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Thefact that evil exists in the world means that there is a major problem in theunderstanding of God. It is imperative to realize that a lot of people believethat if a God existed and that he was all powerful and all mighty then he wouldbe able to effectively end evil and ensure that all human beings lived well. This is an important perspective that many different persons have tried tounderstand it. In order to better understand the issue of evil, it isimperative look at examples which show whether indeed God is good or not andwhether he has the power to stop evil and just decides not to.

An example onthe problem of evil creates a setup where a 6 month old baby dies painfully ina house fire. In this case, God has the ability to save the baby; however, Hedoes not do it. Accordingly, if God is justly good, then there must be a genuinejustifying condition for not saving the baby. The first try that one suggestsis that the baby will go to heaven. However, an individual can criticize thispoint by arguing that if it was not necessary for the child to suffer, then Godwas wrong to allow it (Rachels 84). One can therefore, arguethat being compensated in the afterlife for being wrong in the existing life isa separate issue. Further, if it was essential for the baby to agonize, thereis a need for a clarification as to why the misery was required because presentlyas it stands its need is not apparent. The second try on this setup is that theagonizing death of the baby will eventually have good results, and accordinglyit was allowable for God to allow the child to die agonizingly (Rachels86).

The first criticism towards these issues is that this answer makes theassumption that whatever evil which occurs in the world will have an overallgood when it comes to the long run. If this is to stand, it means that thosethat are causing evil are doing so for the greater good which can be defined asbeing absurd. Anotherexample one can give states that there is a major difference that existsbetween feeling like acting and acting itself. For example, a nurse who wantsto kill her mother because of her pain, she has the means to do it, but it doesnot mean that she is bad for not alleviating pain from her mother (Rachels92). However, accordingly, the answers offered do not explain the reason as to whyGod permitted the child to die painfully.

It only tries to make a point thateven though a horrible thing occurred, it would have an overall good in thelong run. However, this can only be trusted if there is some assurance that Godis good. It is critical to realize that this defense in causing pain and harmwould not be accepted in any other context such as court case. If this couldapply, it means that the defendant can argue that he is innocent and try toconvince the court that although all the evidence points out that he is guilty, eventually, proof will be discovered which will clear him in the long run (Rachels95). TheThird try states that God has given his people free will and therefore, it ishuman responsibility and not his. However, when putting this in a practicalsituation. One can argue that when a bystander knowingly accepts a horriblething to happen despite being in a position where he could have helped withoutbeing injured, the bystander cannot be referred to as good (Rachels93).

Consequently, it is not right to therefore say God is good when he allowed theinfant to die an excruciating death through burning. Therefore, these examplesare important as they show that although God is claimed to be good, there aremany facets that are not properly understood and many of which are not mutuallyexclusive. This therefore, means that if God is good then he cannot be almightyand if he is almighty he cannot be good.