CHAPTER - I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 : The Problem : Evil - Its Nature

One of the major problems in any explanation of the world order is the question of evil. Every philosophy of life has to tackle the problem of evil. In a broad sense evil is understood as the opposite of good. All the religious systems and philosophies of the world attempt to reach the solution of this problem and tries to discover that why evil exists in the world and why there is misery, why there is suffering, crime and vice and how these can be annihilated. Man’s life appears to be mixture of good and evil. According to Oxford Dictionary the meaning of the word evil is that which is morally bad, sin, very unpleasant and harmful. There are divergent views regarding the concept and the problem of evil. Ferm’s Encyclopedia of Religion described evil as “Antithesis of good or value, disvalue, whatever is harmful, painful or undesirable or disapproval, what is contrary to any purpose or ideal, especially to the moral or to the religions. Moral evil is called wrong and religious evil, sin”.1 From the standpoint of philosophy the reality of evil in the world can never be denied. Both Indian and Western thinkers advance their views upon this subject. For some the world is real, so evil is also real and for some the world is unreal and the evil is also unreal. Rabindranath Tagore says “Evil, after all, is only clouds “Which obstruct our vision’, or it is ‘mistakes’ on men’s path of creative progress, ‘deformities’ on the stages of their perfection”.2 So it can be said that evil is ‘avidyā’ or ignorance. The possibility of evil lies in human freedom. According to Plotinus, the soul can never be evil in itself, although it may get entangled in evil. He conceives of being as impossible without soul. Therefore evil, being the opposite of soul, is classified by him as non-being which is utterly different from authentic being. According to Plotinus there are two fundamental cosmic constituents –
soul and matter. But soul’s power of reason and authentic intellect is hampered by the presence of matter. This condition causes error, wrong action and pain.

Whatever springs from weakness is evil according to Fredrick William Nietzsche. The real problem is in the hearts and minds of man. It is not a problem of physics, but of ethics. “Evil is here in the world, not because God wants it or uses it here, but because he knows not here at the moment to remove it away, but to be accepted; and accepted not to be endured, but to be conquered. This is a challenge neither to our reason nor to our patience, but to our courage.” Man is responsible for his own fate. “The belief in a supernatural source of evil is not necessary, man alone are quite capable of every wickedness.” Thomas Carlyle says, “This is a good universe. There is no permanent place for it, for evil. Yea, it would seem as if God and man and the universe itself were opposed to evil. Evil may hide behind this fallacy and that, but it will be hunted from fallacy to fallacy until there is no more fallacy for it to hide behind.” When God sends us evil, he sends with it the weapon to conquer it.

According to the teaching of Manichean religion there were two eternally opposing substances – the kingdom of light presided over by God, the father and the kingdom of darkness presided over by a Dreadful Prince, who was not a deity but who was as eternal as the chief who ruled over the kingdom of light, a spiritual entity and there was constant antagonism and conflict between them. Manicheanism sought to explain the presence of evil in the world. This dualism has been the distinctive feature of religion in Persia. Manicheanism maintained that evil was a material substance which existed from eternity and which was in continual conflict with God. Man’s life is a constant struggle with evil. Evil is accepted as a fact of life. Evil is that which is opposite to good. Good and evil are correlating facts. Because light is inconceivable without darkness, pleasure is inconceivable without pain. The production of good would not be good unless there were evil, i.e. the struggle itself. Augustine speaks of a berneyard cockfight in which one of the combatants emerges battered and bloody. While this might fall under the category of animal evil, it is plainly
meant to apply, by analogy, to the struggle for good going on within and finally emerging from the whole. Thus beauty exists by contrast with the ugly. Augustine call this “the evil-is-needed-to-contrast-with-the-good solution” or “the contrast solution”. “And yet, by that very deformity (of the barnyard cock beaker in a fight) was the more perfect beauty of the contest in evidence”.

In ancient times cunning and selfish savages often employ animals as a vehicle for carrying away or transferring the evil. Sometimes a few drops of blood from the sick man are allowed to fall on the head of the goat, which is turned out in an uninhabited part of the veld. The sickness is supposed to be transferred to the animal and to become lost in the desert. Again man sometimes plays the part of scapegoat by diverting to themselves the evils that threaten others. In great emergencies the sins of the Raja of Manipur used to be transferred to somebody else, usually to a criminal, who earned his pardon by his vicarious sufferings. They seek out a holy Brahman who consents to take upon himself the sins of the dying man in consideration of the sum of 10 thousand rupees. Thus the saint is introduced in to the chamber of death, and he closely embraces the dying Raja, saying to him that he will bear all the sins and diseases of Raja. Having thus taken to himself the sins of the sufferer, he is sent away from the country and never allowed to return.

The existence of evil in the world must at all times be the greatest of all problems which the wind encounters when it reflects on God and the relation to the world. Religion generally conceives God as omnipotent, omniscient and all loving person. And it becomes a difficult task to harmonize the presence of evil and suffering in the world of a loving God. The problem is very important, because in it God and men are different. Man was created by God as a result of which he (man) suffers. Evil is indeed a challenge to the existence of a personal God. Religious thinkers have tried to solve this problem of evil in different ways. The solution which attempts to refer evil to something other than God is known as diabolic solution. In the Zoroastrian religion Zoroaster attributes good to the good God, Ahura Mazda and evil to the bad God, Angra Mainyu (or
Ahirman). In Manichaeanism also “evil is a positive principle, embodied in matter, the good principle is embodied in spirit”.7

Humphrey says, “Evil is man made, and is of his choosing and he who suffers, from his own deliberate use of his won free will”.8

Chou Tun – (1017-1073), a Chinese philosopher, who is often compared to Aristotle, Aquinas, Leibniz and Herbert Spencer. Chou’s suggestion that “all evil is a deviation from the mean is one of the two essentially different approaches to the problems of evil found in the Neo-Confucianism.9 Chou’s theory is that though man’s nature is originally good, its manifestations in actual conduct do not always accord with the mean; conduct of this start we than call evil. Chou writes, “Righteousness, uprightness, decisiveness, strictness, and firmness of action are examples of strength that is good and fierceness, narrow-mindedness and violence are examples of strength that is evil. Kindness, mildness and humility are examples of weakness that is good and softness, indecision and perseverance are examples of weakness that is evil. Only the Mean brings harmony. The Mean is the principle of regularity, the universally recognized law of morality and is that to which the sage is devoted”10.

It is difficult to provide a tolerable account of evil, which is consistent with that assumption that God is transcendent as well as immanent and that He created the world. C.E.M. JOAD says that to regard God “as wholly immanent means that we must regard him as infected with the evil with which the universe is so palpably shot through, as an alternative to writing of evil as a temporary incident or by product of circumstances.”1 If there is no evil then there is no sin, suffering, greed, priest craft, king craft, demagogy, monopoly, ignorance, drink, war, pestilence, nor any other of the scapegoats which reformers sacrifice, but simply poverty”. What, in short is the matter with the poor is their poverty. The remedy for evil is the remedy for the poverty that engenders it namely, money. Money is the most important thing in the world. It represents health, strength, honour, generosity and beauty as
conspicuously and undeniably as the want of it represents illness, weakness, disgrace, meanness and ugliness. Evil is neither endemic nor ineradicable in man; it is the product of circumstance. If we are able to remove the circumstances, give everybody, for example, an equal and an adequate income irrespective of work done and the evils due to poverty will disappear together with the evils of snobbery. The vices of the rich may be expected to disappear when our social system has been so remolded as no longer to put a premium upon wealth. Freud, Jung and Adler treated evil as a form of maladjustment. Man has certain basic instincts which in themselves are neither good nor bad. Owing to unfavourable environment or unsuitable handling in early childhood, these are thwarted and distorted in various ways; or the child is oppressed by his parents and stores up hatred in his unconscious mind. He develops a sense of guilt in respect of the performance of purely natural functions and cravings in respect of which he is caused to feel guilty. The consequences of maladjustment are as numerous as the formula which different psychologists have adopted for their description. Evil, that is to say, is not for them, a positive and distinctive force, endemic in the heart of man. The behaviour and the desires which have been traditionally regarded as evil or as sinful or as wicked are diligently avoided. Ill adjusted behaviour is interpreted as being due to the pressure upon consciousness which have been repressed by the circumstances of early life. C.E.M. JOAD says that morality can change the circumstances, place the child in an approved environment, give him love and freedom, and make him feel important. Then a child can carefully avoid inculcating feelings of guilt or inferiority, and he will grow up into a psychologically healthy cheerful, effective, balanced and fearless adult. "Evil and imperfection were due to bad external conditions and relied, therefore, chiefly upon sciences were-won mastery over matter, resulting in its ability harness the forces of nature in man's service, to improve the conditions of his life. The other aimed more directly at the control of human nature itself, partly by emergencies and scientific breeding, designed to produce a desired type of human being, partly by an education designed to cause men to think, to will, to
desire and to value in desirable ways, partly by a direct assault upon unregenerate elements in the psyche by means of psychological techniques. All good is sought through with correlative evil and that in particular all human advancements and improvements are double-edged. To improve man's science, if man increases his power without increasing his wisdom and his virtue, then the world will be destroyed. But with the power of reasoning and judgment a man is able to know the difference between good and evil.

1.2 Kinds of Evil:

Evil is most real. The catastrophes in nature are most palpable. Augustine distinguishes two kinds of evil. "We usually speak of evil in two ways: firstly when we say that some one has done evil, second, when some one had suffered evil." The evil that man does is for Augustine sin and the evil that man suffers is punishment. It can be said that what we call evil is apparently a case of maladjustment among facts, either in the natural or in the moral and social world, accompanies by feeling of ill being. Mill says that if only man would behave naturally or act according to nature, all would be well. Physical and moral evils respectively are want of adjustment in the physical world as well as in the reason and will of man.

In the physical and moral order creation seems so seriously marred that we find it hard to understand how it can derive entirely from God. The facts which give rise to the problems are of two general kinds and it give rise to two distinct types of problem. These two general kinds of evil are usually referred to as "physical evil" and "moral evil". These two general forms of evil independently constitute conclusive ground for denying the existence of God as all-powerful Being.

Physical Evil: Physical evils are involved in the constitution of earth. There are deserts and ice-bound areas; there are dangerous animals of prey. There are various natural calamities and the immense human sufferings and floods,
tempests, tidal-waves, volcanoes, earthquakes, droughts and famines etc. On the other hand there are vast numbers of diseases, such as leprosy, cancer, poliomyelitis etc. Again there are evils with which so many are born – the various physical deformities and defects such as misshapen limbs, blindness, deafness, dumbness, mental deficiency and insanity. Most of these evils contribute toward increasing human pain and suffering, but not all physical evils are reducible simply to pain. But many of these evils are that whether or not they result in pain. It can be said that physical evils at present predominate over physical goods. If goodness and evil are compared, it will be seen that goodness predominates over evil. It actually helps in the finding of goodness. According to Leibniz also evil helps in the finding of goodness, because if the harmful things did not cause pain and suffering it would be impossible for one to break their habit.

**Moral evils:** Moral evil is generally immorality. Moral evil is regarded as constituting more serious problem than physical evil. Moral evils are like selfishness, envy, greed, deceit, cruelty, cowardice etc. and the other large scale evils such as wars and the atrocities they involve. According to Leibniz, moral evil exists because man is limited and imperfect and evil is an indication of imperfection. Man is inclined towards immoral acts on account of his limitations and imperfection. But he is also possessed of the capacities which allow him to rise above his limitations and to walk on the path of morality. It is for this reason that in the field of morality man has freedom to act for good or for evil. Moral evil is a source of physical evil and that moral evil is man-caused. "......... God, having chosen the most perfect of all possible worlds, had he prompted by his wisdom to permit the evil which was bound up with it, but which still did not prevent this world from being, all things considered, the best that could be chosen."

Leibniz says as man is free, so the man is the cause of evil. There is a subtle shift in the classification of evil from sin and suffering to moral and physical evil. Man is responsible for his immoral action but inspite of this some
sins and bad actions attach themselves to him because he is born finite and limited. Even before the advent of creation man was sinful because he was limited, but he is also possessed of the capacities which allow him to rise above his limitations and to walk on the path of morality. So in the field of morality man has the freedom to act for good or evil. But despite the greatest effort some amount of evil cannot be eliminated.

According to John Hick also the origin of moral evil lies forever connected within the mystery of human freedom. “Moral evil is the evil that we human beings originate: Cruel, unjust, vicious and perverse thoughts and deeds. Natural evil is the evil that originates independently of human action, in disease, bacilli, earthquakes, storms, droughts, tornados etc.” Hick adopted the Irenaean view that God is gradually forming perfect members of the humanity whose nature we glimpse in Christ. This Irenaean view is called by Hick “Soul making”. It is bound up with the disciplines and it builds our character. The necessary connection between moral freedom and the possibility of sin throws light upon a great deal of the suffering which afflicts mankind. For an enormous amount of human pain arises either from the inhumanity or from the incompetence of mankind. This includes such major scourges as poverty, oppression and persecution, war and all the injustice, indignity, and inequality which occur even in the most advanced societies. These evils are manifestations of human sin. Even diseases foster to an extent, the limits of which have not yet been determined by psychosomatic medicine, by moral and emotional factors seated both in the individual and in his social environment. These evils stem from human failures and wrong decisions, their possibility is inherent in the creation of free persons inhabiting a world which presents them with real choices which are followed by real consequences.

I. 3 Evil and Good:

Human life is a mixture of good and evil. Evil is ill being and good is well being. Though evil is that which is opposite to good, yet they are co-
relative facts because light is inconceivable without darkness, pleasure is inconceivable without pain. The production of good would not be good unless there were evil, i.e. the struggle itself. According to Augustine also the evil is needed to contrast with the good. According to Plato “when reason is the cause of the good, necessity is the cause of evil”.16 Though the universe is essentially good, evil must have its place in it, because only evil makes the meaning of good possible. The Hindu solution of the problem of evil and suffering, mainly consists in holding that man himself and not God, is responsible for his suffering, he can remove it by his own efforts. Only in this sense the Upanisads declare that the immortal man overcomes both the thought, “I did evil” and I did good”. Good and evil, done or not done, cause him no pain. So the liberated individual is lifted beyond the ethical distinctions of good and evil. According to Buddha one who is evil may see good as long as the evil has not developed, but when the evil has developed, the evil doer sees evil. Even one who is good may see ill as long as the good has not developed, but when the good has developed, the good one sees good. According to Gandhi man can overcome evil by good, anger by love, untruth by truth and himsā by Ahimsā. God is the source of light and life and He gives us freedom to choose between good and evil. But the existence of good and evil in God is a miracle and this mystery is known only to God. God transcends good and evil. According to Gandhi evil and good are relative terms what is good under certain conditions can become an evil under a different set of conditions. Cowardice is worse than violence, this is an evil. One should not replace an evil by another worse. According to Gandhi, often does good comes out of evil. Man knows that only evil can come out of evil, as good out of good. God is above both good and evil. Evil has no separate existence at all. It is only good or truth. To say that, according to Gandhi, God permits evil in this world may not be pleasing to hear. But if he is responsible for the good, it follows that he has to be responsible for the evil too. In order to overcome evil one must stand wholly outside it, i.e. on the firm solid ground of unadulterated good. “My Gitā tells me that evil can never result from a good action”.17
Iqbal accepted in his own way Sufi interpretation of the relationship between good and evil. It states that “Whatever good falls to the lots of man comes from Allah and whatever falls from evil comes from himself.” Medieval Sufi asserted that both good and evil in the world come from God. The Muslim mystics held that evil was objectively necessary for the realization of good. Just as a bird carefully overcomes the resistance of the air so man can become good only by overcoming evil. That is why man has no right to complain about the existence of evil, but must accept it as a necessary part of life. Iqbal says that “Good and evil .... though opposites, must fall within the same whole” Evil therefore does not contradict Divine Omnipotence.

According to Radhakrishnan majority of men are both good and evil. According to Swami Vivekananda also there are good and evil everywhere in this world. Sometimes evil becomes good true, but at other times good becomes evil also. All our senses produce evil sometime or other. According to Vivekananda, when a man drink wine, it is not bad (at first) but when he goes on drinking, it will produce evil. A man is born of rich parents, good enough, but he may become a fool if he never exercises his body or brain. That is good producing evil. So good and evil are relative terms. The thing good for me may be bad for another. The same thing is good at one part of our life and bad at another part.

According to Vivekananda God did not create evil in the world at all. We have made it evil and we have to make it good. “Good ways of doing things” and “bad ways of doing things” are opposed to one another. The good act is useful by favouring, the bad or evil act is harmful. Moral philosophers often discuss the good and the bad or evil. Whether an act is morally good or bad depends upon its character of being beneficial or harmful, i.e., depends upon the way in which it offers the good of various things. The beneficial and the harmful are relative to subjects. If an act is called good on the ground that it is beneficial, the judgment is incomplete unless we are told for whom it is good (beneficial). Similarly, if an act is called bad on the ground that it does some harm, the
statement is elliptic unless it is added for whom the act is bad. 'Good' when it means 'beneficial' is always 'good for somebody', and 'bad' when it means 'harmful' is always 'bad for somebody'.

The morally good and bad is not in this sense relative to subjects. The fact that an act does harm to somebody may be relevantly connected with the moral badness of the act. "There is the one sense, in which moral goodness is 'absolute' and 'objective' and in which the beneficial is 'relative' and 'subjective'. This makes an important logical distinction between the morally good and bad on the one hand and the beneficial and the harmful on the other hand"20. "Good and bad as moral attributes of intentions do not connote goodness or badness of its kind, i.e. of intentions or as intentions. It would seem, moreover, that 'good' and 'bad' as moral attributes of intentions are in an important sense secondary. By this I mean that the primary attribution of 'good' and 'bad' here is not of the intention as such, but of the objects of intention, the intended results of action. Basically, 'good intention' is intention to do (some) good, and 'bad (evil) intention' is intention to do (some) bad or evil. The problems is how to give a satisfactory formulation to the dependence of the value of intention on the value of the intended"21.

The harmful is also said to be bad, or sometimes evil, for the being whose good it affects unfavourably. It is further said to do bad or evil to this being. It is called a bad thing or maybe even more frequently an evil thing. Often it is called simply an evil.

It can be said that the notion of evil is a sub-category of the notion of the harmful. Anything which hampers the attainment of some end of human action is harmful or detrimental. There are also two senses of the word evil. When 'an evil' means something which affects the good of a being adversely, then 'an evil' means something which is a cause of harm. But instead of 'a cause of harm' we can here also say 'a cause of evil'. Thus the word 'evil' sometimes means the cause of harm and sometimes the harm caused. According to Georg Henrik Von Wright evil caused by revenge for evil is the natural punishment of
evil doing. It can also be called the natural sanction attached to the practice of respecting one's neighbour's good. Fear of revenge may work as an effective deterrent at least against evil-doing on a larger scale i.e. involving several wronged agents. It may go at least someway towards making observance of the practice of not harming.

I. 4 Sin and Evil:

Evil is opposite of good. Moral evil is wrong and religious evil is called sin. Evil, which is not good, can be of various categories, like moral evils, natural evil, physical evil etc. But sin is a theological term meaning transgression of the divine ordinance. Sin stands for the aberration in the religious scheme of the good. In the general understanding of the two terms evil and sin the former is wider in scope than later. Because evil includes sin within itself. St. Augustine had given serious thought to the problems of evil, so far moral evils and sins are concerned. According to him God created man as free beings and if they commit sins, then God can not be held responsible. Though sin is a religious concept, it is not free from its moral links. Hence there is a sharp line between sin and evil. Hick says: "The religious concept of sin covers the domains of two basic ethical ideas, those of wrong action and of bad moral character. If differs, however from a combination of these purely ethical notions by setting them in a theological context and interpreting the human faults in questions as expressions of a wrong relationship with God" 22. We can term it as the moralistic understanding of sin.

Christian doctrine finds the ultimate possibility of sin and evil in the gift of freedom, the freedom of choosing the way of God's will or that of one's own of deciding for or against God. For at the point of freedom, we touch the external, the infinite which "can not be traced. It is best illustrated in the Biblical Story of the original sin committed by Adam. The Original Sin committed by Adam is the root cause of man's evil and suffering. Sin is nothing but disobedience to God. Here two factors become responsible for evil – the devilish provocation of satan and the utter misuse of the free will granted. In the Christian
teaching, sin is no more an imperfection or incomplete movement. It is an movement in the wrong direction and wrong course.

According to Bhāgavad Gītā, the deadly sins are three in number—lust, anger and greed and they lead man to hold other vices like self-centered, stubbornness, arrogance, excessive pride, harshness, ignorance and force, which produces evil. God is depicted as being free from moral evil, and so we can understand why he punishes the sinners. Gītā emphasizes negative virtues which help man to avoid the three deadly sins. According to Radhakrishna man is the root cause of all sin and therefore enemy of man which creates evil.

According to Father Zossima lack of love is the substance of sin. To avoid sin the only positive commandent is to love in accordance with God’s love. “Love a man even in his sin”, he counsels” for that is the semblance of Divine Love and is the highest love in earth........”. 23. According to Judaism also God has granted free will to Human beings, so human beings are responsible for the sins committed by them. Sin is astraying from the path of God and rebellion against God. Evil or suffering is attributed to the sin committed by human being. Due to commit sins they have to suffer. So sin is evil. If sin is the evil that man does the man is the cause of evil and not God.

Aquinas defines the peculiar type of evil which is sin. He writes “Evil is more comprehensive than sin, as also is good than right........ None in those things that are done by the will, the proximate rule is the human reason, while the supreme rule is the eternal law. When therefore, a human act tends to the end according to the order of reason and of the eternal law, than that act is right, but when it turns aside from that rectitude, then it is aid to be a sin” – 24. According to some theists physical evil is God’s punishment of sinners. But the argument that physical evil is punishment for sin is unsound. Because many physical evils are simultaneous with birth, like, insanity, mental defectiveness, blindness, deformities, as well as much disease. No crime or sin of the child can explain and justify these physical evils as punishment and for as parents sin to be
punished in the child is injustice or evil of another kind. Similarly the suffering of animals can be accounted for as punishment.

I. 5 Evil and Religion:

The evils and imperfections in the universe contradicts the very idea of God as a all wise, all powerful and all good being. If God is all wise, he should know how to avoid these evils. If he is all powerful, then he should be able to see that evil do not occur. Then if He exists, how is it that they too do exists? If of course, the conception of God is different if it is supposed that these properties do not literally possessed by God – then the argument would collapse.

The following solutions\textsuperscript{25}, which theologians have adopted for avoiding the problem of evil are given below.

1. Evil is an illusion
2. Evil is merely the privation of good.
3. Evil has to exist as a counterpart of the good.
4. Evil is the byproduct of the operations of the laws of nature which are intrinsically good.
5. The presence of evil brings out the good in people.
6. Evil is a warning to man or man’s punishment for his sin and
7. Evil is due to man’s free will.

Thus the presence of evil always threatens the existence of God as an omnipotent Being.

In this world, good and evil develop as necessarily related expressions of human thinking and behaviour. The close connection between good and evil is fully experienced by the religious consciousness and daily experiences of life. In the battle of opposing forces of good and evil, man has always sought help and strength from religion. Man’s conception of evil served to determine his notion of the meaning of religion. The primitive man felt that the source of good and evil in the world are divine powers. The forces in nature which cause pain, loss
and frustration, which hamper human efforts were conceived to be under the domination of evil deities. The problem of evil attracted the attention of religious philosophers with the development of monotheistic faith in religion. The physical and spiritual order in nature was traced to the will of a simple being supposed to be good. The question was asked that who is responsible for all the evil in human life? A simple religious man who believes in one God as omnipotent and omnipresent Being thinks that the evil is in the world but it can be overcome by the grace of God who is with man and His spiritual power is supreme. During the Middle Ages evil was associated with the free will of man in order to avoid making God responsible for the fact of evil and suffering in the world. Man was created as free being and as good but he developed evil tendencies due to the play of his free will. Due to the power of reasoning and judgment man at a certain stage of growth knows the difference between good and evil. But he is tempted towards sin, due to some psychological factors. So the only way to overcome evil is to help in the development of the sense of culture, consciousness about social responsibility and a reasonable moral standard. According to some religious thinkers existence of God as the supreme power cannot answer the question that, if God is the All-powerful Creator of this world, why has He created evil? If He has deliberately created evil, then He cannot be called all-good. According to Leibniz, it is impossible for God to permit sin and misery, and even promote it without detriment to his supreme goodness. Leibnitz tried to link evil with the purpose of a benevolent God. Evil is traced by Leibnitz to the necessary constitution of the complex whole of experience. If there is no evil, men would not understand the meaning and significance of being good. Evil is the result of imperfection of the finite world. Indian monists have made man responsible for evil. All religions agree in one point that God is not responsible for evil, evil is due to ignorance. Where there is ignorance, there is evil and suffering. When real knowledge is acquired evil and suffering disappear. Even the atheistic Buddha thought that in the state of nirvāna or state of perfect knowledge there could not be any evil or suffering. There is distinction between
natural evil and moral evil. Theologians believe that moral evil came first in time and natural evil is occurred as a penalty for sin. According to Christianism death and all sufferings were the result of man’s first disobedience. Man is responsible for moral evil because moral evils spring from the activity of conscious beings. Psychologically man must be capable of being rational choice. Moral evil can exist only when a self-conscious subject distinguishes itself from its natural impulses and desires. The optimists believe that the world is good and evil is entirely subordinate to good. The pessimists think that this world is subordinate to evil and not the best possible world. But a metaphysician reconciles the existence of evil with his assumption that this phenomenal world is full of limitations. At the transcendental level of noumena, there is no evil. According to D.R. Bali, Evil is the necessary consequence of the phenomenal character of this world.

"Evil exists to give meaning to good because the two are relative terms. Evil and good are only aspects of human life and experiences. A theist argues that God deliberately created evil because in the all-good world man would have forgotten his moral and spiritual responsibilities. For others the concept of free will and moral responsibility would have been meaningless had there been no choice between good and evil. From the commonsense point of view, man is a psychophysical being. There are biological and psychological tendencies which tempt man to live on a purely biological level along with other animals. But man is also a social and rational being. Thus, the distinction between good and evil has social significance and is a necessary part of human conduct. The existence of evil furnishes a ground for the moral development of man. It gives a direction to man for cultural advancement and spiritual realization. It can be stated that evil is a necessary counterpart to good. If there were no evil there could be no good and this may solve the problem of evil. Some religious persons say that God cannot create good without simultaneously creating evil and this view sets a limit to God. So it may be replied that omnipotence has never meant to power to do what is logically impossible. The
existence of good without evil would be a logical impossibility. Every religions of the world accept that evil and suffering have been allowed by God for some good inherent purpose.

1. 6 Significance of the Study.

The study of evil is relevant to philosophy as it concerns with the human behavior and action. This study is more practical than empirical. The human society today is faced with crisis of unpredictable dimensions. Basically man wants good living standards, but he is opposed by the conflict and confusion. So this dissertation seeks to show how four contemporary Indian Philosophers, like Mahatma Gandhi, S. Radhakrishnan, Rabindra Nath Tagore and Swami Vivekananda seek remedy from this situation by discussing the problem of evil. Our actions are caused by ourselves and hence we are free our environment may determine us, but the environmental situation which stimulates us must be related originally to our character. In case of human will determination by environment cannot be external determination as in non-human nature. It is self-determination, which is freedom. There is nothing in the world to prevent us to adopt a course of action except our own nature. Contemporary Indian philosophers try to explain that everyone of us is a mixture of good to evil, but it is possible for a man to change the mixture so that he has more of good and less of evil.

It is said that every philosophy bears the mark of its origin. So also the contemporary Indian philosophy develops system of thought. Contemporary Indian thinkers try to reinterpret some of the ancient ideas derived chiefly from the Vedas and Upanisads and attempt to draw some new notions and rational demonstrations at construction. Indian philosophy is described as spiritual and it lays emphasis on values that is super-natural. For the modern thinkers it is not adequate. Contemporary Indian philosophy tries its best to reconcile the two. Contemporary Indian philosophers study scientifically about the problem of human and they study the various religions and scriptures in a perfectly scientific
spirit, which is not unrealistic and biased, rather it is factual and realistic. This study will highlight some important issues related to the problem of evil for finding out some solutions for the betterment of human beings and his society. Their endeavour is to deal and face with various ethical problems of human being. It is popularly said that a problem well analyzed means the problem half solved. Here attempt is made to analyse the problem of evil with special reference to the contemporary Indian thought. We have taken out some representative thinkers like Swami Vivekananda, Mahatma Gandhi, Rabindra Nath Tagore and Dr. S. Radhakrishnan and will try to understand the problem particularly from their perspectives together with some observations of Western standpoint.
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