CHAPTER II
EVIL : THE WESTERN PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

This study tries to look afresh at an enquiry into the Western approaches to the problem of evil of both traditional and modern philosophy. The area has great practical bearing, for it concerns the ultimate question i.e. whether God exists. Evil has persistently raised doubts about His existence. According to many philosophers, there are conclusive grounds for denying that God exists, because we experience evil.

Most theists deal with explicitly treating of God and evil. They consider actual evil and try to show how it can be accounted for. This is obviously an important issue. The study will ask whether such attempt gives satisfactory explanation of actual evil. The following four premises create a problem:
1. God is all-powerful
2. God is all knowing
3. God is all-good
4. There is evil.

In formal terms the theological problem of evil comes to this — "Why is there any misery at all in the world and not by chance surely. For some cause then is it from the intentions of the Deity? But He is perfectly benevolent. Is it contrary to his intention? But He is almighty"1

The problem of evil, i.e. the theological problem of evil, arises when one assumes two things: First, that there is evil in the world, and Second that there is simultaneously a God who has certain desirable properties, viz. omnipotence, beneficence and possibly others as well.
Thus when this latter assumption is combined with the assumption that Evil is real, this generates the theological problem of evil. Evil must be real, otherwise no problem of evil can be generated. Evil has taken in the sense of sin, the evil that one does, and suffering, the evil that one experiences.

“Evil exhibits itself everywhere as something negative, barren, weakening, destructive, a principle of death. It isolates, disunites and tends to annihilate not only its opposite but itself”

Here, in this Chapter we shall discuss different points of view of the problem about evil, given by different philosophers of both traditional and contemporary philosophy of the West.

II. 1. Traditional Approaches

There are many problems concerning evil. Some of them are practical and others speculative. Speculative problem of evil has been considered so important that it has been called “the problem of evil”. This is the problem whether the existence of an omnipotent and wholly good God is compatible with the existence of any evil. There are three distinct kinds of problem about the logical capability of God and evil. The Traditional problem of evil is fundamentally an abstract problem and that it is a problem about evil in general. The traditional problem of evil is both abstract and general.

The sin of Satan and the sin of Adam are among the great mysterious of the Christian religion. The only evil latent in either Satan or Adam would seem to reside in the privation of infinite being, power and knowledge. But this is not a moral evil in them; it is neither a sin nor a predisposition to sin. Hence, the only cause of their sinning, if God Himself predestines them to sin, must be a free choice on their part between good and evil. If God positively predestines them to sin then they would seem to be without responsibility, and so without sin. In Miltons Paradise Lost, God says Adam, “I made him just and right, sufficient to here stood, though free to fall”
Epicurus gave an early formulation of the problem. Lactantius quotes as follows, “God either wishes to take away evils, and is unable, or He is able, and is unwilling; or He is neither willing nor able; or He is both willing and able. If He is willing and unable, He is feeble, which is not in accordance with the character of God; if He is able and unwilling He is malicious which is equally at variance with God; if He is neither willing nor able, He is both malicious and feeble and therefore not God; if He is both willing and able which is alone suitable to God, from what source then are evils? Or why does He not remove them?” It is necessary to discuss actual causes of evil and to show whether the evil is justified, with respect to God. If evil were to exist, some instance of it could be justified. The traditional problem of evil is also a general problem. The notion of evil admits of kinds, degrees, and multiplicity. In its primary sense evils are of three kinds - (1) Moral, (2) Physical, (3) Psychological. The degree in which each kind may occur can vary. But the traditional problem of evil resists from specific kinds of degrees and multiplicity of evil and arises simply with the notion of evil. For this reason, it may be called the general problem of evil.

If the traditional problem of evil is a genuine one, it stands with the notion of any evil at all. The examples of evil is one of the causes of the confusion, which is to be found in many treatments of this problem of evil. Specific examples are part of that problem whereas the problem fully exists apart from them. Since, the examples are usually taken from the actual world, it gives the impression that the general problem concerns the actual justification not the possible justification of evil. The truth is that the general problems of evil is different from the specific problems presented by examples of evil and is, in fact, the fundamental problem about God and evil. If it is contradictory to assert both the existence of God and any evil, the existence of God is automatically excluded. There will then be no problem of reconciling God’s existence with specific examples of evil. If, however, it is not contradictory to assert both the existence of God and some evil, or if it cannot be shown to be so, problems about the existence of God and specific evil will need to be raised.
II. 1.1. Greek Thought:

Socrates:

According to Socrates good things are fewer with us than evil, and for the good we must assume no other cause than God. But the cause of evil, we must look for in other things and not in God. According to Plato also God cannot be the cause of evil because He is all good. But the question arises, where did evil come? Why does not God stop it? According to Greek thinkers morality is essential for happiness. To be moral is to be happy. The immoral act causes evil. So ideal of greatest good for greatest number should guide us in our day today life.

Socrates looked upon philosophical reflection as the most timely and practical tasks. The aim of his philosophy was to arouse in man the love of truth and virtue, to help them, to think right in order that they might live right. His faith in knowledge is so strong that he sees in it the cure of all our ills including evil. According to him, knowledge is virtue. Right thinking is essential to right action and wrong thinking leads to evil. So to eradicate evil man must have knowledge to right and wrong. Unless a man knows that what virtue is and unless he knows the meaning of self control, courage and justice and their opposites he cannot be virtuous. So knowledge is necessary condition of virtue. Socrates says "No man is voluntarily bad or involuntarily good. No man voluntarily pursues evil or death which he thinks to be evil. To prefer evil to good is not in human nature, and when a man is compelled to choose between two evil, no one will choose the greater when he may have the less."5

Plato:

As to the question of evil in the world Plato maintained that while God is the creator of the world He is not the creator of evil. He is responsible for the creation of the world only to a certain limit and not completely. He is responsible for ideal pattern and potentialities of the receptacles. He is the creator of good and not evil in the world. "Neither, then, could God, said I, since he is
good, be, as the multitude say, the cause of all things, but for mankind he is the cause of few things, but of many things not the cause. For good things are far fewer with us than evil, and for the good we must assume no other cause than God, but the cause of evil we must look for in other things and not in God.'''

According to Plato of whatever is good, rational and purposeful in the Universe is due to reason, whatever is evil, irrational and purposeless is ultimately traceable to matter. In the Republic, Book X, Plato maintains that everything is destroyed by peculiar or connatural evil – The worst vices, injustice, intemperance and ignorance are the peculiar evils of the soul. But they do not destroy the vicious soul. The rational part of man is the true part and man's ideal must be to cultivate his reason to stop all evils. Because the rational part is wise and has to exercise on behalf of the entire soul. For him the person who is wise, brave and temperate and just is incapable of any sort of wrong doing or evil. The individual is wise in whom reason rules over the other impulses of the soul. An individual is brave when his spirited part holds fast through paying and pleasure, to the instruction of reason. A person is temperate when spirit and appetite yield to reason and submit to its authority. When a man has these three qualities than he is just and he has said to be achieved the ethical attitude and brought the harmony in to his soul. Such man would not disrespect to a sacred thing or theft a traitor to his own country, be false to friends or commit any misdeeds or evil. So justice is the supreme virtue and the soul who is just is incapable of any sort of evil. Plato maintains that a life of reason or virtue is the highest good. So with the help of reason man would remain free from evil. As he does not make the matter of creation he creates a world according to the nature of the matter. According to Plato though health, beauty and wealth are great goods to men of justices and religion, one and all of them are great evil to the unjust. A just man alone will get happiness, when the will has been under the control of reason. Therefore there is evil in the world. The creator however, is not responsible for this evil. According to Plato, when Reason is the cause of good, Necessity is the cause of evil.

24
**Aristotle:**

According to Aristotle, all the major areas of human experience and activity are linked with the supreme good, i.e. happiness as means and end. He states that the good is that at which all things aim. In his book, *Nicomachean Ethics*, he states that only the virtuous actions are good and the acts which are not virtuous tinged with evil. For Aristotle, the end or purpose of every man is to realize its peculiar essence, that which distinguishes it from every other creatures. Hence the highest good for man is the complete and habitual exercise of the functions which make him a human being.

Stoicism is much closer than Epicureanism to the philosophy of thought by Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. After the death of the great leaders, the essential elements of their theory of life were presented in popular form by the stoics, a school founded by Zeno. According to stoicism everything in this world is manifestation of God. Even fate or love is the will of God. The stoics adopted two solutions to the problem of evil.

(1) The so-called negative solution which denies the very existence of evil; the world is good and perfect, and what we call evils are only relative evils, which like shadows in a picture or discords in music, contribute to the beauty and perfection of the whole.

(2) The so-called positive solution, which consists in regarding evil, e.g. disease, as the necessary means of realizing the good. They also maintain that since physical evil cannot affect human character, which alone has intrinsic value, it is not really evil. As for moral evil, it is impossible to have virtue without its opposite, virtue goes strong in combating vice. The universe is when viewed in cosmic perspective, is a beautiful, good perfect whole but when considered in relation to the whole, is ugly or evil.

**II. 1.2. St. Augustine:**

In Medieval Greek philosophy, St. Augustine was the greatest constructive thinker and the most influential teacher of the early Christian
church. According to him God is an Eternal, Transcendent being, all-powerful, all-goods, all wise, absolute will and Absolute spirit. God is the cause of everything. In order to maintain his goodness, he has to exclude evil from the world or to explain it away. If God has created and pre-determined everything and absolutely good being, then the so-called evil must be good in its way like the shadows in a picture, which contribute to the beauty of the whole evil is indispensable to the goodness of the world. Evil is not good, but it is good that evil is. Good is possible without evil, but evil is not possible without good for everything is good, at least in so far as it has any being at all. Privation of good is evil because it means an absence of something nature ought to have. All kinds of evil, including moral evil are bought under the conception of privation. Moral evil is the result of an evil or defective will, which springs from the will of man or of fallen Angel, which is nothing positive, but represents or privation of good. The worst evil is privation, the turning away from God, or the highest good, to the perishable world.

The principal sources of Augustine’s understanding of an attempted solution to problem of evil are Divine Providence and The Free Choice of the will, Confessions, The city of God and finally, Faith, hope and charity. Augustine gives us, in these works, what seems to be a nearby complete list of all future possible solutions of problem of evil.

In the Divine Providence he says the evil we see is seen narrowly and myopically. We apprehend the whole creation to realize three things, first, that which the separate parts of the creation may here and there by apparently evil, the whole is nonetheless good; second, that tremendous good comes out of evil, and third, this evil is necessary to the full harmony and goodness of the whole. According to him good arises within the whole and for the whole by the presence of these separate evils. Evils are necessary to prevent greater evils.

In the Free choice of the will, Augustine states that the evil that man does is for Augustine, sin, and the evil that man suffers is punishment. Thus if sin is the evil that one does, then surely man is the cause of evil, i.e. if a man is
free to do the evil that he does, then man is the cause of Evil and not God. Sufferings are sent by God to punish the wicked. This point provides an explanation for the existence of evil as suffering, and it become the discipline solution” to the problem of evil. Augustine holds out the possibility of the kingdom of Heaven as a reward to the suffering children as a recompense for their moment of torture and pain.

In the Confessions, it is briefly stated that evil is the privation of good. Evil and good are better together then the good world is alone. “Where there is nothing to fear, we fear none the less. For that reason, either the evil which we fear does exist, or the fact that we do fear it is evil”7. So it is said that evil is an illusion. Again in the Confessions Augustine says that the cause of evil is moss or matter power call this “the cause of evil is another substance”. It is the impersonal substance. Again where the substance is personal then the cause of evil is devil, wicked personal power. In the city of God Augustine says that good comes out if evil. Through the evil of human suffering, Augustine seems to be saying, two things are accomplished; first, God punishes man for his guilt or sin, and this is justly done, for man deserves that suffering and second, by means of them God could show His own grace to man at the same time. Augustine call this the justice solution” to the problem of evil.

In Enchiridion, Augustine maintains that evil is necessary to contract with good “He who is good permit evil to be done unless in this omnipotence, He could turn evil to good.”8 “which is called evil does not exist if there is no good ………..only what is good can he evil, since every being is good nor could there be an evil thing of the thing itself which is evil were not a being. Nothing then can be evil except a good”9

Augustine states that man was created good, as were all natural beings, but not supremely good. “All natural beings are good, since the creator of every one of them is supremely good; but because unlike their creator, they are not supremely and unchangeably good, their good is capable of dimension (an evil) and increase”10. The problem of evil, as it presented itself to St. Augustine,
is essentially theological. The problem exists only for the optimist, one who believes in the ultimate goodness of the universe.

From the brief discussion of the five texts of St Augustine, Arthur L. Herman tabulates the solutions in the following way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aesthetic Solution</td>
<td>The aesthetic whole is good, though the parts are evil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teleological Solution</td>
<td>Good comes ultimately out of evil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prevention solution</td>
<td>The evils we have are necessary to prevent greater evil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Contrast Solution</td>
<td>Evils are necessary in order to contrast with and paint up the good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Man is free Solution</td>
<td>Man with his free will is the cause of evil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Discipline Solution</td>
<td>Evil disciplines us and builds our character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recompense Solution</td>
<td>Evils such as unjust suffering will be recompensed in Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Illusion Solution</td>
<td>Evil is an illusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Privation Solution</td>
<td>Evil is merely the privation of good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Impersonal substance solution</td>
<td>Evil is caused by an impersonal, wicked substance, e.g. matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personal Substance Solution</td>
<td>Evil is caused by a personal wicked God, e.g. Satan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Justice Solution</td>
<td>Evil is God’s just punishment of man’s sins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arthur L. Herman says about Augustine’s view that “He recognizes the problems inherent in the man is free and the privation solutions, for he spends much time attempting to reconcile the difficulties inherent in these solutions together with God’s omniscience and the reality of evil: And to most commentators he does his least acceptable work with regard to these solutions.”

II. 1.3. Plotinus:

According to Plotinus God is the source of all existence, of all oppositions and differences, of mind and body, forms and matter, but is himself devoid of all plurality and diversity and absolutely one. His transcendence is such that whatever we say of Him merely limits Him and hence we cannot attribute to Him beauty of goodness or thought or will, for all such attributes are limitations and imperfections. The universe is an emanation from God. The ontological system that Plotinus has established is a system wherein the first metaphysical principle, the Good, produces by process of emanation. Intellect follows from it and from the Intellect emanates soul. From, this soul, there comes individual soul and the universe. These three divine entities, Good, Intellect and soul are without evil and wholly good only. But evil enters here somehow and than problem arises. This problem is similar to the problem faced by Augustine that how to make the God consistent with the evil of the world.

Plotinus recognizes that evil cannot have a place among beings. Hence evil must be Non-being. As the soul has entered into matter, it becomes evil. The bodily kind, in that it partakes of Matter, is an evil thing. It is we read, the Soul that has entered in to the service of that in which soul-evil is implanted by nature such a soul is not apart from matter Because it is merged into a body made of Matter. This Matter, which is Non-being constitutes evil. According to Plotinus evil is an absolute lack. So good is not what makes evil, but the actual presence of Evil Absolute is Matter. Plotinus argues that evil is produced by necessity of a plenum in the great chain of being itself. Plotinus states that we cannot be ourselves the source of evil, as evil was before we came to be existent.
"But why does the existence of the principle of Good necessarily compare the existence of the principle of evil? Is it because the All (the plenum) necessarily compares the existence of matter: yes: for necessary this all is made up of Contraries: it could not exist if Matter did not"\textsuperscript{13}

We have seen that the answer to the question of why is there evil - Plotinus states that evil is entitled by the nature of the All; wherever there is a First there must be a Last. Evil is metaphysically & logically necessary to the whole. This solution can be called "the evil - is - necessary-when-ever-good-exists solution.

\textbf{II.1.4 : St. Thomas Aquinas :}

St. Thomas Aquinas is essentially repetitive of Augustine's solutions to the problem of evil, He argues that God is the cause, directly and not through matter or intelligent agents, of the world. But this best world or universe possesses inequalities and these have been placed there in order to enhance the perfection of the whole, “For the universe would not be perfect if only one grade of goodness were found in things”\textsuperscript{14}

According to him, evil is neither a bad nor a good Like St Augustine, St. Thomas regards evil as privation. In so far as a thing was according to its nature, which is good, it cannot cause evil.

Evil is due to defective action on the part of the form, or cause or to the defective state of matter, the effect. In the case of moral evil, the defect lies in the will, which lacks the direction of the rule of reason and of the divine law. All things aim at good, hence whatever evil they realize is outside their intention. This is particularly true of free rational beings. Whatever they strive for, they regard as good and though it may be evil, they do not desire it because it is evil. Evil consists in the fact that a thing fails in goodness. Thomas brings forth three solutions to the problem of evil, solutions that his predecessor had developed i.e. the privation solution — Evil is a merely the privation of good, Aesthetic Solution
— The aesthetic whole is good, though the parts are evil and Teleological solution — Good comes ultimately out of evil.

God is the supreme good, and the cause of all other goodness. There is no supreme evil. Evils are uncaused, because they are not realities as good things are. All things exist for the sake of God. God is their end or goal. Intelligent & non-intelligent creatures alike in so far as they develop in accordance with their natures, and divine goodness. Intelligent creatures find their fulfillment in the understanding & contemplation of God. “Human happiness is not to be found in sensual pleasures, in honour, glory, riches or worldly power, nor in the exercise of skill or moral virtue; it is to be found in the knowledge of God, not as he can be known in this life by human conjecture, tradition or arrangement, but in the vision of the divine essence which Aquinas believes he can show to be possible in another life by means of supernatural divine enlightenment”15

II. 2. Modern Approaches

Problem of evil arises because of the felt of inexplicability, of evil. Reflective man has from time to time raised his head to ask ‘why’ the problem of evil has evolved. In this part attempts will be made to discover different views about evil represented by modern Western thinkers.

II. 2.1 Leibniz:

In the history of modern western philosophy the German Philosopher Leibniz presented an important theory of Evil. He accounts for it by saying that it is a necessary part of the universe. Leibniz, like Augustine before him, sets forth some of solutions to the problem of evil. Leibniz says in his Theodicy “That it has been possible for God to permit sin and misery, and even to co-operate therein and promote it, without detriment to his holiness and his supreme goodness, although generally, speaking, he could have avoided all these evils”16
We can see Leibniz’s thesis rests upon three assumptions — First, God is most perfect and all wise, second, out of His infinite wisdom and goodness He chooses this world from an infinite number of possible worlds; thirdly this world is the best that God could have chosen, because He is perfect in the above senses, hence this world is called the best possible worlds. Leibniz believed that the existence of God could be established independently of evil. Consequently, problems about God and evil are in no way problems about Gods existence but problems of have to account for evil, since an omnipotent and wholly good God exists.

He tried to solve these problems by claiming that evil is a necessary element in the best possible world. Because it is a necessary means to the greatest good, the world’s evil is justified. Evil is expressed in the form of pain and suffering in its biological form. Leibniz believed that this world is the best world possible, not on empirical but on theoretical grounds. He was free to create an unlimited variety of world. No agent acts rationally unless he has a sufficient reason for what he does. Leibniz does not attempt to deny the existence of evil. He says that evil contributes to the world’s perfection in such a way that, without it, the world would not be the best possible. The reason is that the best alternative is not always that which tends to avoid evil, since it can happen that evil may be accompanied by a greater good.

Thus, for Leibniz the best possible world is not a perfect world, that is, a world free of all imperfection. It must contain the evil which the present world had in the past, does have none, and will have on the future. For without it a world which, taken as a whole, is the best possible, would not exist. According to him actual evil is a necessary means to greater good and finally to the greatest good. In the thesis of Leibniz we have a new solution to the problem of evil. It would seem to say that God hates evil but approves of the evil we have because the alternatives are for worse. Lesser evil is a kind of good. The evil we have is the result of Gods choices being limited of the time of creation. The creator
limitation solution dealt with the limitations imposed by the logical possibilities
which lay outside God; with metaphysical evil, is a limitation inherent in the very
stuff of creation. The solutions to the problem of metaphysical evil is simply to
explain evil. Call this the metaphysical solution. The soul could be infected with
original sin, without God’s grace. Justice being impugned, he mentioned the
theory of pre-existence, call this ‘rebirth solution’ to the problem of evil.

God has introduced the greatest possible degrees of diversity and
harmony in the universe. But it is not perfect because the infinite can never be
adequately expressed through the finite forms that exists in the universe. It is
necessary therefore, that the present world should be imperfect over though
nothing would have improved upon it. Evil is the result of such limitations. But
good and evil are the two sides of the same coin. The presence of evil enhances
the beauty of creation. It is because of the presence of evil in the every field of
life that we become even more conscious of goodness.

On the basis of the internal imperfection of the present possible
world and the traditional Augustinian notions of sin, Leibniz, Seems to make
division of evil in to three parts. “Evil may be taken metaphysically, physically
and morally. Metaphysical evil consists in mere imperfection, physical evil in
sin. Now although physical evil and moral evil be not necessary, it is enough that
by virtue of the eternal verities they be possible. And as this vast region of
verities contains all possibilities it is necessary that there be an infinitude of
possible worlds, that evil inter in to divers of them, and that even the best of all
contain a measure thereof. Thus has God been induced to permit evil” 17

Metaphysical Evil :-

By metaphysical evil, he means, an evil, which is inherent in man.
It is a part of his nature, notwithstanding that God made all that he did and found
it good. The presence of metaphysical evil increases the beauty of creation, but it
causes no destruction.
Physical Evil :-

It is present in the universe in the form of pain and suffering attached to certain objects. If goodness and evil are compared, it will be seen that goodness always predominates. It actually helps in the finding of goodness, because if the harmful things did not cause pain and suffering it would be impossible for one to change their bad habit.

Moral evil :-

According to Leibniz moral evil exists because man is limited and imperfect and evil is an indication of imperfection. Moral evil is a source of physical evil, and that moral evil is man — caused. Leibniz insists that, the man is free, so the man is the cause of evil in the world. 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.

According to Leibniz moral evil is caused by man. Because man is limited and imperfect in their nature. “And as for evil, God wills moral evil not at all, and physical evil or suffering he does not will absolutely. Thus it is that there is no absolute predestination to damnation; and one may say of physical evil, that God will it often also as a means to an end, that is, to prevent greater evils or to obtain greater good. The penalty serves also for amendment and examples. Evil often serves to make us savour good the more, sometimes too it contributes to a greater perfection in him who suffers it as the seed that one sows is subject to a kind of corruption before it can germinate”

We find the following solutions to the problem of evil, in Leibniz Theodicy.

1. Necessary solution: -

   Evil is logically and metaphysically necessary for the existence of good.
2. Worse Alternative solution: -
   God hates evils but approves of what we get for the alternatives are far worse.

3. Creator Limitation Solution: -
   The evil we have is the result of God’s choices being limited at the time of creation

4. Metaphor Solution: -
   The language describing God is merely metaphorical.

5. Outweigh Solution: -
   Evil is not so bad, for the good in the world always outright the evil.

6. Rebirth Solution: -
   Man as a consequence of his previous births is the cause of evil and is responsible for evil.

7. Metaphysical Solution: -
   Evil in creation is caused by the imperfections of the creation itself.

II.2.2. John Hick:

   According to Hick evil is co-relative term of good. Whatever is not good is evil. Evils can be of various categories. “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 tornadoes etc.”

   Hick urges, the problem arises only for a religion which insists that the God is perfectly good and unlimitedly powerful. Hick develops his own idea of problem of evil with the view that evil is deprivation of good. – And because sin thus belongs to our own innermost nature so the source of so many forms of evil constitutes the heart of the problem of evil. “Thus man’s inherent sinful
nature is a weakness worthy of pity and not an offence to be condemned. Hick identifies this doctrine as “Soul making” traces the tradition itself through Schleiermacher, “In his teaching that sin and evil are ordained by God as the preconditions of redemption, Schleiermacher has sponsored the thesis that evil ultimately serves the good purpose of God”.

Augustinian tradition sees evil as a privation of good which results from misused freedom of man. God is not responsible for evil. But Hick criticizes Augustinian theodicy saying to God “For if He choose to make creatures who are bound sooner or later to fail (even though they do so without external compulsion), He cannot reasonably complain when they do fail. He must have foreseen that they would fail if He made them and he must nevertheless have decided to make them. This consideration points to fatal contradiction within the Augustinian – Thomist theodicy.”

Hick adopted the Irenaean view that God is gradually forming perfect members of the humanity whose father nature we glimpse in Christ. This Irenaean view is called by Hick “Soul making”. It is bound up with the discipline solution that evil disciplines us and builds our character. “The evil that man receives build and form character in order to make us all worthy of Gods love, Heaven, Grace or what—have—yes”23. Those who have suffered undeservedly will however receive their perfection and reward. This sound like the recompense solution that evils, such as unjust suffering, will be recompensed in Heaven, though Hick denies the existence of Hell. He says “These sufferings will in lead to the enjoyment of a common good which will be unending and therefore unlimited...”24

According to Hick, God’s purpose in creating this world was to provide the logically necessary environment in which human persons could respond, firstly to His infinite love and freely accept a God Contend rather them a self-centered life. Such a world is better than as world without evil, as a world with less evil but with morally determined beings. The apparently excessive pain
and suffering in the world is due to its being the necessary condition of certain virtues and partly to the positive value of mystery which challenges faith and trust. The joys of life after death will amply compensate for the difficulties of this life and there will be no human being who does not have them. “Hick himself rejects animal pain as a problem for theodicy, since (1) death is really not a problem for them as it is for us, since they cannot anticipate it and feel anxiety about it and (2) they are incapable of worrying over the future dangers that could happen to them. Thus on the ground of psychological suffering alone, Hick, argues in effect that animals don’t suffer. Their physical suffering appears to justify in virtue of the fact that the creation is man’s use for his then salvation.”

The problem of evil has traditionally been posed in the form of a dilemma that if God is perfectly, he must with to abolish evil, and if he is all powerful, he must be able to abolish evil. But evil exists; therefore God cannot be both omnipotent and perfectly loving. Hick says that certain solutions, which at once suggest themselves, have to be ruled out so far as the Judaic — Christian faith is concerned. To say, for example that evil is an illusion of the human mind, is impossible within a religion based upon the realism of Bible. The pages reflect and the characteristic mixture of good and evil in human experience. They record every kind of sorrow and suffering. The climax of this history of evil is the crucifixion of Jesus, so there can be no doubt that evil is unambiguously evil and stands in direct opposition to God’s will.

Augustine holds firmly to the Hebrew Christian conviction that the universe is good and is the creation of good God for a good purpose. According to Hick, Augustine completely rejects the ancient prejudice, widespread in his day that matter is evil. God according to Hick does not create evil, but it does not mean that evil is unreal and can be disregarded.

According to Hick, the origin of moral evil lies forever concealed within the mystery human freedom. 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 the culpable incompetence of mankind. This includes such major scourges as poverty, oppression and persecution, war, and all the injustice, indignity, and inequity, which occur even in the most advanced societies. The evils are manifestations of human sin. Even diseases is fostered 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. To the extent that all of these evils stem from human failures and wrong decisions, their possibility is inherent in the creation of free persons inhibiting a world which presents them with real choices which are followed by real consequences.

Physical Evil

Even though the major bulk of actual human pain is traceable to man's misused freedom as a sole or part cause, there remain other sources of pain which are entirely independent of the human will for example, earthquake, hurricane, storm, flood, drought, and blight. In practice, it is often impossible to trace a boundary between the suffering, which results from human wickedness and folly, and that, which falls upon mankind from without. Both kinds of suffering are inextricable mingled together in human experience. For our present purpose, however, it is important to note that the latter category does exist and that is seems to be built into the very structure of our world. It is not possible to show positively that each item of human pain serves the divine purpose of good, but on the other hand, it does seem possible to show that the divine purpose as it is understood in Judaism and Christianity could not be forwarded in a world, which was designed as a permanent hedonistic paradise.

The Augustinian tradition sees evil primarily as a privation of good resulting from misused from on the part of man. On the other hand, Irenaean tradition suggests that man was created an imperfect, immature creature who was
to undergo moral development and growth and finally be brought to the perfection intended for him by his Maker.

Hick distinguishes two theodical traditions in the west the Augustinian and the Irenaean thus:

(1) The Augustinian tradition relieves the Creator of the responsibility for evil by placing that responsibility on creatures, whereas the Irenaean type accepts God's ultimate omni-responsibility for it.(2) The Augustinian tradition embodies the philosophy of evil as non-being with its Neo-Platonic influence; whereas the Irenaean type is more purely theological in character. (3) The Augustinian theodicy sees God's relation to his creation in predominantly non-personal terms; whereas the Irenaean type is more personal according to which man has been created for fellowship with his Maker. (4) The Augustinian type looks to the past for an explanation of the existence of evil, whereas the Irenaean type is eschatological which finds the justification for evil in an infinite and eternal good, which God is bringing out of the temporal process. (5) In the Augustinian type the doctrine of the fall plays a central role; whereas in Irenaean type it is less important. (6) The Augustinian points to a final division of mankind into the saved and the demand; whereas the Irenaean thinkers see the doctrine of eternal hell as rendering a Christian theodicy impossible.

Despite the differences, there are also points of agreement between the two types of theodicy.

(1) The Aesthetic conception of the perfection of the universe in the Augustinian tradition has its equivalent in the Irenaean type of eschatological perfection of the creation, i.e. each proclaim the unqualified and unlimited goodness of God's creation as a whole. (2) Both acknowledge explicitly or implicitly God's ultimate responsibility for the existence of evil. Hence, sin and natural evil are both inevitable aspects of the creative process (3) Both acknowledge logical limitations upon divine omnipotence, though neither regards these as a real
restriction upon God's power. For the inability to do the self-contradictory does not reflect an importance in the agent but a logical incoherence.

II.2.3. John Stuart Mill:

In first of his essays, on the book- "Three essays on Religion", John Stuart Mill begins with a discussion of the problem of evil. According to Mill, if only man would behave naturally or act according to nature, all would be well. He states the problem of Subhuman evil. According to him, if man would behave naturally or act according to nature, all would be well. Mill states the subhuman problem of evil, i.e., evil in nature. “For however offensive the proposition may appear to many religions persona, they should be willing to look in the face the undeniable fact, that the order of nature, in so far modified by man, in such as no being, whose attributes are Justice and benevolence, would have made, with the intention that his rational creation should follow it as an example”

Thus it would seem that a certain set of facts are imbued with what we call evil. The theme is familiar to us that a being who is good and powerful has left behind a creation that is evil and imperfect. “In sober truth, nearly, all the things which men are or imprisoned for doing to one another are Nature’s everyday performance. Killing........ protracted tortures...... all this. Nature does with the most supervisions disregard of both mercy and of Justice......”

Mill gives some solutions that have been offered to explain natures ways in the presence of a benevolent creator, i.e. the aesthetic solution and the teleological solution. The aesthetic solution that the whole is good, though the parts are evil. And the teleological solution is that good comes ultimately out of evil. For example to the defense that good will come from evils Mill says, “It is undoubtly a very common fact that good comes out of evil........ But in the first place, it is quite, of then true of human crimes, as of natural calamities (that they are crimes nevertheless. In the second place, if good frequently come out of evil, the converse fact, evil coming out of food, is equally common”
According to Mill every kind of moral depravity and entailed upon multitudes by the fatality of their birth; through the fault of their parents, of society or of uncontrollable circumstances, certainly though no fault of their own. Mill’s own solution to the theological problem of evil is “The only admissible moral theory of creation is that the principle of Good can not at once and altogether subdue the powers of evil, either physical or moral .........”29 It means that God is not all-powerful, so Mill’s solution to the problem of evil is similar to the “Creator limitation solution”, the metaphysical evil solution and the worse alternatives solution.

**Creator limitation solution:-**

The evil we have is the result of God’s choice being limited at the time of creation.

**Metaphysical evil solution :-**

Evil in creation is caused by the imperfections in the creation itself.

**Worse Alternatives Solution :-**

God facts evil but approves of what after get for the alternatives are for worse. It can be said that the above-mentioned solution are species of Mill’s solution that “the God-is-not-all powerful solution” or “the not-all-powerful solution”. Mill merely makes it explicit what is already implicit in subject of religious theologians and so many theologians from Intellectual or theological hypocrisy. Mill says, “The imperfect and the stringing to become perfect in the natural world is a sure sign that its Maker is also limited and imperfect”30. According to Mill man’s task when faced with such a world and such a creator is to amend that world, not imitate It. Mill says that the creator took wisdom to make the world, so this implies that God is limited in his power. If God was really powerful than he could have made the world without wisdom. Again He required wisdom in constructing the world out of matter and force. So Mill seems
to have two arguments to prove God's Importance, first the nature go the
imperfect world, and second the clash between the two powers of God. His
wisdom and his potency that if He needs wisdom, He lacks potency. So it can be
said that according to Mill, if man does everything according to moral law or act
in a natural way the problem of evil does not arise. Man's duty, according to
Mill, is to help the creator to perfect the creation. Human being is not incapable
to prevent evil. Man can prevent evil by performing right action. According to
Mill, an action to right if it yields pleasure over pain, and an action is wrong if it
gives pain or excess of pain over pleasure. Rightness consists in conduciveness
to pleasure and wrongness consists in conduciveness to pain. Mill does not mean
the pleasure of lower animals. According to him, due to the "sense of dignity"
which is natural to man, no man would consent to be changed in to any of the
lower animals capable of sensual pleasure alone. So it can be said that according
to his opinion man can prevent evil according his own will. Again he says in his
Utilitarianism, "The utilitarian standard of what is right in conduct, is not the
agent's happiness but that of all concerned. In the golden rule of Jesus of
Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of ethics of utility. To do as, one would be
done by, and to love one's neighbor as yourself constitute the ideal perfection of
utilitarian morality"31

According to him, if man acts naturally, performs right action and
God is on the side of man then evil cannot arise. At last, it should be maintained
that Mill's "not-all-powerful" solution to the problem of evil is not a bona fide
solution to problem of evil.

II.2.4. Josiah Royce:

In the book "The World and the Individual" Josiah Royce has
given a number of valuable solutions to the problem of evil. He approaches by
designation three separate positions.

The three positions are the mystical, the realist and the idealist.
These provide view on the nature of evil and a theodicy to explain that evil. Royce says about the nature of evil as "An evil is in general, a fact that sends us to some other for its own justification, and for the satisfaction of our will".

It follows that the paramount element in a situation or in a person in a situation that makes the situation evil is the dissatisfaction produced in our own will "Any temporal fact, as such, is essentially more or less dissatisfying, and so evil". This dissatisfaction of the will is expressed in the defeat of purposes. "But death - and above all, not our own death nearly so much as the death of our friends - is an evil in so far as it appears in our experience as in temporal defeat of the purposes of human love, and the need of the human world for its good men." So according to Royce, evil is a function of a frustration of will. His first view about explaining evil involves a mystical theodicy. The mystic's saying that evil is without reality or being, it is an illusion, a dream a deceit. But those who states that evil is merely a first error, here one might suppose that he has Augustine and the not all—powerful solution or the metaphysical evil solution in mind.

If evil is merely called finite error, this finite error remains none the less, as a factor of human experience, an evil. According, to him those who contend that evil is an illusion call evil as, finite error. Royce says, "The mystic first denies that evil is real. He is asked why then evil seems to exist. He replies that this is our finite error. The finite error itself hereupon becomes, as the source of all our woes, an evil. But no evil is real. Hence no error can be real. Hence we do not really err, even if we suppose that evil is real. Herewith we return to our starting point asserting that it is an error to assert that we really err even if we suppose that evil is real. Herewith we returned to our starting point. According to Royce the doctrine of mysteries is impractical. The denial of the reality of evil makes an end of every rational possibility of moral effort. Because evil is a real thing, it is a fact of human experience.
The criticisms of Royce involve a realistic theodicy. It can be said that it is an attack on theologians like Augustine and Leibniz and the man is free solution. Royce says, "According to his view real evil is entirely due to the free will of moral agents who are essentially Independent Beings, and who have their existence apart from one another, like all the entities of Realism."36

According to realism the existence of objects is real. In epistemology realism holds that in the process of knowledge things are independent of the existence and influence of the knower. Royce condemns this view by saying that realism as explained here cannot handle the sufferings, mainly physical evils, that seen to fall upon the innocent. According to him the realist can counter with the view that the righteous man has secondly sinned if not in this life, in some previous life, like the doctrine of rebirth in Hinduism. Royce responds weakly to this realist's response by saying that "The result is here indeed a moral fatalism, of an unexpected, but nonetheless inevitable sort."37 He has failed to lay proper ground for his realist's response with the consequence that his any reply would probably be inappropriate. His failure to meet Hindu challenge may have other reasons behind it than hosted and improper ground buying that, it is possible that the rebirth cannot be challenged within the idealist framework at all. The rebirth solution is that, man as a consequence of his previous births, is the cause of evil and is responsible for evil. Royce prompts for an idealist theodicy that will explain real evil but that real evil within a nexus of interacting relations among the agents, the world, and God. This evil is real for Royce and it defines itself as moral and physical evil. "Every ill of human fortune..........is. ........either directly due to the magnitude and ideality of our finite plans, or else is more or less directly the expression of the morally defective intent of some human or extra-human moral agent."38

Royce had made the distinction between moral evil or sins connected to human conduct and natural evils, evils that happen to us, like death. For Royce evil is real thing, not illusory. So all are responsible for all and by all.
In the words of Royce “In our moral world, the righteous can suffer without individually deserving their suffering, just because their lives have no independent being, but are linked with all life”\(^{39}\) Thus the evils we individually suffer now all men suffer more or less, but the justification lies in the final reward for all, a specious surely of the recompense solution. The recompense solution to the problem of evil is that, evils, such as unjust suffering, will be recompensed in Heaven. According to Royce, all finite life is a struggle with evil. Yet from the final point of view the whole is good. This view of Royce is similar to the view of Augustine as the aesthetic solution to the problem of evil. The aesthetic solution is that, the aesthetic whole is good though the parts are evil.

The absolute is not impartial and emotion less entity; God knows human suffering and sorrow. So He knows highest good, the overcoming of sorrow. So human will though frustrated on earth and experiences evil in earth, receives its highest good or reward free from evil, in eternity where it will be worthy of its absolute reward. So it can be said that the purpose of evil is to try, test, mold and perfect man “through the endurance and the conquest over its own internal ills the spirit wins its best conscious fulfillment”\(^{40}\). Man learns to be disciplined by pain and enabled through suffering and prepared himself for the good through evil. According to Royce evil disciplines us and builds our character. So Royce accepts discipline solution to the problem of evil. Again Royce admits that the presence of evil is a condition of the perfection of the eternal order, because oneness alone is nothingness, the absolute needs and demands this other, i.e. the presence of ill.

Royce accepts necessary and contrast solution to the problem of evil. The contrast solutions is that evils are necessary in order to contrast with and point up the good, and the necessary solution is that, evil is logically and metaphysically necessary for the existence of good.

Again Royce says in regard to the question that when and by whose deed or defect came just this ill fortune, he maintains that are have seldom any
right to venture upon any detailed speculations because the internal meaning of
the process of nature is hidden from man. So our investigation to have the actual
ways of Nature is “to waste our time in a practically vain blaming of unknown
hostile agencies”.

This solution violently removes the problem from discussion by
saying that there is no solution knowable one. It solves by denying, call this “the
presence-of-evil-cannot-be-justified solution’ or “the mystery solution”. The
mystery solution is that the presence of evil cannot be rationally justified.

Royce avoids the view of the mystics that evil is illusory, while
remaining along from the realist view that each man’s suffering is his own fault.
According to him no evil deed is lost in the whole, all suffer, when one suffers.
Royce recognizes the reality of the evil but also maintains that the
intellectualistic conception of evil is quite unavailing. He emphatically assets that
evil cannot be escaped or lost sight of in as much as it is embodied in the very
nature of man. The problem of evil arises inevitably from our consideration of
the relation between the finite and the infinite. Just because the finite is not the
infinite and is therefore essentially limited, evil must be its inalienable feature.
Royce thus generalizes evil as the most obvious feature of all finite facts. “In the
most general sense of the word evil all finite facts, viewed as such, are indeed
evil, precisely in so far as when taken in themselves, they have no complete
meaning, and leave us in disquietude”.

Good is that in which we seek our satisfaction. Evil is that which fails to satisfy us. Now it cannot be questioned that we are all finite beings and
we consequently seek something else outside of us that can remove all our
imperfections and evils and which can satisfy our desires. On the other hand
everything, which most emphatically expresses our finitude, is called evil or bad.
Royce says that only a deliberately distorted view of existence can discount the
reality of evil as an illusion. In fact the presence of evil is the presuppositions of
morality and religion. Otherwise everything would possess the same moral value
but that all human desires have different meanings and they seek different purposes and that corresponding to them the conditions and circumstance for their realizations are also different, are evidences in support of the reality of evil. If all things were of the same value, there would not be any difficulty. Nor would there be any occasion for any social quarrel or any material setback in our personal and social relationships. The recognition that human desires, passions and impulses are directed to their definite purposes and end is the affirmation of the reality of evil.

From the standpoint of religious experience also, the reality of evil cannot be questioned. While religion is secure in the assurance that this evil can ultimately be overcome, it is no less adamantly insistent in starting from evil as a given fact. Royce observes that the very existence of the religious need itself presuppose not only the presence, but the usual prevalence of the very great evils in human life. For unless man is in greater danger of missing the pearl of great price, he stands in no need of a saving process. Religion takes its origin in our recognition that evil has a very real place in life. All finite life is a struggle with evil yet from the final point of view the whole is good.

The most important solution of the problem of evil that Royce provides is that there is no hard and fast rule that one should suffer only for the faults committed by ones if. No Man's destiny is absolutely independent of the destiny of others. Therefore, one may suffer even for the faults committed by others. This is the organic theory of the world according to which all parts of the totality are interlinked.

According to Royce suffering does not attach only to the person who makes a certain mistake or commits a particular sin. Since the universe is one and all men are bound in a common web of inter-relationships, the suffering that one suffers extends to others as well who are by no means responsible for any sin or error committed by them.
II.2.5. Nietzsche

Nietzsche views human life from the biological viewpoint. According to him the nature of the world is immoral. In it there is no attempt to attain some predestined moral ideal. It is neither good nor evil. He stated that there is no moral phenomenon; there is merely a moral interpretation of phenomenon. According to Nietzsche, all that proceeds from power is good; all that springs from weakness is bad or evil. Good means brave, intelligent and able while evil or bad means weak, foolish and coward. Power is good, weakness is evil. So Nietzsche treats good and evil as relative.

According to him the great power consists in the ability to withstand great suffering, to respond creatively to great challenges. Triumph in competition, the ability to impress others, artistic creation etc. are all instances of such power. According to him what men desire Ultimately is not pleasure, if this term is taken to imply the absence of pain. Men willingly sacrifices pleasures and inner suffering for the sake of power, and the power, which finds expression in creative activity and it, offers the ultimate happiness which men desire. But happiness does not consist of only pleasurable moments, which are free from pain. To be happy a high degree of self-discipline is required. He states that suffering is necessarily an evil. If men desire most is power, then suffering is required as a means to the requisite self-control and as an ingredient of the creative life.

If sin is moral wrongdoing, or transgression of some sort, there must be some rule or set of rules of an ethical sort that are disobeyed. In the universe, with respect to such doing, there are four possible classes of beings, for our purposes, capable of doings: man, superhuman creatures, subhuman creatures and nature as the organic world. We can, personify each group and say that they are example of wrong doing with respect to rules.
We have seen that according to Western approaches the theological problem of evil can be solved logically by denying anyone of the propositions that: 1) God is almighty, 2) God is perfectly good. 3) Evil exist.

Some of the philosophers instead of denying the proposition that God is almighty, have defined the proposition to mean that God can do anything that is logically possible. The German philosopher Leibnitz stated that the existence of evil is necessary in this universe which is best of all possible worlds.

According to him moral evil are the cause of physical evils. Here the source of suffering rests in the sins of man. Leibnitz seems to be correct in laying down that all actual evil can be justified only if it is a necessary means to greater good. Western philosophers are right in saying that the instances of evil are justified because they are logically necessary conditioned of enforced moral growth. On the other hand nonmoral evil is justified because it is an unavoidable result of the laws of nature. According to Western philosophers, man alone is the source of evil. The solutions to the problem of evil must be sought within the human-to-God context and not in the nature-to-God context. It is a problem only in relation to God and man but not about God and nature. It is to be pointed out that good and evil are ontologically incompatible. The solutions to the problem of evil must be sought into the teleological problem of evil. According to Western philosophers the existence of what we have called extraordinary evil is an ultimate religious mystery for man. So the problem of evil is a mystery and challenge to man's faith. It may said that though evil may still exist, God is Good and never interfere with each other.
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