

The it was not
necessary for the
child



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

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

An example on the problem of evil creates a setup where a 6 month old baby dies painfully in a house fire. In this case, God has the ability to save the baby; however, He does not do it. Accordingly, if God is justly good, then there must be a genuine justifying condition for not saving the baby. The first try that one suggests is that the baby will go to heaven. However, an individual can criticize this point by arguing that if it was not necessary for the child to suffer, then God was wrong to allow it (Rachels 84). One can therefore, argue that being compensated in the afterlife for being wrong in the existing life is a separate issue. Further, if it was essential for the baby to agonize, there is a need for a clarification as to why the misery was required because presently as it stands its need is not apparent. The second try on this setup is that the agonizing death of the baby will eventually have good results, and accordingly it was allowable for God to allow the child to die agonizingly (Rachels 86).

The first criticism towards these issues is that this answer makes the assumption that whatever evil which occurs in the world will have an overall good when it comes to the long run. If this is to stand, it means that

those that are causing evil are doing so for the greater good which can be defined as being absurd. Another example one can give states that there is a major difference that exists between feeling like acting and acting itself. For example, a nurse who wants to kill her mother because of her pain, she has the means to do it, but it does not 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 why God permitted the child to die painfully.

It only tries to make a point that even though a horrible thing occurred, it would have an overall good in the long run. However, this can only be trusted if there is some assurance that God is good. It is critical to realize that this defense in causing pain and harm would not be accepted in any other context such as court case. If this could apply, it means that the defendant can argue that he is innocent and try to convince 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). The Third try states that God has given his people free will and therefore, it is human responsibility and not his. However, when putting this in a practical situation. One can argue that when a bystander knowingly accepts a horrible thing to happen despite being in a position where he could have helped without being injured, the bystander cannot be referred to as good (Rachels93).

Consequently, it is not right to therefore say God is good when he allowed the infant to die an excruciating death through burning. Therefore, these examples are important as they show that although God is claimed to be good, there are many facets that are not properly understood and many of

which are not mutually exclusive. This therefore, means that if God is good then he cannot be almighty and if he is almighty he cannot be good.