

Determining the Nature of Evil

My own conception of evil is morally atrocious violation of actions in others or of other character which cause them face-threatening and serious pain, maliciously, or through colossal negligence, and which elicits moral indignation more than wrongdoing. The evil acts do not just represent something harmful or immoral, but are associated with malice, intention, or ignorant neglect of human dignity, and do not often adequately and sufficiently follow the common moral reasons. The evil thus is the type of wrongdoing that is more serious than the aspect of ordinary wrongdoing in the qualitative sense, as it is a threat to the fundamental values like life, freedom, autonomy, and the threat is qualitatively serious, the moral condemnation of which must be severe (Romig). Using an example, systematic torture, genocide, or inhuman exploitation is evil because it entails leading people to suffer with no regard for the presence of humanity in human beings. Less evil ones like petty theft or an untrue thing said are, in my opinion, wrong, but may not necessarily be evil in this more strenuous sense.

Many philosophical or ethical experts are attracted to natural evil, like bad states of affairs that are not the result of the actions of moral agents, e.g., disasters or diseases, unlike moral evil that is caused by evil caused by actions of moral agents. The broad concept of evil includes the two concepts, but the narrow concept, e.g., what persons are likely to mean by saying that something is evil, is the acts that are blameable to the moral responsibility of actors (Romig). The other contemporary philosophers justify the fact, and this is the fact that evil is not just a myth or an outdated word, but is most effectively applicable in the explanation of the most extreme forms of moral malpractices that cannot be well expressed according to the common morals front.

Philosophical theology also deals with the question of evil as it is in the discussion of the existence of suffering. Evil is a problem used by other theorists as an issue with the existence of a benevolent deity who is omnipresent (Bickett 4). The problem of evil illustrates the argument of suffering, including natural evil, and the presence of a morally perfect God. In recent years, however, theorists have been putting forward a few new forms of defence which do not exactly implement the predestination or soul-making (that suffering builds character).

Upon this conglomeration of the opinions of these professionals and my rationale, I perceive evil as a more moral need that is practiced with a precise aim of isolating the gravest and most guilty harms. Such separation of natural evil, like calamities, and moral evil may come in handy, though: it is moral evil that will be most suited to the definition, being agent-involving and having a moral responsibility. Experts state that natural evil is tragic, despite not having a moral condemnation to the same extent, because it does not just occur as a result of decisions made directly.

At the same time, thinkers can also remind us that by the fact that part of the suffering is natural, it does not mean we can do something morally and consider it as a part of the greater existential or religious problem. The issue of evil challenges us to think about how we can make evil out of a good ideal. The modern defences are trying to answer the question of how evil can exist without hindering either of the moral or religious structures and show that the existence of the entire evil does not necessarily have to go through the scrap heap of free will or the myth that suffering brings virtue (Bickett 5). This assists in making the point that evil is not a simple one - occasionally it is a consequence of human activity, or in other cases, it is a more underlying issue in the apparatus or metaphysics.

Overall, the academic literature proves the hypothesis that extreme moral harm is not the concept of evil that can be employed rhetorically only (Romig). It coincides with my explanation that evil does not mean merely wrongdoing; it is rather an act of wrongdoing which needs more moral condemnation because it violates the ultimate moral values and does it wilfully or carelessly.

Works Cited

- Bickett, Tiffany Ann. "The Psychology of the Nature of Evil: Evaluating the Evil Within Us All." *International Journal of Undergraduate Research and Creative Activities* 15.1 (2023): 3.
- Romig, Rollo. "What Do We Mean by 'Evil'?" *The New Yorker*, 25 July 2012, www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/what-do-we-mean-by-evil. Accessed 4 Nov. 2025.