

THEISM AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

BY

NWOSU IFEANYI BRIGHT ART1601401

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION,
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE BACHELOR OF
ARTS (B.A) DEGREE IN RELIGION:**

JANUARY, 2023

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to Almighty God for the wisdom and strength He bestowed on me in the course of this research.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project was carried out by Blessing Ese-EHIAGHE
ART1701733 in the Department of Religions, Faculty of Art, University of
Benin, Benin City, in partial fulfillment for the award of Bachelor of Arts

.....

**NWOSU IFEANYI BRIGHT
OSAGEDE**

(Student)

.....

MRS. BELINDER BUENOSE

(Project Supervisor)

.....

Date

.....

Date

.....

PROF. WILSON EHIANU
Head of Department

.....

EXTERNAL EXAMINER

.....

Date

.....

Date

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to Almighty God for His love, grace, mercy, guidance, provision and protection throughout my academic pursuit.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude goes to God Almighty for His sustaining grace and strength given to me in the course my studies in this great University of Benin and in the process of this research work.

Also, I deem it fit to acknowledge my amiable project supervisor, Mrs. Belinda Bienose Osagiede for her support, mentorship and guidance during the course of the project. I really appreciate her efforts and time put into this project work.

My sincere gratitude goes to the Head of the Department of Religion, Prof. **Wilson Eze Ehianu** for the role placed in the course of my programme in the department. I say a big thank you. I also extend gratitude to the staff and students of the Department of Religion for their accommodation, discipline, lectures and time towards my success as a student of the department.

I will not fail to appreciate my friends in the University of Benin among whom are Bella, Precious and Destiny, for the friendliness and support in the academic world. Thank you all.

THEISM AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

BY

NWOSU IFEANYI BRIGHT

ART1601401

**A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION,
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE BACHELOR OF
ARTS (B.A) DEGREE IN RELIGION:**

JANUARY, 2023

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to Almighty God for the wisdom and strength He bestowed on me in the course of this research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude goes to God Almighty for His sustaining grace and strength given to me in the course my studies in this great University of Benin and in the process of this research work.

Also, I deem it fit to acknowledge my amiable project supervisor, Mrs. Belinda Bienose Osagiede for her support, mentorship and guidance during the course of the project. I really appreciate her efforts and time put into this project work.

My sincere gratitude goes to the Head of the Department of Religion, Prof. **Wilson Eze Ehianu** for the role placed in the course of my programme in the department. I say a big thank you. I also extend gratitude to the staff and students of the Department of Religion for their accommodation, discipline, lectures and time towards my success as a student of the department.

I will not fail to appreciate my friends in the University of Benin among whom are Bella, Precious and Destiny, for the friendliness and support in the academic world. Thank you all.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction

The presence of evil in a world said to be created by a "Being" who is not only omnipotent, omniscience and perfectly good is problematic. It is a problem that has perturbed man for ages and coupled with various natural disasters still makes the concept a problematic one. How can there be a loving God, an all-powerful and all-knowing God and still face the problem of evil, if really, he is perfectly good and created everything then where does evil originate from?

Atheist or agnostics base their case on the lack of evidence for God's existence, however atheist have at least one very powerful positive argument for their position that there cannot be a living, all-loving, all-powerful God because there is so much evil and suffering in the world. Atheist raise questions like this: If you were a parent, wouldn't you do everything in your power to prevent your children from needless suffering? Many innocent children suffer from painful diseases, with this kind of problem how can we affirm for a loving and all-powerful God in the world.

In this study, we are going to look through the lenses of a philosopher who talks about the problem of evil and God's existence. Our main focus on this work is theism and the problem of evil. Before going to the main work, we will

first look at the problem which is evil, the different types of evil and different explanation (philosophical and religious explanation) of evil. According to Augustine, evil is not a being, it is a result of perversion of good, so it was not and cannot be created, evil cannot exist on its own. John Hick, in his analysis gave some reasons why there is evil in the world. On his Greater Good Defense, God himself could not achieve certain result without allowing us to struggle against evil and to endure suffering some evils are necessary in achieving certain good end, (Hick 2003; p359). The good that is achieved outweighs the evil and the same or a greater amount of good could not have been attained by any means that did not involve the presence of those evils.

The scope of this work is such that it would further strengthen the fact that evil is opposed to good, which is the integrity or perfection of being. The problem of evil is sometimes abstracted to designate the ill affecting subject. The existence of evil in the world would all times be the greater of all the problems which the mind encounter when it reflects on God and its relation to the world. The problem of evil does not disprove the existence of God, evil exist, yes, according to some theist, evil exist but because man misuses his free will, Teilhard De Chardin a Jesuit intellectual, asserts that the universe is an imperfect mechanism that is undergoing constant changes in terms of development, the universe we inhabit has not yet attained its perfect goal, but it is gradually moving towards it. Further more, the world is, still in the process of formation,

therefore a world or the process of evolution is a world which suffers labour and sins and at every degree of evolution we find evil always and everywhere.

The idea of God and the problem of evil is one of the most controversial themes in philosophy. Various arguments have been advanced down the ages by philosophers and theologians on this very problem of Evil and God and there has been no definite answer to this problem. The theist gave reasons why evil persist in the world created by a loving God, who they also believed is omnipotent, omniscience and all-merciful. There seems to be conflict between the theist and atheist on this very problem of God and Evil. The atheist used this as a fertile ground to prove that there is no God as claimed by the theist. John Hick in his work "Evil and the God of Love" (1966) is of the view that when God initially created humanity, there was still some work to be done in making us a completed product. However, this remaining work could not be accomplished by God alone, humans have to contribute to the process. Using the Greater Good Defence, Hick argues that even God himself could not achieve certain results without allowing us to struggle against evil and to endure suffering.

1.1 Background to the Study

The presence of evil in a world said to be created by a "Being" who is not only omnipotent, omniscience and perfectly good is problematic. It is a problem that has perturbed man for ages and coupled with various natural disaster still make the concept a more problematic one. How can there be a loving God, all-

powerful and all-knowing God and humans still face the problem of evil, if really, he is perfectly good and created everything then where did evil originate from? Atheist or agnostics base their case on the lack of evidence for the existence of God, however atheist have at least one very powerful positive argument for their position that there cannot be a living, all-loving, all-powerful God because there is so much evil and suffering in the world. Atheist raise questions like this: If you were a parent wouldn't you do everything in your power to prevent your children from needless suffering? Many innocent children suffer from painful diseases, with this kind of problem how can we affirm for a loving and all-powerful God in the world?

In this study, we are going to look through the lenses of philosophers who discuss the problem of evil and God's existence. Our main focus on this work is theism and the problem of evil which will be fully discussed in chapter four of this work. Before going to the main work, we will first of all look at the problem of evil, the different types of evil and different explanation (philosophical and religious explanation) of evil.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The existence of God and the problem of evil has been a problem for long that men have searched for the reason why evil persist in a world claimed to be created by God who is omnipotent, omniscience and all-merciful. Man has tried to find out the causes of evil, why man created by God involve himself in bad

action or why man carry out bad action on their fellow man and why there is so much evil in the world especially natural evil. Theists are faced-with the problem of evil and this lead to their search of what evil is and causes of it, if it is a thing and also what and who is responsible for evil in the world. Different theists have given different views of evil.

The Manicheans claimed to have the answer to the problem of evil, according to them, there are two ultimate principles and sources of all things namely, Ormuzd (The Principle of Good) and Ahriman (The Principle of Evil). The Ahriman is the source of evil, darkness and all material things. The soul of man came from Ormuzd (the principle of good) while the body from Ahriman. These two ultimate principles according to them, are eternal and in perpetual conflict with each other and this conflict is reflected in the things that come from them. Hence light and darkness, spirit and matter, good and evil are also in perpetual conflict. Christian theologians believe that evil is the wrath of God meted out on disobedient children. Augustine hold that evil is the negation or a privation of being. Evil is not a thing according to Augustine and therefore was not and cannot be created. Everything that is created is good and everything that is substance is good, but evil the origin of which the researcher is trying to find out is not a substance and was not created, therefore the question or the problem of evil should not arise because it does not make sense to ask about what is not a thing (substance). Evil cannot exist on it's own but Good can exist on it's own.

1.3 Clarification of Concept

Theism: Belief in the existence of a personal creator god, goddess, gods and/or goddesses present and active in the governance and organization of the world and the universe. The God may be known by or through revelation.

Problem: A difficulty that has to be resolved or dealt with. In regard to this work many philosophers tried to understand the problem. Some theologians believed that this problem originated from God

Evil: Having harmful qualities; not good, worthless or deleterious. God being the creator of this world is known to being good and just and this is what gave birth to the question "why does evil exist in this world"

1.4. Aim and Objectives

The purpose of this work is to expose the ideas of different theist and their different explanation on the problem of evil and the existence of God and most importantly on how they tried to find solution or answers to this very problem of evil and existence of God. Discussing why evil persist in this world created by God who is omnipotent, omniscience and all-loving (which is the major aim of this work), if it is a thing or not, then if it is a thing, who created it? What causes it? Why will evil persist in this world created by God who is omnipotent, omniscience and all-loving? And also, a critical study of different theist who try

to solve or who gave their explanation and meaning to the very problem (Theism and the problem of evil) at hand.

1.5 Significance of Study

The importance of this study is to show why evil exist in the world created by God who is all-loving, omnipotent and omniscience, and also to bring out the different ideas of the very problem at hand, the different meanings of evil and different ways theist attempt to solve the problem. Most atheists or agnostics based their case on the lack of evidence for God's existence, they argue that we cannot claimed to have a loving God, all-powerful and all-merciful and still allow evil in the world, why a loving-God will allow suffering in this world.

The major importance of the study is the explanation by theist why evil persist in the world. Some theist claimed that evil exist because of what is known as Greater Good Defence, it explains that some evil are necessary in achieving certain good end. The good that is achieved out-weighs the evil and the same or a greater amount of good could not have been attained by any means that did not involve the presence of those evils.

1.6 Scope and Limitation of Study

The materials that would be used for this study would be limited only to secondary sources such as textbooks and internet sources. This is due to the fact

that to get a primary source such like an interview etc, could prove to be not time friendly and very expensive for the researcher to handle.

Furthermore, the research will discuss about the world being created by God and Him being known to love His people and if that was the case, it then brings up the questions "why is there evil in the world" and "why has He not chosen to end this evil"

1.7 Methodology

This study employed two research methods which are; primary and secondary sources. The primary sources of data were gotten from Augustine Saints books which are "On Free Choice of Will", "The City of God" and "The Confession". While on the other hand the secondary sources of data were gotten from published books, articles, journals and online materials were also used to support the work on theism and the problem of evil.

1.8. Plan and Synopsis

This work is divided into five chapters, the first chapter deals with the introductory aspect, the background of the study, statement of problem, clarification of concept, aim and objectives, significance of the study, scope of the study and limitation, methodology and plan and synopsis. While chapter two examine the literature review, concept of the theism, the belief of what God is portrayed as, the argument of morals and religion about the existence of God.

Chapter three lays emphasis on the concept of evil, the problem of evil, types of evil that exist and how philosophers tried to find an end to the problem of evil. Chapter four dwells more on the study as it tries to explain work in details through the idea of different philosophers. While chapter five which is the last chapter deals on the evaluation, findings, summary, recommendation and conclusion

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature to be reviewed are

Greater Good Defence: John Hick

Greater Good Defence: The view that when God initially created humanity there was still some work to be done in making us a complete product. However, this remaining work could not be accomplished by God alone, humanity have to contribute to the process using the Greater Good Defence that argues that even God himself could not achieve certain result without allowing humanity to struggle against evil and to endure suffering.

The Confessions: St. Augustine

Augustine was born in August, in Northern Africa, the son of a pagan father and a Christian mother by name, Monica; after receiving a good education in Tahie Rhetoric, Augustine a young man a taught in cartage and Rome. He was baptized at the age of 37 in 387 A.D. and died as a Bishop of Hippo. Before his conversion, he lived a very bad life. However, Augustine's confession was centred on the problem of evil for him, he still has difficulty in thinking of God as a spiritual being and also could not find a clear explanation without complication of the cause of evil. Evil the origin of which he was trying

to find is not a substance, because if it were a substance, it would be good. For either it would be an incorruptible substance of the supreme order of goodness, or it would be corruptible unless it was good. From this nothing can be completely or absolutely evil since evil is a privation of being and non can be completely deprived of being in all aspect and still exist.

To Augustine, all that God have made is good, and there are no substance whatsoever that were not made by God. And because God did not make them all equal, each single thing is good and collectively they are very good, for God made the whole creation very good. In finding an explanation of the problem of evil with the Platonist books Augustine realized that evil is a perversion of the will not, a substance as the Manicheans claimed that God was a substance that could suffer evil.

Readings in Religion and Philosophy

A Jesulf intellectual approached the problem of evil from evolutionary perspective as an evolutional philosopher. Teilhard de Chardin considers the universe as an imperfect mechanism that is undergoing constant changes in terms of development. The universe we inhabit has not yet attained it's perfect goal which it is gradually moving towards. As a result of this, constant changes and gradual development, once in a while there is disorderliness, catastrophe and cataclysm. For him, the world is still in process of evolution:

which suffers, which labours which sins Statistically, at every degree of evolution, we find evil always and everywhere forming and reforming implacably in and around sin... How many failures have there been for one success? How many for one solitary saint? (p 125)

Formally Teilhard de Chardin expose, the world would remain imperfect, while evil triumphs until the world gets to the omega point, which is the targeted goal of the creator.

In St. Anselm's Prologian II

This even the fool is convinced that something that which nothing greater can be conceived is in the understanding, since when he hears this, he understood that whatever is understood is the understanding. And certainly, that then which a greater cannot be conceived cannot be in the understanding alone, it can be conceived to exist in reality also, which is greater. Thus, if that than which a greater can be conceived. But surely this cannot be. Thus, without doubt something that which a greater cannot be conceived exist both in the understanding and in reality.

2.1 The Concept of Theism

Theism

The Word "theos" qeos" in Greek means" God". Theism means belief in God, where God is understood to be the single omnipotent creator of everything else

that exist. God is regarded as a being distinct from his creation though manifesting himself through it and also essentially personal, earring from and communicating with mankind and infinitely worthy of human worships and obedience. Theism is a central element in the whole judaco Christian religious tradition. A theistic argument is one that is meant to establish the existence of God and "prove" it to non-believers or reaffirm it for the benefit of believers.

2.2 The Various Arguments about the Existence of God.

Moral Arguments

Among the philosopher who advance moral argument for the existence of God are Kant and Hasting Rashdall. Kant (2006) argues that:

"Morality per supposes the existence of God, there must be God to reward morality. A morality upright man who conforms to the demand of the moral law ought to be rewarded with happiness proportionate to his observance of the moral law. And it is only God that can do that" (p 43)

Therefore God exists, otherwise morality would not make sense, justice would not be done to those who observe the moral law. Hastings Rashdal points out that the moral imperative is transcendent and obliges all human being. Therefore, it's source must also be transcendent in other words the source of the moral law or the moral imperative must be a being that transcends man a being that is higher than man, and who has the moral law to regulate and control man's

behaviors. The obvious objection to this argument is that very many people, atheists, agnostics and humanists, believe in morality and observe the moral law strictly but without believing in God. They do not see morality as presupposing God and they practice morality without adhering to any religion. They see morality as something on its own, without depending on God or religion. The fact remains however that although belief in God or adherence to a religion is not a necessary condition for the practice of morality, it nevertheless enhances it. The moral practice of the atheist, agnostic or humanist would be enhanced if he becomes converted and comes to believe in God.

Russell (2006), maintains that God exist and the existence (or the reality) of God are solecisms. But these however remain very convenient solecisms which can be rendered harmless by stipulating that God exist is to be understood as shorthand for 'there is an individual and only one, who is omniscient, omnipotent etc understood this way, we can retain the traditional phrase "God exist while admitting it's logical impropriety.

Argument from Religious Experience

This kind of argument can take various forms it can take the form of personal experience of the transcendent, an experience of God, an encounter with him, which in most cases radically changes the course of one's life. A classical example of such an experience is that of Saul of Tarsus on his way to Damascus to arrest any Christian he could find in that city, for he hated

Christians and didn't want to see them anywhere. He launched a relentless attack on them and obtained permission from the authorities to arrest any of them he found anywhere. It was for the purpose that he set for Damascus when on the way he had a dramatic religious experience, which changed the course of his life. By the time he got to Damascus he was a different man radically changed. Instead of arresting Christians, he joined them and for the rest of his life he was preaching that Jesus Christ was the son of God, the long-awaited Messiah, the Saviour of the world.

Paul spent the rest of his life traveling from city to city preaching, winning increasing number of convert and establishing churches- expounding the very church he had vowed to destroy. What happened to him? He tells us himself that this radical change was as a result of the dramatic religious experience he had on his way to Damascus. A brilliant dazzling light came upon him from above and a powerful force knocked him down from his horse. As he was lying helpless on the ground, he heard a voice asking him "Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?" And when he asked who was speaking to him, the answer came: "I am Jesus whom you are persecuting" Jesus was the name Saul didn't want to hear, and whose followers he was persecuting arresting them and putting them in prison, still lying helpless, and realizing that Jesus had now won, he surrendered to him, ready to do whatever he wanted him to do. And so, he

asked Jesus: "what do you want me to do now lord" He was asked to get up and go into the city and there he would be told what to do. When he managed to get up, he discovered he had become blind and he was led by his companions into the city. He remained blind for the next three days and could not eat anything. It was only when a disciple sent by Jesus to him to open his eyes came and prayed for him, laying his hand on him, that his eyes became open again and he was able to eat. From that point onward Saul was no longer the same, even his name was changed from Saul to Paul. He lived the rest of his life working for Jesus and suffering for him until he eventually died for him, such is the power of religious experience.

The objection usually raised against any argument base on religious experience is that religious experience is something subjective, personal to the person who has it and the interpretation he gives, is his own interpretation of that experience which is personal to him. Another person may give it a different interpretation. The point however is that religious experience is an experience of something objectively real. If for example, Jesus were not objectively real how could we account for the force that knocked Paul down on the way to Damascus, what made him blind? How could we account for the radical change of his life? Religious experience is a strong pointer to the existence and reality of God.

2.3 Theist Perspective: Thomas Aquinas

The existence of God can be proved in five ways by Thomas Aquinas. The first and more manifest way is the argument from motion, it is certain and evident to our sense that some things are in motion. Whatever is in motion is moved by something else for nothing can be in motion unless it has a potential for that towards which it is being moved, where as a thing moves in as much as it is in action. By "motion" we mean nothing else than the change of something from a state of potentiality into a state of actuality. But nothing can be changed from potentiality to actuality except by something already in a state of actuality. For example, fire which is actually hot makes wood which is potentiality hot to be actually hot. Thereby fire makes and changes wood from potentiality to actuality. Yet, it is not possible that the same thing at the same moment should be in a state of actuality and potentiality from the same point of view, but only from different point of view. What is actuality hot cannot simultaneously be potentially hot, still, it is simultaneously potentially cold it is therefore impossible that, from the same point of view and in the same way anything should be both moved and mover that is, that it should move itself. Therefore, whatever is in motion must be put in motion by something else. If that by which it is put in motion were itself put in motion, then this also must have been put in when by some thing else and that by something else again. This cannot go on to infinity, for if it did, there would be no first mover and consequently no other mover seeing that subsequent movers only move in as much as they are put in motion by the first movers; as the staff only moves because it is put in motion

by the band. Therefore, it is necessary to arrive at a first mover, put in motion by no other. Everyone understands that the first mover is God.

The second way is from the nature of efficient causation. In the other world of sensible thing, we find that there is an order of efficient causality. There is no case known (neither is it indeed, possible) in which a thing is found to be the efficient cause of itself, it would be prior to itself, which is impossible now in tracing the chain of efficient cause of the intermediate cause, and the intermediate is the cause of the ultimate cause or effect whether the intermediate cause is several or only one. To take away the cause is to take away the effect. Therefore, if there were no first cause among efficient cause there would be neither intermediate cause nor ultimate cause. But if it were possible to go on to infinity in the chain of efficient cause, no intermediate efficient cause, no ultimate effect all of which is plainly false. Therefore, it is necessary to put forward a first efficient cause, to which everyone gives the name of God.

The third way, which taken from possibility and necessity, runs thus; We find in nature things that may possibly either exist or not exist, since they are found to be generated and then to be corrupted. Consequently, they can come into being and then cease to exist. It is impossible for those things to always exist for what which can someday cease to exist must at some times have not existed. Therefore, if everything could cease to exist, then at one time there could have been nothing in existence if this were true, even how there would be

nothing in existence, because that which does not exist begin to exist only by means of something already existing. Therefore, if at onetime nothing existed it would have been impossible for anything to have begin to exist and even now nothing will be in existence, which is assured therefore, not all beings are merely possible, there must exist something. the existence of which is necessary.

Every necessary thing either has been necessarily caused by something else or it does not. It is impossible to go on to infinity, in necessary things which have their necessity caused by something else as has been already proved in regard to efficient cause. Therefore, we cannot but postulate the existence of some being having of itself its own necessity, a being that does not receive its necessity from something else, but rather cause necessity in others, this all men speak of as God. The fourth way is taken from the gradation to be found in things. Among being there are some more and some less good, true, noble and the like.

But "more" and "less" are predicating of particular thing, in so far as they resemble in their different ways some thing that is in degree of "most" for example a thing is said to became hotter when it more nearly resembles that which is hottest since this is the case, there must be something that is truest, something that is best, something that is noblest, and, ultimately. same thing that is uttermost being. For the truer things are, the most truly they exist. What is most complete in any genus is the cause of everything in that genus. For instance, fire, which is the most complete form of heat, is the cause whereby all

things are made hot. Therefore, there must also be something that is to all being the cause of their being, goodness, and every other perfection, and this we call God.

The fifth way is taken from the governance of the world. We see that things that lack intelligence, such as natural bodies act for some purpose. This fact is evident from their acting always or nearly always in the same way, so as to obtain the best result. Hence it is plain that it is not by chance that they achieve their purpose, but rather by design. What ever lacks intelligence cannot fulfil some purpose, unless it is directed by some being endow with intelligence and knowledge as an archer shoot on arrow to it's mark. Therefore, some intelligent being exist by whom all natural things are directed towards a definite purpose, and this being we call God.

Ontological Proof (St Anselm 1033-1109)

In his work the Proslogan, in the context of trying to understand rationally what we possess already in faith, Anselm (1965) argues as follows:

"God is that than which nothing greater can be conceived (thought) but that than which nothing greater can be conceived must exist not only mentally in idea but also extra-mentally. Therefore, God exist" (p. 64).

If God were to exist only mentally, he would not be perfect or the greatest we think of, for we would think of another which is both great and really

existing in reality, therefore greater than him because this better one has both existence and greatness. The conclusion; object of thought exists in reality as well. St Anselm's argument goes straight from the datum that God is for us the greatest reality thinkable if he is the greatest conceivable reality and at the same time one that does not exist, then he is not reality but mere Chimera. But we are at the level of realities in our thought. Moreover, as some people like Bonaventure and duns scouts (1965) argues that:

"there is no contradiction that a finite mind could comprehend an infinite being, not totally but partially, partially, but reality" p. 67

This even the fool is convinced that something that which nothing greater can be conceived, is in the understanding, since when he hears this, Anselm understands it and whatever is understood is in the understanding. And certainly, that than which a greater cannot be in the understanding alone. For if it is even in the understanding alone it can be conceived to exist in reality also, which is greater. Thus, if that than which a greater can be conceived. But surely this cannot be, there is without doubt something that which a greater cannot be conceived and in reality.

Planting a prove of God's existence

1) That God exist in the understanding but not in reality.

- 2) That existence in reality is greater than existence in the understanding alone.
- 3) That a being having all God's properties plus existence in reality can be conceived.
- 4) That a being having all God's property plus existence in reality is greater than God.
- 5) That a being greater than God can be conceived.
- 6) That it is false that a being greater than god can be conceived.
- 7) Hence, it is false that God exists in the understanding but not in reality.
- 8) That God exist in understanding (this is the premise on which even the fool agrees) and that,
- 9) Hence God exist in reality

Barnes, the Ontological:

Barnes argument is as follows:

1. The fool understands the expression "the being than which no greater can be conceived".
- 2 If a person understands an expression "b", then 'b' is in that person understanding.
3. If a thing is in a person's understanding, then the person can conceive of that thing existing in reality.

4. That each thing which exist in reality is greater than anything which exist only in the understanding.
5. That a person conceived of something and that thing entails something else than the person can also conceived of that other thing.
6. That if a person can conceive that a specified object has a given property than that person can conceived that something or other has that property.
7. Hence, the being that which no greater can be conceived exist in reality.

Descartes opines that there is no less contradiction in conceiving a supremely perfect being who lacks existence than there is in conceiving a triangle whose interior angles do not sum up to 180 degrees. Hence, Descartes suppose, since we do conceive a supremely perfect being. Therefore, we must conclude that a supremely perfect being exists.

Aristotle (Proof for God's existence)

Unmoved mover

Aristotle argument for the existence of God is based on his theory of change or motion. A change or motion (the two terms means the same thing for Aristotle) implies a transition from the state of potency to a state of act. A being that change has moved from one state (the state of potency) to another (the state of act) it has therefore acquired what it formerly lacked. But it cannot give itself

what it lacks, for (nemodat quod non habet) nobody can give what he does not have. A being in potency therefore cannot bring itself to act and since motion involves a transition from potency to act, it follows that no being is the absolute initiator of its own motion. Consequently, whatever moves is moved by another, a being in potency requires a being, to move it from potency to act. What is true of any object in motion is true of the whole universe in motion. The motion of the universe presupposes a mover who is himself unmoved. If the cause of the motion of the universe is itself moved, it would also have a mover and if that other one is itself moved it would have a mover too, and so on infinitum. We would therefore have an infinite regress but there must be a starting point in the whole process; there must be a first mover, which is the unmoved mover, the prime mover. Since the unmoved mover is itself not subjected to motion it follows that it has no potency but is pure act.

This means that it has no matter in its being, but is purely immaterial, and since it is pure act without any potency, it must be absolutely perfect, immutable and eternal. Since it neither changes nor moves, its activities cannot be physical for it is an immaterial (non-physical) being. Its activities therefore must be purely intellectual, and this means that its activities consist in thinking. The unmoved mover is God, God is the prime mover, the unmoved mover and the source of the motion of the universe.

In conclusion, we can see that God really, exist, different philosophers gave their different proof and one cannot disprove of God's existence, looking at the universe, it was not just formed by itself. There must be a founded, have never seen anything not formed that is in existence, there must be creator which is God. We have gone through different proof for the existence of God froes St Anselm, Augustine, Aristotle, Descartes and so many others.

CHAPTER THREE

The concept of evil is a bifurcated one. It is a concept involving philosophers and theologians. It is also a concept, which proves or disproves God's existence. Different philosophical school of thought through the ages have given different explanation of the concept of evil in order to understand what we are talking about it is worthwhile to have a clarification of what evil is. Evil is a negation of the perfection of being. It is an active force, which requires continue resistance on the part of God and humans. Different philosophers have different views on the concept of evil. According to Augustine (1994):

"Evil is not a positive thing it is not something positive but simply negative of being. God created every positive thing, for God is the creator of all things and whatever he created is good. (p. 138)

Augustine thus disagree with Plotinus who held that matter was evil since evil is not a positive thing, but only the negation of being, it does not make sense to ask who created it for evil was not created and could not exist on it's own since

it is not a being? Only substance can and do exist on their own and they are good because they were all created by God To Augustine, evil is nothing but the corruption of natural measure, form and order what is called evil in nature is a corruption. If it were not corrupt nature it will be good, but when it is corrupted, so far as it remains a natural thing, it is good. It is only bad in so far as it is corrupted.

St Augustine (1994) also stated thus

"there can be no evil where there is no good nothing evil exist in itself, but only as an evil aspect of some actual entity Evil, therefore have their source in Good and wensless they are parasite on something they are not anything of all Moreover, anything that has being is good. (jp)

If the good is for diminished as to be utterly consumed just as there is no goodness left, so there is no existence left. The only positive point that can attribute to the view that evil is non-existence is that it shows the presence of evil in the universe as secondary, rather than primary and essential. For the Manichean's concept of evil, they are of the motion that life consist of perpetual conflict between the good and evil. The principle of good (Ormured) and the principle of evil (Ahriman). These are the two ultimate sources of thing Le good and evil. The Manicheans hold the view that evil is real and has always co-existed with goodness and it is powerful and active and that there is a single

benevolent divine being, who is finite in power, and consequently, unable to prevent evil from spoiling his created universe upon which he exercise his limited sovereignty.

Platinus for example, sees God as responsible for a few things that happen to man Thus be sought to absolve God of blame for the presence of evil. J. S. Mill (1964) reiterated this view when he said

"There is no ground in natural theology for attributing intelligence of personality to the obstacles which partially thwart what seem the purpose of the crease, the limitation of his power more probably resalt either from the qualities of the material the substances and forces of which the universe is composed not admitting of any arrangement by which his purpose could have been move completely fulfilled or else, the purpose might have been fully attained, but the creator did not known how to do it, creative skill, wonderful as it is, wat mot angficiently perfect to accomplish his purpose move thoroughly (p.36)

However, in this quotation, it is obvious that a limited God who is himself struggling against the forces of disorder in the universes, satisfles neither, reason nor the religious awareness of thoughtful Christians. It therefore appears that to deny the omnipotence of God cannot provide a satisfactory solution to

the problem of evil, since any solution which was against the omnipotence of God is not making a proper attempt. Schopenhauer (1977) in his conception of evil, he is beings with the affirmation of the will as fundamental to the universe. He says, this will to be, will to love, is the cause of all the struggle in the world and thus of all evil and suffering. A world where the more powerful kill and devour the less powerful that may live, is a world of evil. And that the will to good life is through denial of the individual will, self sacrifice bring happiness and peace.

According to Montaigne (1995), the taste of good and evil depends upon the opinion we have of them, this Montaigne sees evil and good as subjective- Spinoza on the other hand also complement that good and evil indicate nothing positive in things considered in themselves nor are they anything else but modes on thought. One and the same thing may at the same time be good and evil or indifferent according to the person making the moral judgment. Furthermore, Spinoza (2001), claims that good is identical with pleasant and flatly declares, "we do not desire a thing because we call it good because we desire it. For Leibniz

(1979), he formulated a theodicy that is classic in nature. He said God is not all powerful because he could not have created a world devoid of evil. He said evil is as a result of the fact that God cannot do all things; that is God cannot stop man from committing moral evil.

More so, according to the stoics, evil is part of the universal plan and it makes its own contribution towards the order and harmony of the universe. It follows from this deterministic world view of the stoics that there is no real evil in the world, since everything is part of God and every event is part of the ways in which God order the world through the laws of nature. In reality, according to the other hand Hegel (1977) believes that evil is necessary for good to exist and evil complement each other. For the Buddhists, they believes that life is evil and full of sorrows only through death that man can escape from life. For the Islam and Muslims, they see the problem of evil in the world from the view point of the absolute power and sovereignty of God who has the whole universe and everything in it under his sovereign control. For Allah is the absolute creator, master and ruler of the universe. Man, a creature of Allah has the duty to submit unconditionally to the will of Allah, following the example of Abraham.

Islam thus emphasizes the absolute power and sovereignty of God and man's duty to submit unconditionally to the will of God, following the example of

Abraham. Since God is the absolute creator and lord of the universe everything is under his sovereign control. This means that evil too is under the control of God, for nothing is outside his control. What we call evil must be part of God's purpose role in the scheme of things according to God's plan suffering can be seen by man as opportunity to demonstrate his unshakable faith in God and

32

an unconditional submission to him. Suffering can be a punishment for sin, but it can also be a test of one's faith in God hence suffering should be endured with patience and submission- total submission to God. On the other hand, everything possible should be done to alleviate suffering, for example, by aiming giving.

This according to Islam God allows people to suffer either to punish them for their sins or to test their faith in him. In either case, it should be endured with patience and total submission. Christian theology explains evil in the light of the suffering and death of Jesus Christ. Jesus suffered much evil but it was turned into good by God, for Christ's suffering and death culminated in his glorification and salvation for mankind. Similarly God will also, in the final analysis, turn

into good the evil that now plagues mankind. It is because he knows that he is later going to turn it into good that is why God permit evil in the world.

Through this various philosophical explanation of the concept of evil, we now come to realize that there is no specific view about the motion of the existence of evil in the universe, since no philosopher theologians have given us a definite explanation about the existence of evil. This now bring us to the problem of evil and how different philosophers try to find solution to this problem.

32 The Problem of Evil

The problem of evil in the world has long been a puzzle to the human mind. There is na philosopher, theologian of apologetic, who has not been confronted with this question. It is therefore of the utmost important that it should be shown that the existence of evil is compatible not only with the existence of God, but also with the love for mankind.

la discussing the problem of evil, fundamental question are normally reveled questions to which answers are not easily find such as: why does God permit so much suffering? Is God able to prevent evil in the world but is unwilling to do so? If there is God who is infinitely good, why is there evil in the world? These are question, which is most difficult to answer.

3.2.1 Type of Evil

Moral evil: moral evil consist essential in the disorder of the will. It can also be said that it has to do with human freedom and the wrong deeds in relation to societal standards concerning principles of right and wrong in human behaviors. Many people minimized moral evil or deny it on the basic of criminal or legal mode.

According to Aquinas (2000),

moral evil is due to man's misuse of it's freedom which is itself a good thing to be free implies to be able to chose good or evil and also mainonidas, says that moral evil is as a result of ignorance, if human being known the truth there would be no wars, or hatred Evil is as a result of human free will" (p 49)

In furtherance, with regard to moral evil Augustine (1994) says that moral evil has no other source beyond the free will of man who makes an evil choice. Thus, the origin and cause of moral evil is man's misuse of his free will by making an evil choice

3.2.2 Ontological Evil

It is also called metaphysical evil. It is the fact of limitedness in created beings. Only God himself is ontologically perfect, with no limitation or lack. He is pure being and in him

is the fullness of being and having existing. In all other beings (angels, human beings and lower beings of the universe) there is the imperfection of the partially of being a through understanding of this, reveal that every created being lack some thing. In as much as there is some lack, there is imperfection, and contingency and finitude. Once these exist, then there is evil, ontological evil in every created being Mental Evil/ Suffering

Suffering, in the words of John Hicks, is a mental state, which may be as complex as human life itself, by this Hicks means that suffering is not necessarily in the material lack or external destitution. It is the carry over to the persons internal composure that makes the situation one of suffering what are the factors responsible for suffering? The factor that cause, accompany and promote suffering are the surrounding circumstances of unfulfilled hopes, injured capability, feeling of dependence and liability to others as well as the treat of unending bad condition. The height of all suffering is death, it is ultimate suffering to have to face death more still if one has a lot unfulfilled desires in life, if one is afraid of what comes after. Suffering (mental or otherwise) however has a salutary value. If one suffers meaningfully, if one suffers vicariously and if one suffers for a good cause, even in this world, one would

have made suffering a redemptive event. This is what Christian suffering is all about, even unto death

Natural Evil

The Suffering to humans and animals resulting from natural causes such as genetic defects, diseases, earthquakes and tornadoes. It is evil done in nature where man has no

moral responsibility. Natural evil is that which occurs by the nature of the way things are, unwilled and uninfluenced by man.

How Various Philosophers Try To Find Solution to the Problem of Evil

Following the Christian scriptures the problem of men started right from the Garden of Eden with the first man and woman claimed to have existence in the same garden. The book of Genesis makes us understand that as a result of man's disobedience, the original state of man was distorted, and the consequence was between God and man. Before the fall of man, man seems to be at peace with God until he was banished from the garden. Critically reviewing the book of Genesis, one is tempted to advance that God created evil along side with other creatures. For instance, God created both the tree of life and serpent that caused the fall of man" God would have created just the tree of life if he wants man to remain in the paradise.

Furthermore, God would not have expected man to be able to defeat the cunning creature since he knows fully well that the serpent was cunning and more intelligent than man, God could not expect man to overcome the temptation posed on him by the serpent. It would seem as if the aims and objective of bringing the tree of life and the serpent into existence was to end the comfortability of man in the Garden of Eden and then thrown into an open miserable world to suffer and die. Theists hold that at creation, God gave man free will to choose between good and evil, God favoured man by making him rational among all other creatures and to subdue the universe to his taste. Augustine as well as Paul claimed that the present situation of the world is brought by the fall of mankind from the original

will, perhaps, the most important proposed solution to the problem of evil is that evil is not to be ascribed to God at all, but to the independent action of human beings.

For stoicism, the problem of evil in the universe is governed by rigid laws of nature emanating from God, and evil is an integral part of the external plan and part of the system and contributes toward the order and harmony of the universe system. Plotinus (1992) on the other hand, asserted that the problem of evil cannot be stopped, as long as we are in the material world and attached to material things we cannot avoid experiencing evil in the world. However, for

Teilhard de Chardin(1972), he considered the universe as an imperfect mechanism that is undergoing constant changes in terms of development. For him, the world is still in the process of formation, a world in the process of evolution is a world: which suffers, which labours, which sins. Statically, at every degree of evolution, we find it always and everywhere, forming and reforming implacably in and around us how many failures for one success? How many sins for one solitary saint"

According to Teilhard de Chardin (1972); the world would remain imperfect, while evil triumph until the world gets to the omega point which is the targeted goal of the creator. For Leibniz (1958), he explained that it was not possible for God to create perfect beings since perfection belongs to God alone. Creating perfect being amounts to creating other gods which God did not intend doing. The only way to avoid the creation of other Gods who would be as perfect as himself was to create imperfect creature. He argued that it was better for God to create imperfect creatures than not to create at all. Leibniz (1958)

"as long as there are imperfect creatures, metaphysical evil is inevitable physical evil (such as earthquake, flood, disasters, sickness and death) is also inevitable because it is part of the system of the universe, and it contributes to the order and harmony in the universes" (p.135)

Leibniz also holds man responsible for moral evil, which is as a result of man's misuse of his free will.

In conclusion, the problem of evil constitute one of the greatest difficulties because there is no definite solution to the problem of evil in the universe many thinkers either rest the causes of evil on human freedom or as a part of the degree for nature to make good possible in the universe.

39

CHAPTER FOUR

THEISM AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

The presence of evil in a world said to be created by a "Being" who is not only omnipotent, omniscience and perfectly good is problematic. It is a problem that a perturbed man for age and coupled with various natural disasters still makes the concept a problematic one. How can there be a loving God, an all-powerful and all-knowing God and still face the problem of evil, if really He is perfectly good and created everything then where does evil originate from? Athiest or agnostics base their case on the lack of evidence for God existence, however atheist have at least one powerful positive argument for their position that there cannot be a living, all-loving, all-powerful God because there is so much evil

and suffering in this world. Atheists raise questions like: If you were a parent, wouldn't you do everything possible to prevent your children from needless suffering? Many innocent children suffer from painful diseases, with this kind of problem how can we affirm for a loving and all-powerful God in the world.

In this study, the researcher is going to look through the lenses of a philosophy who talks about the problem of evil and God's existence. The main focus of this work is theism and the problem of evil. Before going to the main work, we will first look at the problem which is evil, the different types of evil and the different explanation (philosophical and religious explanation) of evil.

4.1 What Theists Understand as the Problem Of Evil

It is impossible to deny the existence of evil in the world as we human beings experience pain and suffering everyday. It is generally accepted that there are two different types of evil- natural and moral. Moral evil is caused by human beings and occurs when humans inflict suffering on other people (e.g. world war, the holocaust), animals (e.g. animal testing) or the environment (e.g. pollution, destroying the rainforests) natural evil is not caused by humans and occurs naturally in the world e.g. earthquakes, droughts and cancer. However, not all evils can be easily separated into these categories as humans can contribute to natural evils i.e. although cancer is a naturally occurring disease, humans often do things which bring about its occurrences.

The problem is not the evil itself but the fact that it exist in the first place. The problem of evil is a problem caused by the nature of God. If we believe that God created everything (creation ex nihilo), then he has total responsibility for the existence of evil as he must have created it. This provokes the question: Why did God create evil or why does he allow evil to exist? The God of classical theism is all good and all powerful, this suggest that one would want to remove evil for the good of the human race and is able to do so. Therefore, if God is all good and all powerful then there should be no evil in the world. However, there is clearly evil in the world. This brings about the following possibilities and questions:

1. God is not all good- is he a malevolent God?
2. God is not all powerful is he worthy of worship?

1. God does not exist

This is the problems of evil. Augustine (1918), summed it up mond effectively when he said, "rider God cannot abolish evil or he will not. If he cannot then he is not all powerful. If he will not then he is not all good". Augustine viewed evil as darkness in the sbsence of light, a non- bring a name for nothing but the want of good. He looked to the hible to account for the existence of God and believed that the fall of humanity from grace, as shown in Genesis, showed the origin of

evil. He believe that evil came into the world because human beings had deliberately turn away from God and his goodness. This suggests that both moral and natural evil is a result of original human sin

Aquinas looked at the problem of evil from a theoretic perspective. Liaz Augustine, he defined evil simply as a privation of good (*privatio bonni*). He believe that evil is not an entity in it's own right but merely the absence of good. He claimed that when humans do evil they are falling short of perfection and that nothing can be pure evil as anything that fell short of it's nature 100% would not exist. For example, Satan and Hitler are good to the extent that they existed but evil in that they acted against their nature and fell short of perfection Aquinas explained that good cannot be evil because it is infinite and cannot be order than he is, he cannot fall short of perfection. Therefore it is a logical contradiction to say that he is evil to Aquinas as evil exist as a separate entity and that evil is simply the absence of good

42 John Hick's Greater Good Defense

John Hick's stands was that; If the notion of a brave new world pill that makes people instantly virtuous does not seem quite right then one can appreciate the solution to the problem of evil proposed by the Christian theologians. John Hick

was born in 1922, educated at Edinburgh, Oxford, and Cambridge universities and was the Danforth professor of religion at Claremont Graduate School until his retirement in 1994. He has published a number of highly regarded works in the philosophy of religion. Hick developed what he calls the "minority report" in the history of theology. This view is that when God initially created humanity, there was still some work to do in making it a completed produce. However, this remaining work could not be accomplished by God alone, humans have to contribute to the process. Using the greater goods defense, Hick argues that even God himself could not achieve certain results without allowing humans to struggle against evil and to endure suffering.

John Hick on Evil and the God of Love

Instead of regarding man as having been created by God in a finished state, as a finitely perfect being fulfilling the divine intention for our human level of existence, and then falling disastrously away from this, the minority report sees man as still in process of creation. And so man, created as a personal being in the image of God, is only the raw material for a further and more difficult stage of God's creative work. This is the leading of man as relatively free and autonomous persons, through their own dealings with life in the world in which he has placed them, towards that quality of personal existence that is the finite likeness of God....

In the light of modern anthropological knowledge some form of two stage conception of the creation of man has become an almost unavoidable Christian tenet. At the very least we must acknowledge as two distinguishable stages the fashioning of homo sapiens as a product of the long evolutionary process, and his sudden or gradual spiritualization as a child of God. But we may well extend the first stage to include the development of man as a rational and responsible person, capable of personal relationship with the personal infinite who has created him. The first stage of the creative process was, to our anthropomorphic imaginations, easy for divine omnipotence. By an exercise of creative power God caused the physical universes to exist, and in the course of countless ages to bring forth within it organic life, and finally to produce out of organic life personal life, and when man had thus emerged out of the evolution of the forms of organic life, a creature had been made who has the possibility of existing in conscious fellowship with God. But the second stage of the creative process is of a different kind altogether. It cannot be performed by omnipotent power as such. For personal life is essentially free and self directing. It cannot be perfected by divine fiat, but only through the unimpelled responses and willing co-operation of human individuals in their actions and reactions in the world in which God has placed them. Man may eventually become the perfected person whom the New Testament calls "children of God" but they cannot be created ready-made as this.

The value- judgment that is implicitly being invoked here is that one who has attained to goodness by meeting and eventually mastering temptations, and thus by rightly making responsible choice in concrete situation, is good in a richer and more valuable sense than would be one created abinitio (from the beginning) in a state either of innocence or of virtue. In the former case, which is that of the actual moral achievements of mankind, the Individual's goodness has within it the strength of temptation overcome, stability based upon an accumulation of right choices, and a positive and responsible character that comes from the investment of costly personal effort. I suggest, then, that it is an ethically reasonable judgment even though in the nature of the case not one that is capable of demonstrative proof, that human goodness slowly built up through personal histories of moral effort has a value in the eyes of the creator which justifies even the long trivial of the soul making process.

If, then, God's aim in making the world is the bringing of many sons to glory: that aim will naturally determine the kind of world that he has created. Atheistic writers almost invariably assume a conception of the divine purpose which is contrary to the Christian conception. They assume that the purpose of a loving God must be to create a hedonistic paradise, and therefore to the extent that the world is other than this, it proves to them that God is either not loving enough or not powerful enough to create such a world. They think of God's

relation to the earth on the model of a human being building a cage for a pet animal to dwell in. if he is human he will naturally make his pet quarter as pleasant and healthful as he can.

Any respect in which the cage falls short of the veterinarian's ideal, and contains possibilities of accident or disease, is evidence of either limited benevolence or limited means or both. Those who use the problem of evil as an argument against belief in God almost invariably think of the world in this kind of way. But if we are right in supposing that God's purpose for man is to lead him from human bios, or the biological life of man, to that quality of zoe, or the personal life of eternal worth, which we see in Christ, then the question that we have to ask is not; "is this the kind of world that an all-powerful and infinitely loving "being would create as an environment for his human pets? Or is the architecture of the world the most pleasant and convenient possible?" the question that we have to ask is rather, "is this the kind of world that God might make as an environment in which moral beings may be fashioned, through their own free insight and responses, as children of God?"

Such critics as Hume are confusing what heaven ought to be, as an environment for perfected finite beings, with what this world ought to be, as an environment for beings who are in the process of becoming perfected. For if our general conception of God's purpose is correct the world is not intended to be a paradise,

but rather the scene of a history in which human personality may be formed towards the pattern of Christ. Men are not to be thought of on the analogy of animal pet, whose life is to be made as agreeable as possible, but rather on the analogy of human children, who are to grow to adulthood in an environment whose primary and overriding purpose is not immediate pleasure but the realizing of the most valuable potentialities of human personality.

How does the best parental love express itself in its influence upon the environment in which children are to grow up? I think it is clear that a parent who loves his children, and wants them to become the best human being that they are capable of becoming, does not treat pleasure as the sole and supreme value. Certainly we seek pleasure for our children and take great delight in obtaining it for them; but we do not desire for them unalloyed pleasure at the expense of their growth in such even greater value as moral integrity, unselfishness, compassion, courage, humour, reverence for the truth, and perhaps above all the capacity for love. We do not on the promise that pleasure is the supreme end of life, and if the development of these other values so mentioned clashes with the position of pleasure, then we are willing to make our children miss a certain amount of this, rather than fail to come to possess and to be possessed by the finer and more precious qualities that are possible to the human personality. A child brought up on the principle that the only or the supreme value is pleasure would not be likely to become an ethically mature

adult or an attractive or happy personality. And to most parents it seem more important to try to foster quality and strength of character in their children than to fill their lives at all times with the utmost possible degree of pleasure.

If, then, there is any true analogy between God's purpose for his human creatures, and the purpose of loving and wise parents for their children, we have to recognize that the pre sense of pleasure and the absence of pain cannot be the supreme and an overriding end for which the world exist. Rather, this world must be a place of soul-making. And it's value

is to be judged, not primarily by the quality of pleasure and pain occurring in it at any particular moment, but by it's fitness for it's primary purpose, the purpose of soul making.

Augustine's Approach on the Concept of Evil

When he was nineteen, he had an illegimate child called adeodatus by his mistress whom he lived with for ten years. He joined the Manichean school (a philosophico-religions school founded by mani, a Persian prophet in the third century AD) to him, Manichaeism seems to explain or present to him rational truth as purposed to Christianity in a God who they said is good. If good is God and created the universe, how come there is evil and suffering in the universe he

created? There seemed to be no answer from the Christian religion to the question puzzling his mind, so he sought solace in Manichaeism theory of two ultimate principles of good and evil. This appealed to him as they seemed to explain his question.

According to the Manicheans, they believe that the principle of God called the "ordmuzd" caused good spirit and all good things. It consist of all immaterial things in the universe, while the principle of all bad things is called "ahriman", and is the source of all natural things. Ordumuzd represent light while ahriman is darkness. These two principles are in eternal and perpetual conflict with each other and this conflict is reflected in the things that come from them. Hence light and darkness, sprit and matter, good and evil are also in perpetual conflict.

At first Augustine accepted it and later rejected it. Augustine became converted to Christianity and he was baptized by the Bishop at the age of 37 in 387 AD. His works are mainly on theology and mostly on controversial issues. His earliest writing sprang from his philosophizing with his friends in classes. He wrote on scriptures particularly Psalms and Saint John. This was followed by the didactic writing on the instruction of a novice writing en Christian doctrines and the Euclidian

But his two famous and most widely read works are: The Confession and the City of God. He believed that to know God is to know his creation. Human

ideas come into being through Intellectual ability too to abstract from sensation, and the knowledge of God illuminates the human mind. In talking about evil, Augustine's mind is like a river that is continually fed from three source Manicheasnm, Neoplatonism and the Bible. In his view of evil, Augustine refuted the Manicheanist conception of evil saying, the devil is evil by nature, there can be no question of it at all". He viewed evil as a privation of something.

For Augustine, evil is taken very serious and is made more basic to Christian thought than the metaphysical concept of evil as a privation. Thus, he says that evil is not as a result of our deficiency but the consequences of our perverse corrupt will, that is the misuse of man's free will by making an evil and good choice, therefore man is the source of moral evil. The question he failed to answer is who is responsible for metaphysical and physical evil that are beyond human contact? He illustrates the necessity of evil in the universe by using a simple analogy of a good painter. A good painter uses both bright and dull colors to

bring out the beauty of his work. A good painter do not only use bright colours for his painting he also states also that a well organized city comprises of heroes, clowns, servant etc.

According to Augustine (1944):

"we are like people ignorant of painting who complain that the colors are not beautiful everywhere in the picture, but the artist has laid on, the appropriate tints to every spot and that cities well governed are not composed of citizens who are equal. Again, we are ensuring a drama because the persons are not all heroes but include a servant and a rustic and some scurrilious clans, yet taking away the low characters and the power of the drama is going to be part and parcel of it" (p.139)

In order to appreciate what is perfect there must be imperfection and it is this imperfection that is regarded as evil. Following Augustine's view of evil, it is the mixture of both good and evil that makes the world look harmonious. It means, if everything is perfect and good, the world will look monotonous and unappreciated for instance, to appreciate good health, one must have experienced poor health. He insisted that man's will has been weakened by original sin and as a result man is unable to do any good action without God's grace. In the aspect of original sin, Augustine says "for as soon our parent had transgressed the commandment, divine grace foretook them, and they were confounded at their own wickedness".(p.38)

More so, talking about God and nature Augustine in his book the confession;

"though than are the creator of all things, yet understanding not readily and clearly the cause of evil. Whatever it was I perceived must be sought out so as not to constrain me to believe that immutable God was immutable. I directed my attention to discern what I now heard that free will was the cause of our doing evil and the righteous judgment of our suffering it. But I was unable to clearly discern it so trying to draw eyes of my mind from that pit, I was plunged again, I know as well I had as that I had life when therefore I was most or unwilling to do anything I was most certain that it was the cause of my sin. But what I did against my will, I saw that I suffer rather did and that I judge not to be my fault by my punishment whereby believing thee to be most just. I quickly confessed myself to be not unjustly punish but again I saw who made me was it not my God who is not just but is goodness itself. Whence come I then to do evil? And to be uncontroled to do that there might be cause for my just punishment who was it that put this in me, and implanted in me the root of bitterness seeing I was altogether made by most sweet God if the devil were the author, hence is that do will and if also by it's perverse will of a good angel become devil? Hence also was the evil will in him whereby he become a devil seeing that angels were made altogether good by that most good creator by this reflection, I was made again cast down and stifled yet not plunge into that well of error" (p.45)

Augustine, however explained that the immutable God is not the cause of evil in the world that free will was the cause of our doing evil and our sin brought about evil in the universe. Also since God is just and perfect God cannot allow evil. For Augustine matter is

not evil as Plotinus claimed because he believes it is not created by God the creator of things. With this explanation of evil, he says that evil is not a thing, therefore it was not created and could not be created, nor can it exist in its own since it is not a being. He believes that everything that is created in the universe is good even that which appears to be good to us is actually good in that it fits into the whole universe.

45 Plotinus on the Problem of Evil

Plotinus was born in Egypt around 203 A.D. And studied at Alexandria under various professors. He was the last of the major Greek philosophers who brought to climax the revival of Platonism and made a different synthesis of major philosophical systems of the past. He founded the Neoplatonist school. However, Plotinus explained evil as the negation of being, that is the lack of being. This negative view of evil derives from Plotinus metaphysics according to which all beings ultimately derived from the transcendent deity which he

calls the "one" the "one" is absolutely transcendent and is ultimate source of being. It is also the ultimate same of being. It is the ultimate source of light for both light and being derives from the "one". Everything in the universe emanated ultimately from it. The "one" is absolutely incomprehensible. He cannot predicate anything positively of it except absolute unity and absolute goodness.

According to Plotinus (1976), the first being to emanate directly from it is called "nous" (ie mind and spirit) while the second being to emanate is the world soul which has two aspect. The inner and outer aspect or the higher and lower aspect the lower aspect is

nature and it is from this part of the world soul that the material universe emanated matter is at the lowest level in the process of emanation and the lowest level of being and of light. This very lack of being is precisely what evil is for evil is the lack of being and matter is evil and darkness. More so, he say that material thing are not completely evil since they are composed of matter and form. In as much as there is form in their composition, there is some light and same being or good in them. Hence, they are not completely evil nor are they complete darkness.

Furthermore, he interprets reality with God in the center this God and good become the key world in Neoplatonism. According to P.S. Pastries (1970), Plotinus can be summed up in the following lines,

"evil is nothing else than the fact that God is present in a varying degree in different entities and the measure in which he is not present in any entity is the measure of evil in that entity, everything we can see or think is consequently partially evil because our thoughts and actions have to do with the valid sense" (p.125)

In conclusion Plotinus agree and held the view that evil is not a positive thing, but only the negative of being, and that nothing can be completely evil. A thing can only be partially evil since evil is being, and nothing can completely lack being and still remain in existence so, therefore evil is not created by God because God is the creator of all good things.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Different theists gave different interpretations of the concept of evil. Firstly John Hick explained what he understood by evil and gave his explanation. John Hick developed what he calls "minority report" in the history of theology. This view is that when God initially created humanity, there was still some work to be done in making us a complete product. However, this remaining work could not be accomplished by God alone, we have to contribute to the process. Using the greater good defence, Hick argues that even God himself could not achieve certain results without allowing us to struggle against evil and to endure suffering.

Atheistic writers almost invariably assumed a conception of the divine purpose which is contrary to the Christian conception. They assumed that the purpose of a living God must be to create a hedonistic paradise and therefore to the extent that the world is other than this, it proves to them that God is either not loving enough or not powerful enough to create such a world. They think of God's relation to the earth on the model of a human being building a cage for a pet quarters as pleasant and healthful as he can, any respect in which the cage falls short of veterinarians' idea, and contains possibilities of accident or disease, is evidence of either limited benevolence or limited means, or both. According to John Hick,

those who use the problem of evil as an argument against belief in God almost invariably think of the world in this kind of way,

But if we are right in supposing that God's purpose for man is to lead him from human Bios, or the biological life of man, to that quality of zoe, or the personal life of eternal worth, which we see in Christ then question that we have to ask is not, is this the kind of world that an all-powerful and infinitely loving being would create as an environment for his human pets or is the architecture of the world the most pleasant and convenient possible. The question that we have to ask rather is; "this the kind of world that God might make as an environment in which moral beings may be fashioned, through their own free insight and responses, into "children of God"?"

According to John Hick (2003), the best way a parent can show love to a child is to bring them up in the best environment, a parent who love his child will want them to become the best human beings that they are capable of becoming, does not treat pleasure as the sole and supreme value, certainly we seek pleasure for our children, and take great delight in obtaining it for them; but we do not desire for them unalloyed pleasure at the expense of their growth in such even greater values as moral integrity, unselfishness, compassion, courage, humour, research for the truth, and perhaps above all the capacity for love. We do not act on the premise that pleasure is the supreme end of life; and if the development

of these other values sometimes clashes with the provision of pleasure, then we are willing to have our children miss a certain amount of this, rather than fall to care to

58

possess and to be possessed by the finer and more precious qualities that are possible to the human personality. According to him, a child brought up on the principle that the only or the supreme value is pleasure would not be likely to become ethically mature adult or an attractive or happy personality. And to most parents it seems more important to try to foster quality and strength of character in their lives at all times with the utmost possible degree of pleasure. In conclusion, John Hick says that the purpose of loving and wise parent for their children is not just pleasures alone and absence of pain because it cannot be the supreme and overriding end for which the world exists. Rather it must be a place of soul making. And if value is to be judged, not primarily by the quality of pleasure and pain occurring it it at any particular moment, but by his fitness for it's primary purpose, the purpose of soul making.

Augustine also gave different interpretation of the concept of evil. To him God is a perfect being, therefore anything evil should not be associated with him. As

a result of his concept of God as a perfect being who has nothing to do with evil, Augustine came to team up with the Manicheans who upheld two ultimate principles. These two principles are; the principle of good (Ormuzd) and the principle of evil (Ahriman). These two principles are the ultimate sources of all things. Ormuzd is spiritual things and light while Ahriman is the source of darkness and all material things. For Plotinus (1976), evil is not a positive thing, it is not something positive but simply the negation of being, the lack of being which is also the same to Augustine. Augustine's notion that God is all powerful, all knowing and also the creator of all things and at the same time not responsible for the evil in the universe is unquestionable because reason has been that it is only God that has power to create, whatever exists traces its source of existence to God. Therefore, if evil (be it moral or metaphysical) exists in any form must be traced to a being who is responsible for the creation of all things. If evil is the work of another being, it suggests that there are two beings responsible for the creation of the universe, which Augustine would definitely not agree with.

More so, since the world is created by a perfect being, it should not contain evil, it follows that God is the cause of evil in the universe because He is the creator of all things and all things were created by him, so definitely evil is created by Him. If God did not create all things, God would not be in existence and man

would not have been committing evil. Therefore, God is the originator and cause of evil that befall on man. According to Father G.H. Joyce, he repudiated the notion of Augustine that evil is not real and that God is not the cause of evil in the universe. But for Joyce (2001), evil is real he says:

"The existence of evil in the world must all times be the greatest of all problems which the mind encounters when reflects on God and it's relation to the world, if He is, indeed, all good and all powerful, how has evil any place in the world which he had made? Whence come evil? Why is it there? If all-powerful, why does he not deliver us from the burden? As like in the physical and moral order creation seems to generously marred that we find it hard to understand how it derive in it entirely from God? (p2)"

In addition, Augustine (1944) held that man is the source of moral evil, which can only be traced to man misuse of his free will, man has the right to choose between good and

evil therefore, he is the source of moral evil". Augustine fail to answer who is the source of physical and metaphysical evil that are beyond human contact? He illustrated the necessity of evil in the universe by using simply analogy of a good painter. A good painter uses both dull and bright colours to bring out the beauty of his work. He states also that a well organized city comprises of heroes,

clowns, and servants. In order to appreciate what is perfect, there must be imperfection that is regarded as evil.

Following Augustine's explanation of the problem of evil, it is both good and evil that can make the world look harmonious. For example, to appreciate good health one must poor health. The two analogies used by Augustine to illustrate the necessity of evil in the universe do not really portray, the pains natural and moral evil inflict on men. Finally, Augustine, therefore succeeded in illustrating that a universe free of evil is a complete utopia. But he did not succeed in propounding solution to the problem of evil in the universe. He however enumerated God from been responsible for the problem of evil in the universe, yet He created the universe and everything in it. Augustine argument looks more of theodicy rather than being philosophical.

5.1 Conclusion

Finally, the problem of evil is a bifurcated one, it constitutes one of the great difficulties by both theologians and philosophers. However, it is clear that evil exist in the universe created by a perfect (being) since he is the creator of all things. The purpose of evil in the universe still remains abstract to man inspite of the various attempts made by

intellectual of different school of thoughts to explain it, and none have given a definite and satisfactory solution to the problem of evil and this very problem of evil is still unsolved.

Many thinkers either rest the cause of evil on human free-will or as a part of the designed for nature to make good possible or to bring one up to be responsible in the universe. However, since no theologian or philosophers have given us definite explanation to the problem of evil in the universe, and no solution have been propounded, they have been busy explaining but no solution to the problem, it is very clear that the problem of evil will continue to be a problem to man since there is no solution to the problem. And finally. man will continue to face this problem until there is an answer to it. Only God knows when solutions will be found.

5.2. Recommendations

It is no news that evil exist in the society we live in, these evil are two view which are moral and natural views, Moral evil is caused by human intentions which is to say to some extent the heart of man is naturally evil and God being the creator of evil has also made arrangements for human to overcome this evil through moral teaching both by his spiritual servants and sacred books.

Secondly, from the birth date of a child, he/she should be enlightened about love and evil, this is because as a child grows up, they begin to learn from things around them and in a society whereby love prevail, it is almost impossible for evil to take root.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Books

Augustine Saint, (1964). *On Free Choice of Will*, Trianna S. Benjamin and L. H. Hackstaff, Indiana Poles Library of Liberal Arts.

St. Augustine, (1952). *The City of God*, Chicago: William Beston, Edited by Robert R. M. Huchings, Britannica Great Books.

Augustine Saint (1944). *The Confession*, Chicago: William Destin, Edited, Robert R. M. Huschings, Britannica Great Books.

Secondary Sources

Books

Barnes, J. (1972). *The Ontological: Carl*, London Machirdan.

Bethrand, R. (1970). *An Outline of Philosophy*, London: George Adilen and Unian Ltd.

Descartes, R. (1968). *Discourse on Method and the Meditations*, Translated with an Introduction by F. Sutcliffe, Harmands Worth: Penguin.

Edeh, E.M.P. (1985). *Towards an Igbo Metaphysics*, Chicago Lodaoice Univ. Press.

Frost, S.E. (1977). *Basic Teaching of the Great Philosophers*, Published by Ploubleday. New York.

Isirimen, C. and Akhilomen, D. (1958). *Philosophy of Religion, Ethics and Rearly Church Controversies*, Lagos: A.B. Associate Publishers.

John Hick (2003). *The Philosophical Journey*, New York: McGraw Hill,

John, S. (1958). *Philosophy of Religion*, London: Collier Macmillan Ltd.

Kettle, L. (1972). *Religion of East and West*, New York: & William marrow.C.

63

Kushener, R. H. (1981). *When Bad Things Happen to Good People*, New York: Avion Books.

Maduka, C. (2000). *Philosophy and Logic*, Published by the Department of History, University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria.

Max, O. (2003). *Hallman Graversing Philosophical Boundaries 2nd Edition* L.CM.

Omeregbe, J. (1990). *Philosophical Look at Religion*, Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publisher Ltd.

Omeregbe, J. (1994). *A Simplified History of Western Philosophy*, Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Limited.

Omeregbe, J. (1996). *Knowing Philosophy*, Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd.

Omeregbe, J. (1996). *Metaphysic without Tears*, Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd.

Omeregbe, J. (1999). *Metaphysics*, Lagos. Joja Educational Research and Publisher Ltd.

Onimhaw, J. A., Izibili, M.A, & Igborn, B.O. (2006). Theistic Atheistic Argument, Deocraft Ghana Published.

Oyadele, E. O. (2006). Readings in Religion and Philosophy, Benin Teredia Publication.

Pantalean, 1. (1995). Metaphysics The Kpim of Philosophy, Owerri: International Universities Press Ltd.

Peter, K. (2003). The Philosophical Journey, New York Me-Graw Hill.

Pike, N. (1979). "Pleating and free will and evil" Religious Studies. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Robert P. W. (1970). About Philosophy, N.D.A: Prentice Hall.

Saint Anselm (1905). Prologian II. In St. Anselm's Prologian II M.Charlesarth (ed) Oxford Oup

Smith, J. (1958). Philosophy of Religion, London Collier Macmillan Ltd.

Smith, N. (1964). Philosophy and Religious Truth, London. S.M. Press Ltd.

64

Theodore, P. (1961). Leaving to leave with evil, New York, W.M.B. Fedman Publishing
Thomas, A. (1981). From Somma Theological translated by the father of the English Domnicen province, West Minister md. Christian Classics.

Udoldem, I. S. (1992). Understanding Philosophy, Nigerian: P.H. University Press.

Wallace W. A. (1977). *The Element of Philosophy. A Compendium for Philosophers and Theologians*, New York: Society of St. Paul.

Journal

William F. (2000). *Lawhead The Philosophical Journal*, New York: Mc-Graw-Hill Companies, Inc.

DICTIONARY

Flaw, A. (1979). *A Dictionary of Philosophy*, S.V Eiril: London: Macmillan Press.

Harkin J. M., *The Oxford Dictionary*. S.V. Evil: Great Britain: By Charlesleft and Company Ltd., 1995.

6