

The 'Original Matter Insufficiency Theory' to Solve the Problem Of Evil

Yahya Mohamed

For many, evil is still the rock of atheism on which the heads of faith are obliterated. This contrasts with the believers, who consider the precise cosmic order a rock on which the heads of atheism break. Each of them faces great speculations in which they are unable to explain or answer the existence of God.

The believer faces the dilemma of evil without a satisfactory answer, while the atheist faces the dilemma of the precise cosmic order without also finding a convincing answer. The consequences of each of them are contradictory, as the believer proposes the idea that it is easy to be convinced of the existence of God by the precise order in the universe, while the atheist believes that the phenomenon of evil leaves no room for belief in the existence of such a god who permits evil.

However, through the dilemma of evil, a logical argument can be formulated in favor of faith, according to syllogism as follows:

- 1 God is nonexistent.
- 2 Chaos prevails without order.
- 3- One of the requirements of chaos is the dominance of evil in life.

This is the logical evidence to deny the existence of God through the phenomenon of evil. However, in reality, evil and chaos are not prevalent. This eradicates the previous premise, according to syllogism, and thus God exists.

Yet the dilemma of evil is real, and it is often exploited to negate existential care altogether, especially concerning extreme evil.

However, there are, in principle, four different presumptions related to the importance of evil and its relationship to life and human order with respect to the believer, which is:

1 - Extreme evil has no necessary connection within the relationships between life and human order.

2 - The extreme personal evil, as well as the specific evil, has indispensable importance according to the existential care of this order.

3 - Specific extreme evil, in particular, is of importance within the existential care of the aforementioned order.

4 - Extreme evil is one of the requirements of life and human connection according to the necessity of causality without being in itself something of the existential care of life's order. In this sense, it becomes a necessary evil, considering that its absence means changing life's order to a different kind.

These are four presumptions we make to address extreme evil. Taking into consideration the real competition between the third and fourth hypotheses, the fourth presumption is the minimum acceptable level, as it is sufficient that what happens from extreme evil is an inevitable necessity resulting from causality and its interactions without having a strong benefit within, whereas the third presumption requires the fourth as a condition and not vice versa because it requires further evidence.

According to the third, extreme evil has a specific concern that accompanies it, as well as care related to some cases of this type of personal evil, although we do not realize this care thus far, and the day may come when the validity of this hypothesis will be manifested, similar to our knowledge of many life functions that we once

considered purposeless, as in the appendix, coccyx, junk genes, etc.

In the dilemma of evil, the problems usually revolve around the power and righteousness of God, as he is either in the cable of eliminating extreme evil, or he is not righteous or at the least unaware of what is going on in his creation.

In fact, what we notice is that the problem of evil is not treated as an issue that has an analytical relationship with the presumptions of how the creation occurred in principle. Thus, the possible presumptions in this regard can be identified as follows:

- 1 That the source of creation returns to a passive subject without the existence of independent action.
- 2 That the source of creation returns to a complete active without the existence of an independent passive.
- 3- That the source of creation belongs to a deficient active, despite the absence of an independent passive.
- 4 That the source of creation goes back to a deficient active with an independent passive.
- 5- That the source of creation returns to a complete active with a deficiency in the independent passive.

These are five presumptions, from which we identified the fifth presumption in preference to be more plausible, as we considered the source of the insufficiency to be due to the fundamental matter and, because of it, the advanced creation that necessitates evil took place. That is, we acknowledge the existence of a separate entity or an independent fundamental matter that has been responsible for forming creation, but its ability is limited. Despite the impeccability of the divine attributes of knowledge, power, and righteousness, what resulted from creation was affected by the existence of this limitation of

imperfect material. The gap in evil is not due to a lack of divine attributes but to the deficiency of the origin of matter from which the creation was made.

By this material, we mean that it is the simplest and fundamental existential commonality in the universe, even if it has not been scientifically discovered thus far. In the light of this theory, it is possible to explain the reason for the existence of evil, as well as the reason for the development of the world and its impossibility of creation to appear in an instant. All of this is due to the nature of the origin of matter on which the synthesis and development take place within the limits of what is permissible. Although the Creator's ability and will is real, it does not go beyond the nature of the material from which the manifestations of the universe, life, and evolution are formed. There is a subjective impossibility of everything that is beyond the nature of matter, just as there is a subjective impossibility related to its creation from pure nothingness.

We are not talking - here - about the world's infinite existence or its beginning but are exclusively placing focus on the origin of matter. The creation or non-creation of this matter does not preclude both of the previous hypotheses. By multiplying the presumptions, we have only four, and each one of them exists in itself regardless of the preference for one over the others. The preference does not preclude the imposition, as follows:

- 1 The origin of matter is created with infinite occurrence.
- 2 The origin of matter is created with the beginning of occurrence.
- 3- The origin of matter is not created with infinite occurrence.
- 4- The origin of matter is not created at the beginning of the occurrence.

A careful look at these presumptions makes us realize that the first

three of them are plausible, regardless of our prior preference for one over the other. The last hypothesis remains, as it may imply that it is inconsistent, as it means that matter exists and is suspended until the creation of the world begins. However, this case applies to the entirety of God's creation from the beginning, as it means the divine suspension pending its beginning of this creation, regardless of whether the matter is created or independent of creation, as long as we assume the power of God can create the world.

Furthermore, the issue of the origin of matter results in a dispute over the nature of cosmic laws, evolution, and the problem of existential evil. If the matter was uncreated, then all of what we have mentioned about the nature of creation, evolution, and the problem of evil would have nothing to do with divine power as much as it has to do with the possibilities of its origin, uncreated matter, and the case of transcendence of the potential of matter to which it would be similar to the concept of logical impossibility, which is that it does not stem from the impotence of the divine power, but is related to the insufficiency of matter and the weakness of its capabilities.

Cosmic evolution, the nature of laws, and the problem of evil are all predicated on the origin of matter. If the matter was created, there would be no impossibility related to creation that occurred in an instance without being gradual in development, and thus, there is no impossibility concerning the eradication of evil in its initial stages. Rather, on this presumption, the natural laws become completely dependent on the absolute divine will, as the theologians proposed, such as the Ash'aris and others.

For this reason, what Omar Khayyam (1048-1131) assumed could not be achieved, as it was attributed to him saying: 'If I had authority over the universe like God, I would have annihilated this universe from its roots and would have created a new universe in which everything would freely reach its goal.'

But if the matter was uncreated, this would mean that it is the thing on which creation and formation take place within limits permitted by its nature, including what some of its natural laws allow in the material condition of the change in its causality. It was also necessary to gradually evolve, and the presence of evil becomes necessary during this process, despite its contingency that can be removed upon existential completion. Evil is subject to the directed process of development, just as its demise is subject to its development until it becomes infallible. This is attested by the uninterrupted developments of the cosmos, life, and reason, as well as the social aspect as we humans are subject to our abilities and our willpower - within the divine, will of creative development towards the most fitting of creation.

Although the mental aspect does not help us in preference to the creation of the origin of matter or its absence, if we assume that the original matter was created, then it will be difficult to explain why the laws of nature take a specific form to reach their objectives without it taking any other forms during its stages of change. And if it was said that this state is the best among the possible ways to reach its natural objectives, we would have answered that from a purely rational point of view, achieving objectives through established means leads to a lot of struggle, calamities, and torment and it would have been rationally possible to avoid these negative consequences through the replacement of natural laws by other laws or to reach ends without any natural means.

What we suggest contradicts the Ash'ari logic of belief in denying God's wisdom and observance of His creation, just as it contradicts the statement of the system of philosophy and mysticism in making the divine will and power metaphorically. Consequently, the third option came as a combination of two things that no one else has in common, namely the non-creation of the origin of matter and the universal divine power.

Thus, the common objection is as follows: Why does God not prevent evil? What is the use of His presence if He is not able to eradicate evil completely? It can be answered according to our perceptions about the inadequacy of the origin of matter. It is known that from a physical point of view, the world may be considered the best of the worlds due to its richness and precise order, but the initial dilemma can be answered according to what was previously presented, which is that the demise of evil comes gradually according to the laws of the cosmos, life and mental development, and there is no escaping from that based on the nature of the origin of matter which is to create and flourish.

Translated by Zaid Kanady

The reference

<https://www.fahmaldin.net/index.php?id=2564>