

**Chapter 1 : The Common Good FAQ - Marriage Unique for a Reason**

*The "common good" is not as easy to define. However the general idea with it is that in certain situations, the rights of individuals must step down in favor of the collective will of a group or community. Simply put, this theme is defined as the struggle of the rights of the individual and the.*

His many books currently in print include: *An Introductory Exposition* He is a retired minister in the United Methodist Church. His email address is cobbj cgu. This essay was delivered at St. SUMMARY Our shrinking planet cannot afford the continuation of the view of individual people or individual nations competing for scarce resources. It can only survive if the movements toward cooperation for the common good gain dominance. The title of this discussion points toward the need to clarify what we mean by the common good. Is it the greatest good of the greatest number? But do we, then, think of it as describing a situation that is ideal in some independence of the people who participate in it? For example, is the good of the United States something other than the good of its inhabitants, so that all of its inhabitants may be called on to sacrifice for the common good? Is there a tension between the rights of individuals and the common good? In my view a useful understanding of the common good depends on a clear understanding of community. But a good understanding of community is difficult to attain when we begin with modernist assumptions about human beings. For this reason I feel the need to make some points that I will repeat from a different angle tonight. We need to overcome the dominant modernist habits of mind. We "process" thinkers like to blame much of what is wrong on substance thinking. Few people today consciously adopt substance metaphysics, but just because they do not think metaphysical issues are meaningful, they continue to reflect deep-seated metaphysical habits. Please forgive me if I take a few moments to explain what I mean by substance philosophy and to show how it has informed so much of modern thinking about human society. My point here is that it blocks adequate understanding of community and therefore also of the common good. The philosophical idea of substance arises from reflection about the kinds of objects with which we are surrounded: These objects remain much the same through considerable period of time. They occupy definable regions of space and are contained within these boundaries. They may move through space without suffering significant alteration. What changes are the spatial relations to other substances, but these relations do not affect the substances themselves. A chair can be moved from one room to another while remaining the same chair with the same characteristics. The chair as such can also be distinguished from its characteristics. It may be repainted, for example, without becoming a different chair. In this sense, at least, there is an unchanging substance underlying changing attributes. Much of our language refers to objects as the subjects of sentences and then to their attributes or actions. The carpet is blue. The cat walks around the room. This expresses and supports the emphasis on objects, understood as substances. We may also think of ourselves as substances. I am sometimes talking and sometimes listening. I am sometimes sad and sometimes joyful. But "I" seem to remain the same "I" through these changes. Of course, the substances of which I have spoken thus far come into being and decay. Hence they are not quite satisfactory as fulfilling the metaphysical idea of substances as the unchanging reality underlying the changing attributes. Distinguishing them as composite substances from the simple substances of which they are composed can solve this problem. Compound substances can be broken up into these simple substances. It is these basic components of the larger objects that are the true substances. This type of reflection led to the dominance of atomism in modern thought. An atom is a simple substance, that is, a substance that cannot be broken up into smaller substances. Because it cannot be broken up, it is everlasting. It does not change in any way except in its location. Modern thought supposed that the deepest truth about the world is that it is composed of material atoms in motion relative to one another. The goal of scientific explanation is to show how, following the laws of motion governing the movement of atoms, all the phenomena of the natural world can be explained. Although the course of physics has required many changes, the reductive program inherent in this metaphysics still guides most scientific work. Our interest here, of course, is with human beings. Some moderns have supposed that the movement of the atoms can explain us, too. Much physiological psychology shares this program of research. Nevertheless, the more common form of modern metaphysics is dualism.

Dualists exempt the human mind from the laws of physics. It is of a fundamentally different nature. The founder of modern philosophy, Rene Descartes, held that whereas the primary characteristic of the entities making up the physical world is extension, the primary characteristic of minds is thought. What is striking, however, is that Descartes and the modern thinkers who followed him, believed that the thinking minds are also substances. That means that they are self-contained entities, underlying the flow of changing experience. The relations among them, like the relation among atoms, are external to them. These relations do not affect the mind as such. The philosophical implication is a radical form of individualism. This individualism dominated thought about society throughout the early modern period and has shaped much of late modern thought as well. The most obvious examples are in ethical, political, and economic theory. I will be speaking of economic theory this evening. I will now speak briefly about ethical and political theory. In ethical research, one asks about the situation of the individual. Since individuals remain what they are through time, their desire to achieve what satisfactions they can over the course of their lives is understandable. For some ethicists, a prudential hedonism must describe human behavior. The problem is then that in our ethical heritage there are many teachings that suggest we should seek the good of others. Christian theology often adapted itself to this egocentric view. The church called people to act in ways beneficial to others, promising that the rewards they would receive for such behavior after death far exceeded the costs in this life. Even persons who broke with much of the Christian tradition were inclined to think that the teaching of rewards and punishments after death was necessary to support socially constructive action here and now. The judgment that this was needed was lessened by the discovery by advanced thinkers in the eighteenth century that when all seek their individual benefit, the result produces benefits for the whole society. The implication is that altruistic behavior is not needed and may even damage the society. Nevertheless, the weight of Christian tradition remained strong through the nineteenth century. The most widely accepted ethical teaching in that century was utilitarianism. One should act so as to produce the greatest amount of pleasure for the largest number of people. This teaching is as fully based on individualism as is the assumption that self-interest reigns. But the individual is held to have a moral principle or intuition directing each to the well being of others generally. The Kantian alternative in terms of duty is equally individualistic. For Kant moral reason requires that we act according to universal rules. We should act in the way that we can will that all act. It is significant that the major political theorists based their understanding of how the state came to be on the principle of self-interest alone. Individuals were willing to pay a price in freedom for the sake of security. Hence they entered a compact with one another and with someone selected to rule them to obey his rule as long as this rule provided security. Locke thought that somewhat more than security was required from the ruler. The traditions of German romanticism and idealism could give rise to a different kind of political thinking. It could reify a nation or a group. Its most influential product was Karl Marx. Marx tended to reify classes. This was certainly a sharp break with individualism. But it did not break with substantialist thinking. It simply shifted the substances from individuals to nations or classes. Now my point in all this is to note that the idea of community is missing from substantialist thought. This is because for substantialist thought relations are external to those who are related. They remain individuals, whether individual human beings or individual classes. This is true whether their relations are altruistic or competitive. Hobbes and Locke explain how, given that human beings have this character, they nevertheless form societies. But a society is not a community when it is based solely on the agreement to obey a ruler in exchange for security and other possible services.

**Chapter 2 : Putting the Common Good Above Individual Rights | Demos**

*Our collective emphasis on individual rights and the common good gives rise to the notion that legitimate government derives its authority only from the consent of the governed.*

The Church firmly teaches that each and every human being is a unique and irreplaceable person, created in the image of God see Gen 1: Because of this, every man, woman, and child has great dignity and worth, a dignity that can never be taken away i. It also means helping them to flourish as a human being. The intrinsic dignity of the human person should be the starting point for all moral principles. What does marriage have to do with human dignity? Marriage protects and promotes the dignity of men and women, the dignity of children, and the dignity of all persons in society. Only within marriage can sexual relations mean what they are supposed to mean as an expression of self-giving love between a man and a woman not selfish use. The promises of a husband and a wife speak a high level of mutual trust and invite the confidence that sex will not be exploitative but will manifest true union and life-giving love. Second, marriage provides a context within which the rights of children to a mother and a father are legally protected. Marriage also helps assure that children will be welcomed as gifts; apart from the life-long commitment of marriage, children are likely to be viewed as threats or acquired as products. Finally, the family, founded on marriage, is a place where a person can exist for his or her own sake see LF , no. Marriages teach society not to value persons only for their usefulness. Does the Church believe that people who experience same-sex attraction have equal dignity? Every single human person has great inviolable dignity and worth, including those who experience same-sex attraction. All persons should be treated with respect, sensitivity, and love. What does it have to do with the common good? Marriage is a personal relationship, but not a private one. In fact, marriages play a crucial role in society. By publicly joining hands in marriage, husband and wife enter into a unique communion and sharing of their whole lives that not only joins their distinct families into one, fostering greater connections between people, but also provides the essential context for welcoming new human life. In fact, because of its procreative aspect, marriage can be said to be the very source of society see CSDC , no. By practicing loving interdependence, husband and wife teach society to reject individualism and seek the common good for all. In modeling love and communion by welcoming and raising new human life and by taking care of the weak, sick and old, marriages and families provide social stability and thus foster the principles of solidarity and subsidiarity. The social value of marriage is great and is apparent even to those who do not share the Catholic understanding of its religious meaning. Marriage as a lifelong, faithful, and fruitful union between husband and wife serves the good of all “ it serves the good of the spouses, the good of the children who may issue from their marital union, and the good of society in assuring that reproduction happens in a socially responsible way. To be sure, these goods are affirmed and reinforced by most religions. But they do not rely on any religious premises; they are based instead on the nature of the human person and are accessible to right reason. The government has the responsibility of promoting the common good and the best interests of all people, especially the most vulnerable, and upholding authentic marriage does precisely that. The fact that the responsibility of government to promote and protect marriage coincides with widely held religious convictions is not a reason for government to abdicate that responsibility. What are basic human rights? Basic human rights flow from the nature and dignity of the human person. Rights are inseparable from duties and responsibilities see CV , no. Since genuine rights promote the good of the whole human person, and all people, they should never be in competition with each other. Is marriage a basic human right? But having the right to marry does not mean having the right to enter into a relationship that is not marriage, and then to force others by civil law to treat it as marriage. All persons have the right to marry, but not the right to redefine marriage. Relationships between two persons of the same sex are not, and can never be, marriages, because two people of the same sex fail to meet a basic defining element for a married couple sexual difference ; they are not denied the right to marry any more than different-sex couples that fail to meet the other basic defining elements of marriage e. Marriage has great public significance see question 5, above. Law is a teacher, and such a law would teach many bad lessons, backed by the moral authority, financial resources, and coercive

power of the state, such as the following: See section 4, below, regarding religious freedom back to top

Treating different things differently is not unjust discrimination. Marriage can only be between a man and a woman. The government has a very strong interest in protecting the right of those children to a mother and a father, and in reducing the likelihood that those children will become wards of the state. The civil law of marriage serves both these interests by legally bonding adult couples to any children they may create, and to each other. Government is thus eminently reasonable, and in no way unjust, in distinguishing between two persons of the same sex and a different-sex couple in conferring the rights and duties of legal marriage. What about civil rights? Far from serving the cause of civil rights, redefining marriage would threaten the civil right of religious freedom: The sexual relations between a man and a woman are simply not the same as the sexual relations between two men or between two women, regardless of their ethnicity. The intimate acts of husband and wife are able to unite them fully and to enable them to welcome children. Sexual difference is an essential characteristic of marriage; ethnic sameness or difference is not. Marriage is rooted in nature: As was said above in number 7, authentic human rights flow from the nature and the dignity of the human person, a nature that includes sexual difference. What about equality and fairness? All persons deserve fair and equal treatment, in recognition of their great dignity. But protecting and promoting marriage as the union of one man and one woman is not denying equality or being unfair. Every person has the right to marry, but those who seek to enter same-sex unions seek something other than to marry; instead, they seek to have the civil law force others to treat their non-marital relationships as if they were marriage. But the relationships are not the same, either functionally or morally. Real fairness, real equality, depends on truth. Marriage is a unique good in itself. Nothing compares to the unique partnership of husband and wife, who through their sexual difference form a life-giving communion. No relationship between persons of the same sex can be the same as that between a man and a woman, nor should they ever be treated as analogous to marriage in any way. As such, they are never acceptable. Basic human rights are not protected but violated by the erosion and redefinition of marriage.

**Chapter 3 : Individual Rights vs The Common Good by Steven Budzinski on Prezi**

*We are often told that property rights must occasionally be sacrificed for the "common good". According to advocates of this position, we must find a balance between what is good for "the community" and the uncompromised protection of individual rights. What this really means is, individual.*

Opinion Which is more important in government – protecting individual rights or working for the common good? When I ask my civics and government students that question, the right answer is that it depends on the context. Yet, when I read the newspaper, I see that the National Rifle Association has its rights desires protected at the expense of the supermajority of the American voters. When I look at the actions of the Washington state Legislature, I also see that protecting the self-interest of the legislators comes before protecting the rights of the citizens to know what our representatives are doing behind closed doors. In all these cases, protecting the interests of the elected representatives comes before either individual rights or the common good. Time and again, after some bloody massacre of school children as in Parkland, Florida, or Sandy Hook Elementary in Connecticut, or innocent adults in some insane shooting incident like the bloodbath in Las Vegas, common sense screams that gun rights need to be curbed. Why do we allow large, round clips on rifles? Why do we allow the sale of military-grade, semi-automatic machine guns like the AR? Why do we permit the sale of bump stocks that increase the lethality of rifles? And why is that? The NRA has the resources to donate money to campaigns for members of Congress. The NRA can also support opponents of those representatives who do not toe the line, forcing them out of office. Our national and state representatives are more afraid of the NRA than they are of their constituents. The NRA is a bully and elected members of the U. On a more local level, the Washington State Legislature finally could agree to something. They were told by a judge they had to obey the Public Records Act like every other elected body in the state. Democrats and Republicans got together and agreed that they wanted to keep their activities secret. They voted with a veto-proof majority to protect their right to keep the machinations of their decisions from the prying eyes of the press and the public. The bill that was just passed and sent on to the governor drips with hypocrisy and self-interest. This is an election year. Property taxes will rise substantially in due to the McCleary decision to fully fund schools. At first blush, this seems like a sensible thing to do. Unfortunately for his colleagues, State Treasurer Duane Davidson threw a monkey wrench into the political machine by reminding the Legislature that they have been increasing debt at an ever-growing rate. We are the sixth-most indebted state based on the number of residents. During boom times, wise financial management dictates paying down the debt to prepare for the inevitable troughs to come. When I teach my civics and government students about our Constitution and representative democracy, I usually praise our system, especially when contrasted with the dictatorial governments of China, Vietnam or Kazakhstan, where most of my students come from. Our only redeeming factor is that we also have a free press that can be used to challenge and highlight the peccadillos of our elected representatives. Good government only comes with diligent and vigilant voters who can read between the lines in the news and sniff out the smell of self-interest over either the common good or the individual rights of our citizens. Nobody said representative democracy was easy.

## Chapter 4 : Weighing individual rights vs. the common good | COMMENTARY | Renton Reporter

*Individual Rights and Community Responsibilities Today, citizenship requires that people be knowledgeable about public issues and possess the capacity to work toward solution by acting together. History records voluntary actions by private citizens working together to right injustices, change directions and pursue benefits for the common good.*

Definition[ edit ] The term "common good" has been used in many disparate ways and escapes a single definition. Most philosophical conceptions of the common good fall into one of two families: According to substantive conceptions, the common good is that which is shared by and beneficial to all or most members of a given community: According to procedural formulations, by contrast, the common good consists of the outcome that is achieved through collective participation in the formation of a shared will. In the history of moral and political thought[ edit ] Historical overview[ edit ] Under one name or another, the common good has been a recurring theme throughout the history of political philosophy. On this teleological view, the good stems from objective facts about human life and purpose. The thought goes back to Thomas Aquinas theory of common good being virulent in whole premodern Europe. Rousseau maintains that the general will always tends toward the common good, though he concedes that democratic deliberations of individuals will not always express the general will. The pursuit of the common good, then, enables the state to act as a moral community. In his Theory of Justice , Rawls argues for a principled reconciliation of liberty and equality, applied to the basic structure of a well-ordered society, which will specify exactly such general conditions. Starting with an artificial device he calls the original position , Rawls defends two particular principles of justice by arguing that these are the positions reasonable persons would choose were they to choose principles from behind a veil of ignorance. Such a "veil" is one that essentially blinds people to all facts about themselves so they cannot tailor principles to their own advantage. According to Rawls, ignorance of these details about oneself will lead to principles that are fair to all. If an individual does not know how he will end up in his own conceived society, he is likely not going to privilege any one class of people, but rather develop a scheme of justice that treats all fairly. In particular, Rawls claims that those in the original position would all adopt a "maximin" strategy which would maximize the prospects of the least well-off individual or group. Rawls claims that the parties in the original position would adopt two governing principles, which would then regulate the assignment of rights and duties and regulate the distribution of social and economic advantages across society. The First Principle of Justice states that ""First: A public good is a good that is non-rivalrous and non-excludable. A common good is simply non-excludable. A simple typology illustrates the differences between various kinds of goods:

**Chapter 5 : Individual Rights and Freedoms v. The Common Good**

*This lesson will discuss the balance of individual rights versus the rights of others and the common good. It will cover the nature of individual rights in America, and the restrictions placed on.*

What are the dangers of valuing the collective more than the community? Post your thoughts below and respond to other postings. With the large migration of Massachusetts residents every year, some feel the face of New Hampshire is being irreversibly changed. Will New Hampshire soon see an influx of social interest and welfare programs such as those in place south of the border? Could sacrificing the rights and liberties of individuals in the interest of improving the common good in the state decrease poverty levels and give more people health care? As New Hampshire grows it may find itself struggling with the issue of eminent domain. What happens to the family who has lived in a New Hampshire farmhouse for 8 generations when they are forced off their land by the public need for a highway? Which is more important in this case: With the flu season swiftly approaching and the H1N1 already affecting large numbers across the world, New Hampshire faces the possibility of a flu epidemic. In such an instance, what action would the state or federal government take? The possibility of a massive quarantine gets thrown around every time a flu epidemic exists, but is such an action an infringement of the rights of individuals living in a free nation? Or is the common good of preventing the spread of infection more important? Even the current health care debate reflects the tension between individual rights and the common good. Some have expressed the view that health care initiatives are in the interest of a healthier state and nation. Can the individual rights vs. There is the question that comes up around the disabled. Do you build special infrastructure to accommodate the few who are disabled even if that meant the cost to do this would jack up prices. What is more important, buying a cheaper car that fits your personal budget and your personal tastes or a more expensive and efficient auto that would help save the environment? What do you think? Recommended Reading The U. Constitution and the Bill of Rights The classic document explaining the "inalienable" rights of each citizen. What exactly are rights? Are they as absolute as the constitution makes them out to be or are there situations in which it is appropriate to take away these rights in the service of a greater good? A Political Philosophy for Tomorrow The first libertarian candidate on a presidential ballot, John Hospers is one of the foremost advocates of individual rights. For Hospers and other Libertarians, an individuals property is equivalent to his or her own person and possesses most if not all of the same rights. Ayn Rand - Atlas Shrugged A fictional glorification of individuality. For the Common Good: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels - The Communist Manifesto One of the most revolutionary and important books ever written, the Manifesto explains clearly and concisely what communism is, its goals, and its methods. The Manifesto contains one of the favorite rallying cries in the service of the common good: Utilitarian calculation is one of the most popular tools historically for doing so. Based on the principle "the greatest good for the greatest number" utilitarianism offers an almost scientific method for making ethical decisions.

**Chapter 6 : Editorial: Abortion and the Common Good - Politics & Policy - News - Catholic Online**

*The common good or working toward the common good is when those in the community come together and do things that benefit or are in the best interests of everyone in the community. Individual liberties have to do with our individual freedoms within a community or a person's rights that cannot be trampled upon by any authority.*

Presidency begins, we face a strange new twist in the political lexicon. Everybody is talking about the Common Good. This election will come down to who defines the term. I have tried to inform my social and political participation in reference to what I call the four pillars of participation, life, family, freedom and solidarity with the poor and the needy. I have written regularly about the meaning of the phrase Common Good. I have proposed that Catholic Social teaching should form a framework within which faithful Catholics, other Christians, other people of faith and all people of good will work together to truly build a just society, a civilization of love. My efforts have placed me, at times, outside of the realm of acceptability in both major political parties. They have elicited opposition from the so called "right", the so called "left" and many others in between. For example, my opposition to capital punishment has not found an ear in the leadership of either major political party in the US. My opposition to the initial foray into Iraq as having been unjustified under any interpretation of the so called "just war theory", placed me in opposition to the growing number of "neo-cons" on the "right" and their colleagues, the "neo-liberals" on the "left". I have dared to express concerns that if a market economy places profits over people, families and the common good, it can devolve into economism or what the late Servant of God John Paul II rightly called "savage capitalism". A just economic model based on the market must place that market at the service of the person, the family and the common good and expand participation. This position has evoked some of the most rancorous responses. I have contended that there can be no real blending of what is called "libertarianism" in American politics and Catholic social thought because the two theories begin with two entirely different reference points in their "anthropology" understanding of the nature of the person and their vision of freedom. Catholic social thought positions freedom within a vision of the human person as naturally and supernaturally created and recreated in Christ for communion. It asserts that governing is a part of our relational identity. Truly good governance begins with the smallest governance, the family and must follow a principle of subsidiarity. We were made for one another and we find our human fulfillment only in giving ourselves to the other. And another principle, a principle of social charity called solidarity, insists that we are "our brothers and sisters keeper". Family is the starting point, not the individual. Concern for the articulating the meaning of the phrase "common good" runs throughout the Catechism of the Catholic Church See in particular, Part II and is wonderfully expounded upon in the "Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church". Of course it is also not an exclusively "Catholic" notion but is a part of political patrimony and any just theory of government. It is not "left" or "right", it is human. Years ago I wrote an article called "Requiem for the Religious Right" and urged my fellow Catholics, who first called themselves "conservatives" or "liberals" to remember that "Catholic" should be the "Noun" in our political participation. It is our identity and should root us and define us. I have regularly cautioned my fellow Catholics, whether on the "right" or on the "left", to reject building their policy and political positions on partisan ground and then attempting to dress them up in Catholic language. I also formed two organizations years ago, Common Good Foundation and Common Good Alliance, in an effort to make Catholic social teaching accessible as a vehicle for what I also called a "New Catholic Action". The organizations still exist and I still hope to utilize them. However, the thought espoused by both of them is not original. It is simply a restatement of Catholic Social teaching. The problem is that many Catholics do not know this teaching or have wrongly allowed "experts" on the "left" or the "right" to interpret what it is for them. Or, in some instances, when people like me started speaking or writing about ideas such as those I have just discussed above, we are disparaged. These same principles and ideas helped to launch other organization which now use the term "Common Good" in their name or their mission. However, in some cases, they take very different positions on what constitutes or furthers the Common Good. Therein lays the real challenge, whose definition of the "Common Good" will prevail? To be Pro-life is not to be Partisan Among the several organizations using the

term "common good" within the ranks of Catholic activism these days there are some who attempt to argue that when people like me emphasize that every procured abortion is intrinsically evil and can never further the Common Good, we are engaging in "a single issue" politics. They argue that this insistence fails to take into account other important elements of Catholic Social thought. I disagree and insist instead that it is the firm foundation for all that other Catholic Social thought. Some of these folks write me in response to my articles. Rather it is about where any authentic understanding of Catholic social teaching should begin, unfold and end - the inviolable dignity of every single human person at every age, every stage, and of every size. When there is no life, there are no other rights. Human rights do not exist in a vacuum; they are goods of the human person. Rather, it is to be truly human. Without acknowledging the preeminent right to life, all derivative rights and the entire infrastructure of human rights is placed in jeopardy. The further legitimate questions and positions of political parties become moot. Without the freedom to be born, all of the talk about compassion for the poor and the promotion of freedom throughout the entirety of life, and how we attain it, is hollow and empty. Failing to recognize our neighbors in the womb as having a right to be born and then to live a full life in our community is a foundational failure of our obligation in solidarity to one another. It was Mother Teresa, whose anniversary we recently commemorated, who said it so clearly: Wade has deformed a great nation. The so-called right to abortion has pitted mothers against their children and women against men. It has sown violence and discord at the heart of the most intimate human relationships. It has portrayed the greatest of gifts -- a child -- as a competitor, an intrusion, and an inconvenience. It has nominally accorded mothers unfettered dominion over the independent lives of their physically dependent sons and daughters. And, in granting this unconscionable power, it has exposed many women to unjust and selfish demands from their husbands or other sexual partners. Human rights are not a privilege conferred by government. The right to life does not depend, and must not be declared to be contingent, on the pleasure of anyone else, not even a parent or a sovereign. Nor should those who hold such a position be dismissed because they are "religious". Yes, as a Catholic Christian my position in defense of this preeminent right is in fact informed by my embrace of Christian revelation and the infallible teaching of my Church. However, I insist that some things are true not because they are Catholic; they are Catholic because they are true. For example, the truth of the humanity of every child in the first home of the whole human race and the truth of the intrinsic evil of every procured abortion is confirmed by science and written on every human heart by the Natural Law. The child in the womb is our neighbor. We all know that. The marvelous developments in intra-uterine surgical proceedings and sonogram technology are only two of the scientific facts which accuse us of our National crime. We are engaged in a horrid contemporary version of playing with words in an effort to mask the evil. I reject the oxymoron "Abortion rights". I absolutely refuse to be called "anti-abortion rights" and note the use of the term by many in the news media as an example of how far we have fallen. Simply because the current "positive law" in this instance, a law which was judicially created attempts to assuage the conscience and cover over the evil by calling what is always wrong a "right" by rooting this sophistry in a contrived "penumbra" of the notion of privacy, no Court can ever make of abortion a true "right". Killing innocent children in the womb can never be a right in the Natural Law. And, like other intrinsic evils in our history before it which were bolstered by judicial imperialism for example slavery, it will be revealed for what it is when Roe v Wade is overturned. Insisting that the Pro-life position is "religious" - and must therefore also be kept "private" - is also virulently anti-Christian. Faithful Christians must never accept a notion of "privacy" which sanctions the reaching into the womb and killing children by what Mother Teresa also rightly called a "war against the child". When she addressed the Presidential prayer Breakfast in she warned: And if we accept that the mother can kill her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another. This is the death of true freedom. I am not alone in this insistence. He recently made the entire issue very clear. I ask every one reading this article to carefully weigh the words of Cardinal George. They have tried to confuse Catholics, other Christians, other people of faith and people of good will concerning the primacy of the Right to Life for all children in the womb. Cardinal George correctly restates the truth in this letter: Since this teaching has recently been falsely presented, the following clarification may be helpful. The Catholic Church, from its first days, condemned the aborting of unborn children as gravely sinful. You shall not kill what is generated. This same teaching has

been constantly reiterated in every place and time up to Vatican II, which condemned abortion as a "heinous crime. Any other comments, by politicians, professors, pundits or the occasional priest, are erroneous and cannot be proposed in good faith. This teaching has consequences for those charged with caring for the common good, those who hold public office. The unborn child, who is alive and is a member of the human family, cannot defend himself or herself. Good law defends the defenseless. Our present laws permit unborn children to be privately killed. Laws that place unborn children outside the protection of law destroy both the children killed and the common good, which is the controlling principle of Catholic social teaching. One cannot favor the legal status quo on abortion and also be working for the common good. The Church does not endorse candidates for office, but she does teach the principles according to which Catholics should form their social consciences. The teaching, which covers intrinsic evils such as abortion and many other issues that are matters of prudential judgment, could not be clearer; the practice often falls short because we are all sinners. There is no room for self-righteousness in Catholic moral teaching. The Conference of Bishops in this country and the Bishops of Illinois have issued statements about Catholic social teaching and political life. They are available in our parishes. All of us should keep our country and all the candidates for office in the next election in our prayers. God bless you and your families. Sincerely yours in Christ,.

*"Balancing Individual Rights and the Common Good," Tikkun, Vol, No.1, (January/February ), pp. Some people have thought that communitarianism resembles conservatism in placing a focus on the need for greater individual responsibility toward the community, and in its critique of the excesses of a rights-oriented society.*

Individual Rights and Freedoms v. The Common Good By S. Leon Felkins October 10, We would hope that if government must promote anything, it would be the common good [1]. Most of us are not too happy with the government specifically giving help to private individuals, although it is obvious that this occurs routinely. The common good is a close cousin to the Fascist idea of "total devotion to the state" as promoted by such regimes as the Nazis and the Communists. Nevertheless, while supporters of "democracies" often denigrate such concepts and are quick to blather about the freedom of the individual, as our present rulers do when promoting the war and the PATRIOT Act, most visible actions by the government are nominally for the "common good". Unfortunately, many forcefully imposed actions for the common good have done great harm to our republic. I will list a few: Income Tax The one action by our government ostensibly for the common good that has been the most disastrous over all, is probably the imposition of the Income Tax in by means of the 16th Amendment to the Constitution. However, as destructive as that amendment was, the major damage to the Republic came by the legislation that implemented "withholding". If the citizens still had to annually pay their taxes in one lump sum out of their savings, there would not be a massive federal government; there would not be a military budget nearly as big as all the rest of the world combined; there would not be a terribly wasteful and inhumane "Drug War" that destroys the lives of so many young people every day; and there would not be the pervasive Orwellian, "Big Brother is Watching You", invasion of privacy. Compulsory, Government Funded and Controlled, Education. When schools were managed and funded locally, there was a fair chance that most students would get a realistic, life-enhancing, and somewhat honest education. However, the trend has been to centralize control; first to the state level, and then to the federal level. Which is where we are today. History demonstrates that if government can control education, it will create mindless serfs. By means of laws, regulations and grants including the supplying of teaching materials [3] , the Federal Government dictates what and how our children will be taught. Since the populace has already been brainwashed to accept this tyranny, there is hardly a whimper of complaint. Yet today, billions of dollars of property are taken annually by state and federal governments without due process. By means of a series of statutes put on the law books, starting with the RICO act and the "Comprehensive Drug Abuse prevention and Control Act" [4] , both passed in , our governments can seize properties worth millions, including homes and life savings, without making an arrest or filing any charges. It is up to the victims to take action to get it back by proving they did not commit a crime -- in spite of our Constitutional promise that we are presumed innocent until proven guilty. By two other means the public is shown that it really has no right to private property [5]: Incarceration of millions of young people who have done no harm to anyone but, possibly, themselves. Destruction of respect for the police and other "authorities" Allowing the military to get involved in policing of citizens " in spite of the provisions of the "Posse Commitatus" act of Establishment of the much abused principle that there were "exigent" situations that create exceptions to the "Bill of Rights". Providing a fertile environment for political and government corruption. For example, secret paid informants. Yes, in spite of the Constitutional guarantee that the accused has the right to face their accusers, paid, secret, informants are used routinely in drug cases to get convictions. The 10th Amendment is now Non-functional In spite of the promise of the 10th Amendment [6] , the Federal government now rides roughshod over all, citizens and states alike. There is no aspect of our life that is immune to Federal control and interference. How can this be? That precedent established the superiority of the federal government. It was downhill from there. Also see "Gibbons v Ogden " where the supremacy of Federal powers over states in matters of commerce was established. On this one, the "camel got its nose in the tent" way back in in the Supreme Court case of "Munn v. Illinois" case where it was decided that "that the general welfare requires that business interests be reined in by governmental authority" and that businesses "must submit to be controlled by the public for the common

good Nevertheless we have enjoyed this right for the first years of our existence as a nation. But, out of the needs of protecting the public from Terrorists, Marijuana smoke, and sex toys , our government has found it necessary to severely cripple this right. There is not room here to discuss the extraordinary reduction in our freedom that this and related acts have imposed. This brief outline has attempted to show the dangers of using the common good as a basis for laws, decrees, and court decisions. While it is acknowledged that the common good is the primary purpose of most laws and government actions, it should never be the sole basis for such laws and actions. For if that were allowed, then we could have situations in which some humans would be sacrificed for the common good. As an example, we might have a leader or brilliant scientist that is dying of liver disease. Hmm, well, on second thought, maybe not. Felkins is a retired former military officer, college professor, and computer systems engineer. How much do you really pay? See "Subverting the Constitution in high school" by Alan Caruba at <http://www.felkins.com>. The RICO act and subsequent acts that implemented the seizing of private property through forfeiture is discussed in the comprehensive article "Policing for Profit: I call them sacred, because, if they are unprotected, all other rights become worthless or visionary."

**Chapter 8 : The Common Good: Individual Rights and Community Responsibility – Religion Online**

*Individual Rights v. The Common Good The U.S. Constitution: Promoting the Public Good and Protecting Individual Rights This essay explores the way in which the U.S. Constitution reflects a balance between the classical republican concern with.*

In effect, the notion of the common good is a denial that society is and should be composed of atomized individuals living in isolation from one another. Instead, its proponents have asserted that people can and should live their lives as citizens deeply embedded in social relationships. It has been most clearly developed in the political theory of republicanism, which has contended that the common good is something that can only be achieved through political means and the collective action of citizens participating in their own self-government. At the same time, the notion of the common good has been closely bound up with the idea of citizenship, a mutual commitment to common goods and the value of political action as public service. Therefore, it has played a prominent role in the defense of republican constitutional arrangements, notably the defense of the Constitution of the United States in the Federalist papers. In Book I of the Politics, Aristotle asserted that man is political by nature. It is only through participation as citizens in the political community, or polis, provided by the state that men may achieve the common good of community safety—only as citizens and through active engagement with politics, whether as a public servant, a participant in the deliberation of laws and justice, or as a soldier defending the polis, that the common good can be achieved. The notion of the common good was next taken up in the late 15th and early 16th centuries in the work of Machiavelli, most famously in The Prince. Machiavelli contended that securing the common good would depend upon the existence of virtuous citizens. Political authority would only be regarded as legitimate if it was according to the general will and toward the common good. The pursuit of the common good would enable the state to act as a moral community. The importance of the common good to the republican ideal was notably illustrated with the publication of the Federalist papers, in which Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay provided a passionate defense of the new Constitution of the United States. Madison, for example, argued that political constitutions should seek out wise, discerning rulers in search of the common good. In the modern era, instead of a single common good, an emphasis has been placed upon the possibility of realizing a number of politically defined common goods, including certain goods arising from the act of citizenship. The common good has been defined as either the corporate good of a social group, the aggregate of individual goods, or the ensemble of conditions for individual goods. Because the common good has been associated with the existence of an active, public-spirited citizenry, which has acknowledged the duty of performing public service whether politically or, in the case of the ancient Greek city-states, militarily, its relevance to contemporary politics has been called into question. In the modern era the emphasis has been placed on the maximization of the freedom of the individual, as consumer and property owner discovering that freedom in the private domain of liberalized markets rather than as citizen achieving the common good in the public domain. Nevertheless, for contemporary politics, the importance of the idea of the common good remains in that it identifies the possibility that politics can be about more than building an institutional framework for the narrow pursuit of individual self-interest in the essentially private domain of liberalized markets. The common good points toward the way in which freedom, autonomy, and self-government can be realized through the collective action and active participation of individuals, not as atomized consumers but as active citizens in the public domain of politics. It also affords the possibility that political participation can have an intrinsic value, in its own right, in addition to its instrumental value of securing the common good.

**Chapter 9 : Rule of Law | iCivics**

*The common good is a close cousin to the Fascist idea of "total devotion to the state" as promoted by such regimes as the Nazis and the Communists. Nevertheless, while supporters of "democracies" often denigrate such concepts and are quick to blather about the freedom of the individual, as our present rulers do when promoting the war and the.*