

The Question About God In View of the Evil

Winfried Schlotter, Independent Writer, Germany

ABSTRACT

This paper is a summary of my book *Meine Weltsicht*¹ which gives a personal answer to the existential questions of man, taking into account today's state of scientific knowledge. How the search for truth leads to a religious, especially Christian worldview is reasoned step by step.

Starting at the limitations of human knowledge, I argue that there is nevertheless a recognisable truth, and that derivable from the contradiction between truth and untruth, freedom (and on the level of conscious action) freedom of decision-making exist and subsequently also good and evil.

The lawfulness, which forms the basis of our world, is related to the principle of truth, and this principle of truth is brought into relation with the idea of God. By man's belief in a providential, true and good God, the idea of salvation reveals itself, which tries to overcome the evil in the world by compliance with the true and good. This idea of salvation is the basis of all religious worldviews and finds the most convincing expression in the path of salvation indicated by Christ.

With regard to the question of responsibility for the evil in the world, the cause for it is seen by the theory of evolution not only in humans and also not in animals acting instinctively. If there is a responsible primal origin for the true and good in the world, there must also be a pre-human responsibility for the contradiction to this, namely the spirit of untruth and evil.

The alternative, namely the atheistic assumption that responsible action is confined to human beings alone or that there is no responsibility at all, leads to the conclusion that the principle underlying all being is a "blind," "not anticipatory," and partly "self-contradictory" law of nature. Then man as its product is hardly able to overcome the evil in the world by himself.

INTRODUCTION

By recognising that there is a uniform law, which is inherent in all that exists, we as human beings who are aware of our existence and think about ourselves and the world, are faced with the question of the nature of this law. In the following summary of my book *Meine Weltsicht*, I attempt to provide a personal and convincing answer to the question of the source of all being and its intrinsic nature.

First, we must recognise that all being comes into existence for us only by the information we receive through our sense organs and which becomes conscious in some way in our brain. Thus, all our cognition is fragmentary, and only an aspect of the whole reality

1. Winfried Schlotter, *Meine Weltsicht*, (novum publishing GmbH, Neckenmarkt, Austria, 2013)

brought to our knowledge. Quantum physics teaches us that the simultaneous determination of the position and momentum of an elementary particle is subject to an uncertainty principle and that the exact state of an object can never be determined even with the most accurate methods of measurement.

If everything that we perceive and recognise is ultimately a subjective reality depending on our form of existence, what about the real being, the objective reality?

To approach the objective reality, we need to question our observations concerning the logic that underlies all being. The physicist and philosopher Werner Heisenberg used the term “central order” for this law inherent in all things.² This law also determines the logical thinking of man, which, as we know, by this law can distinguish true and false.

We as humans can't objectively perceive the real being or recognise it perfectly. However, according to what has been said we can check the subjectively perceivable for its true content, i.e., for consistency, and thus enhance our human knowledge about the objective being in the sense of truth.

Searching for the nature of the law that forms the basis of all being we encounter the concept of truth. It is consubstantial with the logic of “central order.” It is, as far as we can recognise it, chronologically not changeable, i.e., of an unalterable nature.

If everything is subjected to the laws of the truth, from where comes then the untruth, which stands in unbridgeable contradiction to the truth? The untruth does not derive its essence from the truth but presupposes the truth. Therefore, the truth is more original. It is incompatible with the untruth, but allows obviously the contradiction, not in itself, but in that what is changeable by freedom. Thus, we necessarily come to the concept of freedom.

Although freedom is in contradiction to the strict causality, as initially perceived in the laws of nature, we now know due to more exact physical research that this strict causality is not valid everywhere. For example, in the field of quantum physics, various possible states coexist, and that here probability must be applied and that the causality, as we know from classical physics, only arises from the overall probability of the sum of many single events in the area of the elementary. Freedom must not be of purely random nature but can also mean freedom of choice. This freedom of action profoundly determines the subjective feeling of a person who feels in himself the possibility to be able to decide though not unmotivated and

2. Werner Heisenberg, *Der Teil und das Ganze* (R. Piper & Co. Verlag, München 1969)

not without any reason, but freely between different options. This self-experience of man, however, is characterised by several brain researchers and by many psychologists as self-illusion, and they believe that they have found proofs for this.³ Nevertheless, it must be countered that freedom must exist in some form when it can come to error and contradiction to the truth in that what is existentially subjected to the laws of truth. Furthermore, without freedom, every demand for ethical action would be an illusion because, in this case, no real alternatives would exist. Also, any guilt would be unreal because every event and action would be determined.

People have always been concerned with the problems indicated. There is no religion, that does not recognise the contradictory in the world and which does not derive consequences for the own ethical action. Also, most philosophers and thinkers recognise at least the human freedom and the thereof derivable human responsibility for right action.

What are the reasons now, that follows from the previous insights, to take a further step and bring that what we have recognised as the one indivisible truth into relation with the concept of God, which we encounter in the religions, though in different notions, but as the one last creative authority? What has brought the atheist and truth seeker Edith Stein to become a convinced Christian and to say: “The search for truth is the search for God.”⁴

Only with the help of our intellectual knowledge, without the further step of faith, the access to such a personal relationship with God will presumably remain for us locked forever. However, important reasons speak for the fact that the last creative authority is more than a “blind natural law.”

There is the question: Must the development of all creaturely life up to a human being with all his abilities not be “pre-thought”? Moreover, if all that we experience as existential is “pre-thought” by the last creative authority, did this authority then not have at least the ideas of all this in itself? This doctrine of ideas, which also was represented by Plato, is quite consistent with the theology, the doctrine of God.⁵

The Age of Enlightenment looked for new ways to get closer to the aim of finding the truth with the help of human mind. In particular, the natural sciences have achieved significant progress. However, they have also demonstrated, for the first time, the fundamental

3. Wolf Singer, *Ein neues Menschenbild?* (Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 2003)

4. <http://www.1000questions.net/en/chroniq/stein-en.html>

5. <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ideenlehre>

impossibility to find out the whole truth with the help of scientific methods. Thus, the mathematical-scientific way of thinking leaves us completely in the lurch on the question of the right doing. It deals not with that what should be, but with what is, what was and what will be by logical laws. From this, it follows that there are many different value systems due to different worldviews and presumably those are prevailing, which use as a criterion the personal well-being and that of the associated social group, whilst such a system of values is usually oriented only as far on the public welfare as this has consequences on the personal well-being and that of the own group. In contrast, the view that our activities should be guided by what serves the whole is rather a minority position. However, this position is the only one that gives hope that the conflicts and contradictions in the world can be overcome. The truth that tolerates no internal contradiction is namely by its nature, as far as the changeable is concerned, only then fully in line with this, if also all changeable is in accordance with each other.

After critical examination, we find that hardly anyone can claim to meet this requirement. Everybody is too much intent on the own advantage and that of the own group. The self-preservation and the preservation of the own species and the associated desire for self-assertion and self-realisation are essential characteristics of biological evolution. We know the consequences: The more successful ones prevail. The “struggle for existence, “kill or be killed, even with cunning and deceit, but on the other hand also the concern for the preservation of the own species up to the point of self-sacrifice, all this already exists at least in the animal kingdom. However, no one would get the idea to hold plants and animals responsible for their behaviour. Their behaviour is largely genetically determined which to a certain extent is also valid for human beings. But we humans can question things. “One should treat others as one would like others to treat oneself” is the Golden Rule, which everybody can recognise as true and correct if one knows that the other as a human individual, objectively speaking, is to be judged hardly different in his needs than oneself. Here, however, the waters begin to part. While the one who follows the truth tries to act according to the principle of the Golden Rule, the one who uses as measure only his own benefit or that of the own group shows little regard for the needs of those who have no connection to him.

The possibility of a conscious free will decision is the prerequisite for evil based on responsibility according to our definition as we observed in the course of evolutionary history for the first time in humans. However, because from a human perspective the contradictory already exists in the still unconscious, animated nature, the conclusion is obvious that the false and bad is more original than the evil based on responsibility, which would remain therefore

limited to humans.

In most religions, however, this is seen differently. In the polytheistic religions, there are the gods themselves who cause evil like we humans. In the monotheistic religions, these are the demons, which, although originally good, have turned away from God by free will decision and subsequently in hostility against God try to realise the evil in the world. Thus, the evil based on responsibility would not be limited to humans but would be existentially more original.

Yet it is usually not that beliefs are at the end of a fundamental epistemological discussion of the raised questions. We, humans, are born in a cultural and also ideological environment. Depending on the respective cultures, there are different religious beliefs, which influence the thoughts and actions of people. But increasingly also modern scientific knowledge penetrates general awareness and supersedes old ideas. As a result, there are more atheistic worldviews. However, they do not renounce ethical demands. Concerning the question of what should be, they are highly influenced by socio-political values, and in this respect, they are a kind of substitute for religion.

I was born in a Catholic family and was educated according to Christian principles. Nevertheless, I began quite early to argue with the given views. As a boy, I asked myself, where does evil come from if everything comes from God? That strict laws form the basis of all physical events, I learned at school but could observe too. However, this hardly helped me in the understanding of the world. When I was 15 years old, and my father fell seriously ill, needed long-term care and died two years later, it was the confrontation with suffering and death that moved me. I read Schopenhauer and found that much of what I felt, and thought were confirmed by his worldview. I did not want to come to terms with the death, especially the often-cruel death.

On the other hand, it was difficult for me to believe in the Christian resurrection and life after death. The miracle reports of the Bible did not fit my view of the strict physical laws of this world. The biblical history of creation that first people had to die because they had sinned did not recognise the fact that man like every animal is subject to the law of evolution, which also includes the death of the individuals and the transmission of life within the species. Death existed long before man entered the world stage. The fact that the theory of evolution of the origin of species in principle was correct made sense to me quite early on. Particularly the view that every living being, and thus also human beings go through the whole history of

development, outgoing from the ovum, so to speak, in a time-lapse tempo, fascinated me. I saw evidence of it in the fact that, for example, frogs first exist as swimming tadpoles or that embryos of birds have hands with five fingers instead of wings. The different animal species, if one pursues their embryonic development in reverse, show resemblances, which get lost in the course of the development of the individual in analogy to the phylogenetic development. On the other hand, I was quite sure that the pure principle of selection failed regarding the origin of species. The expansion of the whole universe, of all living things including man with his consciousness, was for me already laid down in the natural laws and could occur only because a principle of order is inherent in the natural laws, which permits the development into more and more complicated forms and properties. The existence of a higher rational being, which forms the basis of all and which I tried to equate with the traditional concept of God, I have never doubted. However, I had difficulties with “miracles” and such “truths,” which were not in accordance with the scientific knowledge that could be regarded as valid.

Seeing my own existence and that of the entire cosmos as a miracle did not answer my question. All this was in keeping with the laws of nature. In the miracles above, if they were real events, the known laws of nature had obviously lost their validity. “If God was omnipotent and thus master of the laws of nature, he was also able to annul these. Was that the answer? I never observed that natural laws had no more validity. Not everything was explicable by the known laws of nature. But that probably was because we knew too little about these laws.

Also, about the perception of God “contradictions” still existed for me. How could the “Almighty God” permit that so much “terrible evil” happen even to innocent people and where the cause is to search honestly not at the people, but in the forces of nature? Was it the “punitive God,” as the prophets of the Old Testament believed to understand him?

Obviously, there was an inconsistency regarding our ideas of the “omnipotence,” and the “love and mercy” of God. Were our ideas of God too much of human nature? Here only the sincere search for the truth could help.

If God is the truth and the origin of all being, then the laws of nature, which obey the non-contradictory truth, are of divine origin too. Thus, the inherent logic, which we can describe even mathematically in many areas, is by its very nature identical with the divine truth. Therefore, reports on phenomena, which are contrary to these laws, first are to be questioned. Nevertheless, carefulness is required for a universal response.

We all know many phenomena, from which we suppose that they are in line with the

natural laws, but they cannot at all be explained by the laws of nature so far known. There is the whole world of living beings, which obviously obeys the laws of nature, but whose behaviour is by no means identical in all with that of the non-living physical world. Finally, the conscious life emerges, which hitherto completely eludes a purely physical interpretation. The consciousness suggests a new form of existence so that our human existence appears in a light exceeding the purely physical existence. Namely, the fact that *I* am in this my body, that *I* do not exist in another body as *another self*, but as *myself*, just as *other selves* have adopted existence in other bodies, is not a physical question. It rather suggests that there is something that goes beyond the purely physical.

This note is very important because it shows that the whole of reality, in principle, cannot be disclosed only with the help of scientific knowledge.

The brain scientist and Nobel laureate John Eccles sees this as follows:

I believe that there is a fundamental mystery in my existence, transcending any biological account of the development of my body (including my brain) with its genetic inheritance and its evolutionary origin; and, that being so, I must believe similarly for each one of you and for every human being. And just as I cannot give a scientific account for my origin – I woke up in life, as it were, to find myself existing as an embodied self with this body and brain – so I cannot believe that this wonderful gift of a conscious existence has no further future, no possibility of another existence under some other unimaginable conditions.⁶

“Transcending the physical (metaphysical, i.e., ‘beyond the physical’)” therefore means that not everything can be disclosed by a physical explanation or interpretation. In other words, there is still more fundamental than the rationally accessible physical world and its laws, which are only a partial aspect of the divine truth being inherent in all. However, this does not imply that in metaphysics the logic is repealed, and arbitrariness prevails. The cognition that a consistent logic is inherent in all being is so evident that we must assume that also the metaphysical is subject to the divine truth that is the basis of all. This is valid both regarding the phenomenon of “miracles,” which cannot be excluded according to what has been said and in terms of our understanding of the “omnipotence of God,” which cannot be arbitrary and contradictory. God does nothing that contradicts his own being, i.e., the truth.

“Miracles” are, therefore, phenomena that are very well consistent with the fundamental truth, but they cannot be interpreted physically only because they are based on a

6. John C. Eccles, *Facing Reality*, Philosophical Adventures by a Brain Scientist (Springer-Verlag New York. Heidelberg. Berlin 1970), 83.

more original, deeper underlying logic.

In spite of what has been said about the immutability of the divine truth, the question remains what about “the love and mercy of God.”

We humans repeatedly make the experience that true love prevails there, where harmony exists with the true and good. Therefore, also love is of divine nature. However, we humans also search “love,” where not the harmony with the true and good is in the foreground, but the feeling of happiness, which results from the harmony of our *Self* with the *You* or more in general from the corresponding relationship with persons or objects of our appreciation. With regard to what we call “love,” it is similar to what we regard as “good.” We are not guided by what is objectively true and good, but by subjective preferences. That is why we find it so difficult to love in all situations God who alone is invariably true and good. And, the love for others is often not oriented on what is truly good, but on what we like. Divine love, however, is only focused on what is true and good. This also applies to the “mercy of God” which consists in the fact that wherever there is freedom, also the possibility for the return to the true and good exists. The “love and mercy of God” and thus salvation and redemption are therefore always effective where we try to live and to act by the true and good, i.e., in obedience to God, which also includes in particular to endure cross and suffering. However, “love and mercy of God” are no measure for the fulfilment of our wishes. This also explains that much of what we perceive as “evil” happens by the divine truth. But the contradiction to this truth, i.e., the rebellion against God, leads to the fact that we question the “love and mercy of God.”

In general, the question arises: What about that what we subjectively experience as “good”? To what extent are, for example, “beauty” and “happiness” of divine nature? To answer these questions, I have to come back to what I said about the “good.” If we define the good as all that is in line with the one indivisible truth, so everything which is objectively good is included. However, beauty, happiness and other aspects of what we feel as “good” are not always aspects of the true and good. The problem is that even the false and the evil use these aspects. Deceptions and false allurements consist in the fact that we make a positive impression as the standard for our actions, detached from what is truly good. However, that often leads to evil, as we know. But this does not mean that beauty and happiness are not desirable in itself. In particular in the perfect harmony with the true and good we experience beauty and happiness in a special way. So, they are also of divine origin. Only their abuse has evil results like everything that exists and turns away from the true and good. Same is valid,

by the way, especially for human sexuality.

Realising that the true and good alone must be the guiding principle of our actions revealed to me a new vision of the redemption of our world full of contradictions:

If freedom is a characteristic feature of divine truth, God admits the sin, i.e., the turning away from him, and thus also the evil within his creation resulting from the conflict with the truth, but where conversion to the true and good happens, healing and redemption occurs too. Because truth and falsehood, and good and evil are according to their contradicting nature in constant conflict with each other, perfect redemption happens only after reversal of false and evil to the true and good. In other words after a complete and final separation of the true from the false and the good from all evil. Therefore, the overcoming of all contradictions will be at the end of the redemptive path. Only a creation, which is in line with the divine truth, can fully experience God's welfare.

Thus, the rational-related cognitive abilities of man maintained a priority for me in the search for the truth. But also, the Christian faith got a new meaning for me, mainly because of the way of salvation shown by Christ, to overcome sin and its consequences. Though there are still many things in past and present Christianity, which caused annoyance, it was the wrongness that inheres more or less in everything that needs salvation. The history of salvation, which began with the search of man for the true and good, was a long way that did not end with Christ, but in its now perfect focus on God's love and charity gives best hope to gain healing.

But did this mean, on the other hand, that other doctrines and beliefs are wrong? The idea of salvation does not exclude anyone from the outset. "Who we are before God is really who and what we are: nothing more and nothing less!"⁷ This is the convincing judgment of Francis of Assisi. All who are of good will may attain salvation, whose goal is the perfect realisation of the true and good. Hence, everyone is to be measured according to the extent that the realisation of the true and good is a guideline of his thinking and acting.

The statement that the future of the world is not irrelevant to our personal existence is important. The view that there will be for a person as a conscious *self* no more life after death is questionable because the conditions for the life of every human being as conscious *self* before it exists and after its existence, i.e., after the death of the respective person, are not

7. <https://datinggod.org/2012/09/25/francis-of-assisi-on-humility/>

significantly different. The probability that I exist today as conscious *self* is hardly different in comparison to a future existence of this *self* in another form of existence if I assess it from the perspective of my pre-existence.

What this future will be like is beyond our knowledge. While in Judaism a belief in a bodily resurrection of the dead at the end of the world characterises the idea, in Christianity the immortality of the soul is more in the foreground, in which one understands the non-physical portion of a person, “the real *self*.” The idea common to both religions that this *self* “on the Day of Judgement” will assume a new physical form is related to the Buddhist-Hindu idea of reincarnation. However, “reincarnation” and “transmigration of soul” have no eschatological orientation in the latter religions, and the identity of the person, i.e., of the *self*, is from its meaning not of the same kind.

For Christians, the belief in “the bodily resurrection of Christ” is also of central importance. That is because in the Gospels under the naming of credible witnesses’ concrete statements are made about “manifestations of the Risen,” which indicates a completely new form of existence. Because here knowledge-based access on the basis of the laws known to us, is impossible, for the believer for whom the truth must be self-consistent, persists that regarding the “miracles” made statement, there must exist a more fundamental, “transcendent reality” beyond the physical laws known to us.

Because religious convictions are largely beyond the possibility of cognitive, scientific verification, in particular, religious antagonisms are difficult to overcome. Therefore, when tolerance is missing, conflicts are inevitable. The persecution of believers of other religions up to their physical destruction is a historical reality even now.

I do not want to hold a brief for relativism because I am convinced that there is only one objective truth. But we must always be aware that our knowledge is imperfect and that we depend on beliefs as guidelines for our actions. Therefore mutual tolerance must be demanded in favour of our own convictions and for the sake of truth.

This also applies to the doctrines represented in the history of the Church and later corrected due to scientific knowledge. Such mistakes and errors are human. The resulting prosecutions and convictions of innocent people, however, are a mortgage of guilt and sins, which hardly can be erased. Before now in the Jewish religious history, intolerance and wrong religious zeal played an inglorious role. Also, the militant Islam, citing the Koran, the “holy book of Islam,” is largely intolerant towards other faiths. By now a simple comparison of the

“holy books” of the world religions Judaism, Christianity and Islam shows us that they cannot all be equally “divine revelation.” Given that there can be only one self-consistent objective truth, contradictory statements about what is “true” and “good” are therefore to be questioned critically. As far as these texts credibly give evidence of what is true and good in terms of a critical search for the truth, they are critical healing sources on the way to salvation of the world. However, making them without restrictions in each case the absolute measure of what is true and good, is religious fundamentalism, which does not overcome possible errors and their consequences.

Moreover, many similarities can be observed between all religions regarding their ethical demands. The search for the true and good, and so for the liberation from evil, is the guiding principle of all faiths. Even the religious practices to achieve this goal are often similar. On the other hand, we must say that the different religious views are often contradictory, which suggests that we are also here dealing with errors. It is the task of religious dialogue and of the continued search for truth to overcome these. This requirement applies of course not only to the different religions but all worldviews and resulting ethical conceptions. The truth does not need to shy away from honest intellectual debate because it can only win.

The situation is different when debating with those who are not interested in a dialogue for the sake of truth. Such discussions are mostly useless and do not help in the search for truth.

If we critically reconsider the different “ways of salvation” and take into account the initially made basic epistemological reflections, particularly those ways have to be described as aberrations, which regardless of a recognisable, from the existence of an independently existing reality and thus from the objective truth make man the sole standard of the “right actions.” As we have bitterly experienced again and again in the history of mankind, this has mostly evil consequences. But even those who rely on “God-given or natural laws and fundamental rights” must ask themselves to what extent their often divergent or contradictory views derive from the one indivisible truth that does not allow a contradiction in terms.

To whom shall we go given all these deficiencies? After I have already answered this question for myself, I think that also those who are still searching and have to decide, in the light of what has been said should recognise and profess that the way to overcome the evil can be found most likely in Jesus Christ and his message.

This raises the question, where do we find (given the inconsistencies between the

various Christian denominations) true Christianity? Like the different religions, here too, the various doctrines are largely outside of cognitive scientific verifiability. It also applies here that for the sake of own conviction as well as truth, mutual tolerance must be demanded. Nevertheless, it must be clear that the divisions of Christianity into contradictory confessions and ecclesial communities are contrary to Jesus' demand for unity. Christ links the unity above all with the faith in his message and with the mutual love of those who rely on him. As can easily be seen, unity in faith presupposes a uniform understanding of Jesus' message. A different understanding is not necessarily based on the lack of willingness to listen to Jesus' words, but may also be the result of misunderstandings, especially since not everything that is recorded in the Gospels about Jesus and his words is entirely clear. But the spirit that speaks out of Jesus' words is, as already said, unequivocal. That this divine spirit, if we open ourselves totally to him, will not mislead us, but lead us to the true and good, in it we may trust. Therefore, religious schisms are always signs of human guilt, particularly about the love of God and love of neighbour.

Accordingly, the question of where to find the true Christians cannot be answered only by the formal belonging to a Christian community. True Christians are those who not only received the sacrament of baptism but also personally confess to Christ, believe in his message, and seek to follow it. This discipleship of Christ requires above all love of God and love of neighbour, which are expressed most clearly in the search for and realisation of the true and good, in the selfless care for others and the search for unity of all people of good will.

The question, how one can be a true Christian, is, therefore, less a question of denomination, but a question of honest endeavour to follow Jesus.

The knowledge that these divisions cannot be in the sense of Jesus and can only be overcome by a joint search for the right way was realised only slowly and led to today's ecumenical attempts with the objective of global unification and cooperation of all Christians.

These efforts have not been without positive results, as can be seen at least on the fact that tolerance has increased among representatives of the various Christian denominations, which earlier were often fighting each other.

If we project what we have said about the conflicts between the different Christian denominations and the efforts for overcoming these contradictions onto the antagonisms between the different worldviews, hence, the problems here are of course even bigger and the search for solutions is much more difficult because the common base of what is considered as

good and right is smaller. It's especially problematic when opposing views, particularly regarding crucial questions such as the responsibility of man to a higher truth authority above him or questions concerning the recognition of universal human rights and duties, (which are not within the discretion of an individual or majorities), are so severe that common approaches in search for the true and good can hardly be found.

Below I will address the issue of the origin of our world and show that science and faith are obliged to the same indivisible truth.

Just in this area the scientific knowledge has rapidly developed in recent times and has given us unexpected insights into the origin of the universe and our planet with its unique biosphere, which includes us as thinking human beings.

According to the recognised standard model of cosmology, the beginning of our universe can be traced back to about 14 billion years. The redshift of light detected by Edwin Hubble in 1929 and reducible to a temporally expanding space made it possible to determine the start of this expansion by back-calculation. The resulting theory of a big bang, which assumes that the beginning of our universe was a spatio-temporal singularity, has found an impressive confirmation by the discovery of the cosmic background radiation in 1964.⁸

The validity of laws of nature has its beginning not earlier than the start of our universe. We can trace the origin of the world back only as far as the laws that form the basis of our thinking. Only the step beyond that limit, namely the assumption that there is a timeless truth, which is the source of all being and therefore origin of all thinking and recognising, creates a trusting relationship with this ultimate truth, which stands above all and from which in a logical consequence, does not exclude freedom and has evolved our present universe to conscious life.

Among all the planets, which we know, only our earth verifiably offers the necessary prerequisites for the emergence of higher life.

While at the beginning of biological evolution the reproduction of single-cell and multicellular organisms took place by simple cell division, a new principle of biological reproduction, namely the sexual reproduction, evolved about 1 billion years ago.⁹ This sexual reproduction led to a considerable acceleration of evolution, i.e., to a rapidly advancing form

8. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cosmic_microwave_background

9. http://file.scirp.org/pdf/NR_2013090314251405.pdf

of variety and complexity of life on earth.

An additional acceleration of evolution took place when living beings began to nourish themselves from other living organisms instead from the chemical constituents of their surroundings. This behaviour increased the selection pressure by creating advantages for the superior and more adapted individuals concerning preservation and propagation of their species. Thus, life organised itself into ever higher and more complex forms up to the self-conscious man.

However, at this point, I must come back to my earlier critical remarks on the instinct of self-preservation and self-realisation as an essential feature of biological evolution, which is focused primarily on the own existential advantage and the benefit of the own group. I had interpreted the resulting “struggle for existence” and contest without respect for the welfare of other individuals and that of the whole as a contradiction to a creation, which is quite in harmony with the divine truth. My main argument was that the discord between human beings and similarly the hostile confrontation in the animal kingdom is at least felt as “evil” by those who suffer from it. If this “struggle for existence” as the principle of evolution would be objectively good, then those who claim the “right of the stronger” would be right, and all those who consider it as “evil” and help the weak ones would be objectively wrong.

I assume that in the course of evolution (on the basis of freedom) starting from object-like organism’s subject-like individuals have evolved. They no longer necessarily obeyed the laws of the one consistent truth, but on the basis of freedom started to act as subjects in the sense of a *self* and thus gave priority to self-preservation and self-realisation over everything else. At the latest in humans, the resulting hostile behaviour, often associated with falseness and deception, takes place consciously in the “struggle for existence,” and at the latest, man also recognises the connections and negative consequences resulting from a purely self-related behaviour, which is no more oriented on the welfare of others and of the whole. There are many indications that already in the animal kingdom, at least in the higher animals, a kind of consciousness exists, so that also animals painfully experience the conflict between the pursuit of self-preservation and the threat and destruction of the own existence. I am aware that the answer to the question, to what extent this conflict is founded by the laws of truth or not and, since I have brought this truth into relation with the existence of God, therefore is or is not God’s will, ultimately decides on the correctness of my worldview.

If what is experienced as an “evil” is willed by God, then the subjective conception of

this “evil” is wrong and thus itself of evil, or as far as the experience-based conception of what is an “evil” is objectively correct, this “evil” cannot be willed by God, i.e., not a direct consequence of a true and good Creator-God.

The thought that everything that exists can be traced back to an original creative entity suggests that what we experience as consciousness has already existed as an idea before all time. This consideration is necessary since only in such a way we can explain that the “evil,” which presupposes conscious action in the sense of what is contrary to truth and good, is more original than man.

Since the truth itself cannot be the cause of the “evil,” the spirit of contradiction against the true and good, which is possible due to freedom, must be responsible for it. If there is a true and good God, then it must also exist the adversary, namely “Satan,” the spirit of untruth and thus of the evil.

At this point, however, we must re-examine the atheist ideology that the original creative entity is nothing more than a “natural law underlying all being.” As already pointed out, such a law is not by itself “forward-looking.” Whatever is due to it has a final cause, but the goal direction is not “pre-planned.” In this case, we are dealing with a “blind,” partly contradictory process up to the point where the spiritual potency, which is evidently inherent in the natural law underlying all being, “awoke,” i.e., when for the first time what we call “consciousness” emerged. Due to our scientific knowledge, we know that certain conditions must be given, so that man with all his abilities could originate. For instance, the natural constants in the atomic range must have definite values, so that stable atoms and molecules, which in turn are prerequisites for complex biological systems, can exist. With only minor deviations of these natural constants, everything we have observed in the scope of our evolution consideration as stages of development from the formation of the atomic building blocks up to ever more complex systems would not be possible. No one can scientifically explain why the natural laws are as they are and so that everything accessible to our perception could arise.

Even if randomness is brought into play, and we assume that our universe is only one of an infinite number of universes and that the conditions, necessary for the development of biological systems up to human being equipped with consciousness and cognition ability, are fulfilled in our universe due to chance probability, such an answer is unsatisfactory since the logic underlying the recognisable laws of nature does not exclude chance, but has essentially

no random character.

The atheist must live with the idea that the world and, therefore also he is fundamentally contradictory, and he can hardly hope that the evil resulting from these contradictions can be overcome in the world.

CONCLUSION

Even after Darwin's theory of evolution, which is correct in its approach, and in the light of all scientific knowledge and even while the search for an "all-explaining world formula" continues, we can in good conscience keep to the conviction that there is a providential, true and good primal ground, namely God to whom as his creatures and in faith in Jesus Christ we can say "Father" despite God's own transcendental reality.

REFERENCES

- Eccles, John Carew. *Facing Reality, Philosophical Adventures by a Brain Scientist* (Springer-Verlag New York, Heidelberg, Berlin 1970)
- Heisenberg, Werner. *Der Teil und das Ganze* (R. Piper & Co. Verlag, München 1969)
- Koloso, Petr. "Sexual Reproduction One Billion Years Ago" (Natural Resources, 2013, 4, 383-386), http://file.scirp.org/pdf/NR_2013090314251405.pdf
- Schlotter, Winfried. *Meine Weltsicht*, (novum publishing GmbH, Neckenmarkt, Austria, 2013)
- Singer, Wolf. *Ein Neues Menschenbild?* (Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 2003)
- <https://datinggod.org/2012/09/25/francis-of-assisi-on-humility/>, "Francis of Assisi on Humility"
- <https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ideenlehre>, Ideenlehre.
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cosmic_microwave_background, "Cosmic Microwave Background"
- <http://www.1000questions.net/en/chroniq/stein-en.html>, "Edith Stein, Her Life & Message"