianity would not be a religion according to this definition. May we go forward remembering that Christianity is not a religion which merely lays upon us weak, human beings the hopeless task of living an impossibly good life helped only by the example of a man who lived a perfect human life 2, years ago, but rather that Christianity is a relationship to God whereby He communicates to us His strength and vitality which enables us to live on a higher plane. For the first time in my life I realized that the key to Christianity is Jesus Christ. Christianity is a relationship not a religion or code of ethics. Beginning a New Life in Christ Religion is a set of rules and rituals. Christianity is not a religion, but a relationship. Jesus brings us into a personal relationship with God who loves us. Christianity is not a religion. Christianity is a relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ. We hear our preachers say that Christianity is a relationship, not a religion. But the Latin root of the word religion is ligare€”the same as the root for ligament, the tendon that holds together, the muscle that joins, the tie that binds. Good religion holds us together. Evangelical and Pentecostal Protestants have played on this idea and assured people that Christianity is a relationship, not a religion. But Christians who speak this phrase are referring to a popular understanding of religion that means a set of rules that one has to follow to gain approval from God. Worldmark Encyclopedia of Religious Practices: Religions and Denominations I. Evangelicals, however, tend to interpret liturgical patterns as overly ceremonial. Jesus as a Way of Life The idea of journeying and walking with God is one of the classic biblical metaphors for Christian living. Keys to Living Naturally Supernatural Effective prayer that brings Heaven to earth is about intimacy not performance, resting not striving, faith not formula, relationship not religion. A Theology of Public Witness

Chapter 6 : What is moral action? | Ethical Religion by M K Gandhi : Complete Book Online

*The Importance of Religion reveals the significance of religion in modern times, showing how it provides people with meaning to their lives and helps guide them in their everyday moral choices Provides readers with a new understanding of religion, demonstrating how in its actions, texts and world views religion is enduring and vividly engages with the mystery of the world Offers striking.*

Definitions of the word "religion" Problems. Some dictionary definitions Problems with definitions of "Religion: Many attempts have been made. Many people focus on a very narrow definition that matches their own religion, but few if any others. To limit religion to only one of these categories is to miss its multifaceted nature and lose out on the complete definition. Some exclude beliefs and practices that many people passionately defend as religious. For example, their definition might require a belief in a God or Goddess or combination of Gods and Goddesses who are responsible for the creation of the universe and for its continuing operation. Also, Unitarians , who are called Unitarian Universalists in the U. Some definitions equate "religion" with "Christianity," and thus define two out of every three humans in the world as non-religious. Some definitions are so broadly written that they include beliefs and areas of study that most people do not regard as religious. These are fields of investigation that most people regard to be a scientific studies and non-religious in nature. Sometimes, definitions of "religion" contain more than one deficiency. Sponsored link Some attempts to define the word religion inclusively: Many Unitarian Universalists and progressive Christians are excluded by this description. It would also reject all religions that are not monotheistic, including: Duotheistic religions like Wicca and Zoroastrianism , because they believe in a dual deity. Polytheistic religions like Hinduism , since the above definition refers to "a" personal God, and these religions believe in a pantheon, usually consisting of both Gods and Goddesses. A specific fundamental set of beliefs and practices generally agreed upon by a number of persons or sects: Something one believes in and follows devotedly; a point or matter of ethics or conscience: Also it requires that a person pursue their religion with enthusiasm. Many people identify themselves with a specific religion, but are not intensely engaged with their faith. This dual nature of religion is expressed clearly in the Christian Scriptures New Testament in Matthew This is the first and great commandment. The beliefs, attitudes, emotions, behavior, etc. An essential part or a practical test of the spiritual life. An object of conscientious devotion or scrupulous care: His work is a religion to him. Religious practice or belief. These spiritual things can be God, people in relation to God, salvation, after life, purpose of life, order of the cosmos, etc. Although it is partly built around belief in a God or Goddess, it would also accept a belief system involving ones beliefs in "highest truth. Monotheistic religions like Judaism , Christianity , Islam , Sikhism , etc. The following information sources were used to prepare and update the above essay. The hyperlinks are not necessarily still active today.

*Just as an action prompted by the motive of material gain here on earth is non-moral. That action is moral which is done only for the sake of doing good.*

What Is Moral Action? When can it be said that a particular action is moral? In asking this question, the intention is not to contrast moral with immoral actions, but to consider many of our everyday actions against which nothing can be said from the conventional standpoint and which some regard as moral. Most of our actions are probably non-moral; they do not necessarily involve morality. For the most part we act according to the prevailing conventions. Such conventional behaviour is often necessary. If no such rules are observed, anarchy would be the result, and society-social intercourse would come to an end. Still the mere observance of custom and usage cannot properly be called morality. A moral act must be our own act; it must spring from our own will. If we act mechanically, there is no moral content in our act. Such an action would be moral, if we think it proper to act like a machine and do so. For in doing so, we use our discrimination. We should bear in mind the distinction between acting mechanically and acting intentionally. It may be a moral act of a king to pardon a culprit. How can a man understand morality who does not use his own intelligence and power of thought, but let himself be swept along like a log of wood by a current? Sometimes a man defies convention and acts on his own with a view to [doing] absolute good. Such a great hero was Wendell Phillips<sup>1</sup>. Addressing an assembly of people, he once said, "Till you learn to form your own opinions and express them, I do not care much what you think of me. We shall not reach this stage, as long as we do not believe-and experience the belief-that God within us, the God of all, is the ever present witness to all our acts. It is not enough that an act done by us is in itself good; it should have been done with the moral or otherwise depends upon the intention of the doer. Two men may have done exactly the same thing; but the act of one may be moral, and that of the other contrary. Take, for instance, a man who out of great pity feeds the poor and another who does the same, but with the motive of winning prestige or with some such selfish end. Though the action is the same, the act of the one is moral and that of the other non-moral. The reader here ought to remember the distinction between the two words, non-moral and immoral. It may be that we do not always see good results flowing from a moral act. While thinking of morality, all that we need to see is that the act is good and is done with a good intention. The result of an action is not within our control. God alone is the giver of fruit. Historians have called Emperor Alexander "great". Wherever he went [in the course of his conquests,] he took the Greek language and Greek culture, arts and manners, and today we enjoy the benefits of Greek civilization. But the intention of Alexander behind all this was only conquest and renown. Who can therefore say that his actions were moral? It was all right that he was termed "great", but moral he cannot be called. These reflections prove that it is not enough for a moral act to have been done with a good intention. The result of an action is not within our compulsion. There is no morality whatever in my act, if I rise early out of the fear that, if I am late for my office, I may lose my situation. Similarly there is no morality in my living a simple and unpretentious life if I have not the means to live otherwise. But plain, simple living would be moral if, though wealthy, I think of all the want and misery in the world about me -and feel that I ought to live a plain, simple life and not one of ease and luxury. Likewise it is only selfish, and not moral, of an employer to sympathize with his employees or to pay them higher wages lest they leave him. It would be moral if the employer wished well of them and treated them kindly realizing how we owed his prosperity to them. This means that for an act to be moral it has to be free from fear and compulsion. When the peasants rose in revolt and with bloodshot eyes went to King Richard II of England demanding their rights, he granted them the rights under his own seal and signature. But when the danger was over, he forced them to surrender the letters. For his first act was done only out of fear and had not an iota of morality about it. Just as a moral action should be free from fear or compulsion so should there be no self-interest behind it. This is not to say that actions prompted by self-interest are all worthless, but only that to call them moral would detract from the [dignity of the] moral idea. That honesty cannot long endure which is practiced in the belief that it is the best policy. As Shakespeare says, love born out of the profit motive is no love. Not for the sake of winning heaven,

Or of escaping hell; Not with the hope of gaining aught, Not seeking a reward- But as thyself hast loved me, O everlasting Lord! That action is moral which is done only for the sake of doing good. A great Christian, St. Francis Xavier, passionately prayed that his mind might always remain pure. The great saint Theresa wished to have a torch in her right hand and a vessel of water in her left, so that with the one she might burn the glories of heaven and with the other extinguish the fires of hell, and men might learn to serve God from love alone-without fear from hell and without temptation of heavenly bliss. To preserve morality thus demands a brave man prepared to face even death. It is cowardice to be true to friends and to break faith with enemies. Those who do good out of fear and haltingly have no moral virtue. Henry Clay, known for his kindness, sacrifice his convictions to his ambition. Daniel Webster, for all his great intellect and his sense of the heroic and the sublime, once sold his intellectual integrity for a price. By a single mean act he wiped out all his good deeds. We have also the answer to the question raised at the outset in this chapter: Incidentally, we also saw which kind of men could live up to that morality. Here follows a poem from Kavyadohan, an anthology of Gujarati verse, but it is not reproduced in this book.

Chapter 8 : Action | Define Action at [blog.quintoapp.com](http://blog.quintoapp.com)

*Affirmative action, when used as a factor in college admissions, is meant to foster diversity and provide equal opportunities in education for underrepresented minorities.*

Where there are fewer women or minorities than would be reasonably expected, the employer has to establish goals. Numerical goals do not create guarantees for specific groups or preferences, nor are they designed to achieve proportional representation or equal results. No requirement exists that any specific position be filled by a person of a particular race, gender or ethnicity. By casting a wider net and recruiting a diverse pool of qualified individuals, an affirmative action employer eliminates preferences and levels the playing field for all. The essence of affirmative action is opportunity. In seeking to achieve its goals, an employer is never required to hire a person who does not have the qualifications needed to perform the job successfully. Affirmative action prevents discrimination; it does not cause it. The Executive Order does not require that contractors treat goals as either a ceiling or a floor for the employment of particular groups. The standard is and has always been "good faith effort. Affirmative Action Programs benefit women, persons with disabilities and veterans as well. The emphasis is on opportunity: The debate over affirmative action demarcates a philosophical divide, separating those with sharply different views of the "American dilemma" -- how the nation should treat African Americans, other people of color and women. This division centers on a number of questions: The continuing need for affirmative action is demonstrated by the data. In Fiscal Year there were 88, charges of discrimination filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: According to Diversity in Higher Education. Minority representation in faculty, administrators, and governing boards do not match minority representation in the student body: These initiatives were at least modestly successful, bringing about African-American participation in elections for the first time. Sporadic efforts to remedy the results of hundreds of years of slavery, segregation and denial of opportunity have been made since the end of the Civil War. A significant number of African Americans held public office, including two U. But when the federal government withdrew its support for Reconstruction in the late s, the gains made by African Americans were quickly stripped away and replaced by a patchwork system of legal segregation including, in some instances, legal segregation of Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans as well. By , in Plessy v. Ferguson, the Supreme Court upheld the cornerstone segregationist doctrine of "separate but equal" - i. In the modern era, the concept of affirmative action was reborn on June 25, , when President Franklin Roosevelt -- seeking to avert a march on Washington organized by civil rights pioneer A. Philip Randolph -- issued Executive Order requiring defense contractors to pledge nondiscrimination in employment in government-funded projects. Two years later, President Roosevelt extended coverage of the executive order to all federal contractors and subcontractors. But it also found "the wartime gains of Negro, Mexican-American and Jewish workers. This was succeeded by another executive order Executive Order issued by President Lyndon Johnson, along with the creation of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance in the Department of Labor to enforce its non-discrimination and affirmative action requirements. The Executive Order was amended in to include prohibitions on sex discrimination by federal contractors, along with a requirement that they engage in good faith efforts to expand job opportunities for women. Executive Order remains among the most effective and far-reaching federal programs for expanding equal opportunity. Implementation of affirmative action started slowly, with the construction industry the site of one of the first tests. In , the Office of Federal Contract Compliance created government-wide programs to redress the years of discrimination in the construction industry. The series of affirmative action programs was designed to boost minority employment by emphasizing hiring results in federally funded construction jobs. In the Rehabilitation Act required federal agencies and contractors to take affirmative action in employment and promotion for people with disabilities. The Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of called for "the preferential employment of disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era Affirmative action was understood to be the creation of opportunities to compete and not an assurance of success. The various programs culminated in the "Philadelphia Plan," implemented under President Nixon. This plan required contractors doing business with

the federal government to commit themselves to self-determined numerical goals for minorities. By withstanding challenges both in Congress and the courts, the Philadelphia Plan helped establish affirmative action as a way of life for American employers. Indeed, employers often embraced affirmative action as a good business practice, enabling them to tap into larger, more diverse, and more qualified pools of talent. In a letter to President Reagan, the business group said it "believes the current executive order provides the framework for an affirmative action policy" and argued that "the business community is concerned that the elimination of goals and timetables could result in confusing compliance standards on federal, state and municipal levels and a proliferation of reverse discrimination suits. President Franklin Roosevelt issues Executive Order , which bans racial discrimination in any defense industry receiving federal contracts and established the Fair Employment Practices Committee to investigate such complaints. In , President Roosevelt broadened the coverage of Executive Order by making it applicable to all government contractors. Nearly a decade later, on December 3, , President Harry S. The committee, as its name implies, was tasked with overseeing compliance by federal contractors with the non-discrimination provisions of Executive Order This reorganization furthered the principle that "it is the obligation of the contracting agencies of the United States Government and government contractors to insure compliance with, and successful execution of, the equal employment opportunity program of the United States Government. President Kennedy meets with civil rights leaders. By the time John F. Kennedy was elected President, it was evident that to advance equal employment opportunity federal involvement needed to be broader and more proactive. On March 6, , shortly after JFK took office, he signed Executive Order , opening a new chapter in achieving access to good jobs by requiring government contractors to "take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color or national origin. In his commencement address to graduates of Howard University, LBJ gave voice to his vision, declaring, "We seek not just freedom but opportunity. We seek not just legal equity but human ability, not just equality as a right and a theory but equality as a fact and equality as a result. Today, Executive Order , as amended and further strengthened over the years, remains a major safeguard, protecting the rights of workers employed by federal contractors-approximately one-fifth of the entire U. In , the Nixon administration picked up a plan that the Johnson administration had put forth for the construction industry in the city of Philadelphia, referred to as the Philadelphia Plan. The Johnson administration plan was faulted for not having definite minimum standards for the required affirmative action programs. The Nixon plan did issue minimum standards—specific targets for minority employees in several trades. This allowed the administration to argue it was not setting quotas, though critics of the plan suggested the administration was in fact doing so. The Plan set the tone for affirmative action plans that followed. Soon, the standards put forth in the Philadelphia Plan were incorporated into Executive Order which affected all federal government contractors, who were required for the first time to put forth written affirmative action plans with numerical targets. After the implementation of the Philadelphia Plan, legislation was passed at the federal, state, and municipal levels implementing affirmative action plans using the Philadelphia Plan as a model. Today, almost all government affirmative action plans are offshoots of the Philadelphia Plan. The courts, however, have provided a more accurate and precise definition: Such quotas are legally impermissible and are not a component of lawful affirmative action programs. What affirmative action does sometimes involve is the establishment of a numerically expressed hiring goal, often in connection with a timetable. Indeed, as mentioned above, the Executive Order program covering federal contractors relies on the use of goals. Having established a goal, which is tied to the availability of qualified minority and women workers in the labor market, the employer pledges a "good faith" effort to achieve the goal. Failure to achieve the goal, however, does not, in and of itself, subject the employer to sanctions unless the affirmative action has been judicially ordered as a remedy to illegal discrimination. Ironically, affirmative action is used to eliminate the effects of preferences enjoyed by some for more than three centuries. In a news release of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights regarding the language used by the proponents of the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative in , executive director Wade Henderson stated: Placement goals serve as objectives or targets reasonably attainable by means of applying every good faith effort to make all aspects of the entire affirmative action program work. Placement goals also are used to measure progress toward achieving equal employment

opportunity. In the event of a substantial disparity in the utilization of a particular minority group or in the utilization of men or women of a particular minority group, a contractor may be required to establish separate goals for those groups. Quotas are expressly forbidden. Affirmative action programs prescribed by the regulations in this part do not require a contractor to hire a person who lacks qualifications to perform the job successfully, or hire a less qualified person in preference to a more qualified one. In *Regents of the University of California v. At the same time*, however, in an opinion written by Justice Powell, it ruled that race could lawfully be considered as one of several factors in making admissions decisions. *United Steelworkers of America v. Weber* involved a new in-plant training program for workers at a Louisiana plant that had hired few minorities in skilled positions. The employer and the union had agreed that 50 percent of the positions in the training program would go to African American employees and 50 percent to whites. Within each group, positions would be filled on the basis of seniority, meaning some junior African Americans would be admitted ahead of more senior whites. In rejecting the claims of a white employee that the program violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Court said the law allowed affirmative action by private parties "to eliminate traditional patterns of racial segregation". One test of lawfulness was whether the program "unduly" trampled on the interests of white workers. The Court held that the plan passed the test because it did not require firing any white workers, nor did it create an "absolute bar" to white advancement. The plan was also permissible because it was "a temporary measure; it [was] not intended to maintain racial balance, but simply to eliminate a manifest racial imbalance. Klutznick, the Supreme Court upheld a congressionally- enacted 10 percent minority business set-aside of federal funds for state and local public works. In the ruling, the Court stressed the remedial nature of the set-aside, with Chief Justice Burger writing that the program "was designed to ensure that Memphis Fire Department the Court took on the hard issue of whether seniority would determine the order of layoffs in the Memphis fire department even at the cost of wiping out affirmative action. It ruled that Title VII "precludes a district court from displacing a non-minority employee with seniority under the contractually established seniority system absent either a finding that the seniority system was adopted with discriminatory intent or a determination that such a remedy was necessary to make whole a proven victim of discrimination. In testimony before Congress, Reynolds said the department would end the use of any goals and timetables as a remedy to correct discrimination -- a stance the department carried into its court cases, relying almost exclusively on recruitment programs as remedies for employment discrimination, but refusing to look at the number of minorities or women actually hired or promoted. At the same time, Reynolds and the department sought to undo the affirmative action remedies that had been agreed to prior to the Reagan administration. Reynolds construed *Stotts* as holding that any form of race or gender-conscious relief were impermissible. These views were rejected by the courts. The court in again emphasized that lawful affirmative action programs cannot require that male workers be discharged to make way for female workers. *Jackson Board of Education*, the Court held that a public employer may not lay off more senior white workers to protect the jobs of less senior black workers. Men and whites cannot be excluded from consideration for opportunities; all candidates must have the chance to compete and have their qualifications compared to others. *Paradise and Johnson v. In Paradise*, the Court upheld a one-for-one promotion requirement i. In the second case, *Johnson v. The employer developed its plan after its review found that no women were employed in any of its skilled craft jobs.*

**Chapter 9 : Affirmative Action (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)**

*Religion Dictionary. New Testament Greek word "euangelizomai," which means "to proclaim the good news" schemas from which they derive patterns of action.*

To get the graphic organizer to accompany this video as well as more than a dozen other worksheets, login to The Religion Teacher, buy the activity pack , or become a premium member. To pursue the common good is to work towards the greatest good for all persons, not the greatest good for the greatest number and certainly not the greatest good for only a specific group of people. There is a difference between the good for a majority of people and the good for all people. One example that is sometimes used to illustrate the common good is a sports team. The common good of a team is to win, or maybe to protect the integrity of the game. Certainly, a team wants individual players to perform well and to improve, but ultimately the common good of the team is to win. This sometimes requires star players to make sacrifices in order for the team to work together to win. Then, of course, there is the role of the coach in a sports team. The coach must protect the common good of the team that goal of winning not just the individual players and their individual goods. Likewise, it is the role of the state to defend and promote the common good of civil society and its citizens. The Catechism of the Catholic Church describes three essential elements of the common good: The common good presupposes respect for the person as such. The public authorities government must respect and protect the rights of the human person. The common good requires the social well-being and development of the group itself. Public authorities should make accessible what is needed to lead a truly human life, for example: The common good requires peace. Public authority should ensure a morally acceptable means of security and defense of its people. In addition, however, we also pursue a Universal Common Good. The world today is increasingly interdependent, meaning, we all rely on other countries for our own well-being. Though we may live in different parts of the world, we are all a part of one human family and, therefore, we seek a universal common good. This means that nations must also help humans who are not from their country. This is why the Church works toward assisting refugees and migrants who are displaced from their homes. Jesus taught the Golden Rule to his disciples: From this law is drawn the great wisdom of the common good.