Callum Doty

PHIL 430

Instructions: Please complete the following exercises using Microsoft Word or save it as a PDF. Make sure that you state the parts of arguments (premises/intermediate conclusions/main conclusions) using *complete*, *independently intelligible*, and *truth-apt* sentences. Make sure that the labels in your argument diagrams match the labels you use for premises/intermediate conclusions/main conclusions. Make sure that you proofread your assignment to eliminate any spelling and grammatical mistakes. Your assignment is due before the beginning of class on Tuesday, October 25th.

1. In your own words, summarize the free will theodicy.
   1. The free will theodicy is based upon two causal effects of evil, the first being human free will, the second being divine punishment. God created humans with free will to either do good or evil (and if evil, then God will punish those few). Within the context of divine punishment, the evil that occurs outside the context of human free will is considered an act of God.
2. In your own words, summarize Rowe’s two objections to the free will theodicy.
   1. The implications of the free will theodicy are that free will is so great in value that God is justified in establishing free will because God knows the causal effects. The outcome of the casual effects must equate to good prevailing over evil as God transcends any human rational or understanding. Rowe’s objection includes natural disasters that do not proportionately equal the evil acts of humans either in influence or death, therefore we cannot assume that natural disasters are God’s will because there is no reasonable justification for these events. In addition, the good of human freedom cannot be responsibly justified when it causes the most undeserved and intense suffering. A moral God would intervein and rectify suffering. Essentially, the free will theodicy provides insufficient reason to assume that God exists due to the abundance of evil.
3. Develop the best reply you can think of to one of Rowe’s objections to the free will theodicy.
   1. Rowe’s first objection to the free will theodicy identifies natural disasters, acts of God, do not proportionately equal the evil acts of humans, therefore we cannot assume that natural disasters are God’s will. This is an insufficient claim in arguing that we cannot assume God’s will because the definition of God transcends humans’ in every aspect including rational and understanding. Therefore, what Rowe deems proportional is irrelevant compared to an act of God. Rowe seems to ignore the fact that even though there exist and existed terrible acts of evil, there is still the possibility that the good produced by human free will outweighs the evil. Rowe makes a valid claim and I agree, yet his argument is also insufficient against the free will theodicy because he has not disproven the probability that the causal effect of human free will is more good than evil.