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Philosophical Paper on “Good and Evil”

**Introduction**

This universe is full of different philosophical concerns that require the necessary attention to better understand the real nature of this world. Active consideration of these factors or paradigms is also necessary to build a strong association between various philosophical notions. The philosophical theory of knowledge encourages people to critically think about the universe and explore better grounds to live in this world. It is noteworthy to mention that the concepts of good and evil play a critical role in every individual’s life. It is imperative for everyone to have a basic understanding of the fundamental principles of good and evil to live life on ethical foundations. The notion of good and evil also got great attention from many philosophers since the beginning of the original domain of philosophy. It is established by many great philosophers to correctly deliver its stance on the practical approaches of good and evil (Fromm). However, active consideration of these two prospects is mandatory for human beings to judge their every action according to the correct perspective of right and wrong. This response paper focuses to critically examine the topic of good and evil by considering the philosophical standpoint delivered by Kant, Buddha, Plato, and Sartre.

**Discussion**

The practical actions of good and evil are characterized as moral concepts for human beings that eventually define their will in case of every act they performed. It is significant to identify the prevalence of philosophical difference that exists between good and evil. This form of examination is critical to characterize the individual’s direction in life. Undoubtedly, it is one complex idea to explicitly illustrate what is good and what is evil because people are different from each other. The one thing which might be good for one might be ranked as evil by another individual. The complexity of this approach can be assured through careful examination of the philosophical theories shared by some great philosophers of all time. It is vital to reflect on good and evil by exploring great philosophers’ main ideas of philosophy separately.

*Kant’s Philosophy on “Good and Evil”*

The moral theory presented by one great philosopher, Kant is one helpful theoretical foundation to better assess the concepts of evil and good in the form of actions. The human’s will to perform any action is connected by a philosopher with the broader domains of good and will. According to him, moral goodwill is a basic idea that helped people to identify the existing difference between good and evil. The approach of goodwill is also characterized as a direction for human beings to attempt good actions as compared to evil ones due to their goodwill. A detailed examination of the idea of evil helped to identify the prevailing difference between the main ideas of good and evil. The fundamental idea of good and evil presented by Kant is that human beings can be recognized as morally good entities only if they choose to select morally right actions. This form of consideration is important for individuals because they are morally on the right side and ready to reject the idea of evil will.

  Immanuel Kant has strong philosophical standing when it comes to defining existing differences between good and evil. The nonspiritual theory of evil presented by Kant, considering both the main prospects of good and evil. He characterized the influence of good and evil on an individual’s will. It is critical to indicate that his philosophical concept of evil does not build any form of association to the domain of supernatural or divine aspects (Grimm). Moreover, this theoretical approach to explain evil can never be ranked as a response to the concern of evil. Three critical conflicting facets of human nature are established by Kant as basic domains to recognize the features of good and evil. He developed a philosophical argument that all human beings are radically free that gives them the freedom to perform any action. The second critical argument presented by Kant on the issue of good and evil is that humans are naturally persuaded toward goodness. This philosophical statement is further established by Kant that by nature, human beings are also inclined to the perspective of evil. It is imperative to indicate that this basic philosophy of evil is greatly rejected by other experts on the grounds that Kant insignificantly connects the factor of evil with the approach of free will adopted by human beings. This critique requires further explanation of ideas of good and evil developed by Kant in the form of his theory of evil.

The basic thoughts on the evil and evil presented by Kant as human beings have moral goodwill only if they are inclined to adopt ethically correct actions just because they are morally right things to do. In a simple manner, any individual who never adopts morally good action eventually has an evil will that appears in the forms of various thoughts and actions. It is significant to establish that the idea of evil is further assimilated by Kant by defining it in the form of three main stages. The first phase of evil is defined as the paradigm of frailty that helps to define the magnitude of evil and good persisted by any individual. Considering this phase of evil, a person is recognized as the one who is willing to perform good actions because these actions are established as the right things to do, but their will is weak enough to never allow them to follow their domain of morality and eventually adopt the option of evil. The second stage of evil approach is illustrated as the prospect of impurity that categorize individuals as an impure entity who does not willing to perform any right action just because these actions are defined as morally good actions. People referring to this particular stage are interested to perform good deeds due to the existence of some form of self-interest. In other words, personal aspiration is the main cause for human beings to perform good deeds over evil actions. The last stage of evil developed by Kant is recognized perversity or wickedness under the domain of corruption. This form of moral ethics of evil established that the factor of self-love is prioritized by an individual as compared to the approach of moral standards of good and evil. This argument can be better apprehended in case of the situation when an individual is willing to morally right action just with the objective of promoting the idea of self-interest.

*Buddha’s Philosophy on “Good and Evil”*

The Buddhist philosophy presented by Buddha also established some strong philosophical arguments referring to the concepts of good and evil. The platform of primal duality is considered in the case of the philosophical basis of Buddhism to clearly illustrate the prevailing difference between good and evil. The persisting problem between good and evil is argued by Buddhist philosophy by establishing the concept of the original form of dichotomy. The problems of good and evil are defined under the spectrum of language, which is characterized as Pali according to Buddhist philosophy. It is argued in Buddhist philosophy that it is important to recognize the ideas of good and evil by considering the context of diverse situations of disparity.

The Law of Karma is the foundation in Buddhist philosophy to successfully depicting the ideas of good and evil considering the main context of every situation. The specific terms of Kusala and Akusala used in this philosophy to defines the perspective of ethics under the qualities of the original law of Karma. The two terms of Kusala and Akusala are used to better apprehend the features of good and evil but it is important to establish that these philosophical domains are not the same (Loy). The philosophical term of Kusala is used to critically establish mainly aspects of goodness, intelligent, skillful. Contrary to this concept, Akusala is used to defines the elements of evil, unskillful, etc. Both social priorities and psychological laws are used to define the elements of good and evil adopted by human beings in different situations. Both the conditions of good and evil are recognized as essential parts of the antagonistic duality that needs to be overcome by the continuous adoption of Sunyata.

*Plato’s Philosophy on “Good and Evil”*

A platonic theory of evil has great philosophical significance when it comes to characterizing difference between good and evil. He established the argument that all human beings are naturally gifted with the knowledge of good and evil aspects in life before they come to this world. According to his thoughts, this precious form of knowledge or understanding prevails in the human soul that directs him to wisely choose between good and evil in life. He also indicates, that with time, human beings forget any form of knowledge that is instincts by them that eventually cause the reason of bad deeds by people. He explained that a forgotten form of innate knowledge can be recollected by adopting fruitful options of meditation on nature, etc. Furthermore, the spectrum of experience also helps people to identify the existing difference between the factors of good and evil acts accordingly (Clark and Dudrick). He developed philosophical idea that all forms of good and evil are innate in human beings that leads humans in their lives.

*Sartre’s Philosophy on “Good and Evil”*

The broad philosophical idea of existentialism is utilized by Sartre to illustrate problems of evilness in the scenario of the 20th century. This is the consideration of the entire struggle of human beings to correctly address the issue of evil. The original form of evil is defined by the philosopher as any action with the conscious approach to destruct the liberty of any individual. It is one complex idea relevant to various aspects of considerations. According to Sartre, the existence of evil in various forms in this world can never be ignored as it comes to the exploitation of many individuals who are potentially weak in the complex world scenario. It is further explained that the objective of goodness in life can only successfully be achieved by understanding and address different struggles of a factor of evil (Lawler and Ashman). He indicates that there is no proper or fixed design for humans to play their role in this world, and this concern can only overcome by clearly identifying the distinction between good and evil.

**Conclusion**

To conclude the critical discussion of different philosophers’ views on good and evil, it is mandatory to establish that all these great philosophers considered various and diverse approaches to recognized these concepts. It is imperative to characterize ideas of good and evil by considering three major areas of morality defined as meta-ethics, normative-ethics, and applied ethics. Understanding these aspects is an essential condition to better apprehend different moral issues concerning practices of good and evil.
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