

# ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

UDC 141.3+159.9+2(075.8)

V. Y. POPOV<sup>1\*</sup>, E. V. POPOVA<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University (Vinnytsia, Ukraine), e-mail popovmak@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0003-3097-7974

<sup>2\*</sup>Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University (Vinnytsia, Ukraine), e-mail popovaelena2667@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-0157-4642

## Main Paradigms of the Concept of Evil in Western Anthropological and Psychological Studies

**Purpose.** The authors aim to investigate the evolution of the paradigm shift of the concept of evil in Western philosophical and psychological thought. **Theoretical basis** is determined by the latest methodological approaches in studying the relationship between philosophical, psychological, and theological approaches to understanding the essence of evil and its manifestations. **Originality.** For the first time in Ukrainian philosophical literature, a systematization of the evolution of the concept of evil in the philosophical and psychological sciences has been carried out. **Conclusions.** Analyzing the main mythological, theological, philosophical, and psychological concepts of evil provides an opportunity to systematize them through the main five paradigms. The primordial paradigm can be considered dualistic, which retains its influence until our time. Evil is understood in it as the personification of natural disasters, diseases, human crimes, and a force opposing Good. Ancient philosophy and Christianity try to deprive evil of its ontological status: evil does not exist as such but is only a lack of Good. Based on this understanding, a privative paradigm was formed, which dominated the European philosophical and theological consciousness for more than a millennium. It became the basis for philosophical theodicy: the justification of the all-good God in the face of clearly existing evil. But at the end of the 18th century, it gave way to the dialectical-romantic paradigm, the most vivid representatives of which are Schelling, Hegel, and Nietzsche. The concept of evil is reinterpreted and considered as a necessary component of the world, which, along with good, belongs to a higher reality. The concept of evil receives a new understanding in the psychoanalysis of Freud, Jung, and Fromm: its source is determined by the human subconscious, and its external manifestation is aggression. A similar understanding of evil is inherent in many other psychological schools, some of which also conducted psychological experiments on the originally evil nature of man. However, such "experiments" are characteristic of the social practices of totalitarian regimes, based on which the concept of the "banality" of evil arises. The appearance of the latest postmodern paradigm of understanding evil is connected with the attempt of some thinkers to reject all previous concepts of evil and a kind of return to the oldest dualistic paradigm. It would seem that the fall of most totalitarian regimes and the expectation of the "end of history" did not give grounds for popularizing this paradigm. Still, the events of the early 20s of our century indicate the need for its actualization.

**Keywords:** evil; dualistic paradigm; privative paradigm; theodicy; dialectic-romantic paradigm; psychoanalytic paradigm; "banality of evil"; postmodern paradigm; transparency of evil; fluidity of evil

### Introduction

In the 20th century, Western intellectual elites, alongside the average citizens of mass society, seemed to have definitively buried God as the embodiment of eternal and immutable Good, following Nietzsche's legacy. Alongside God, Satan, as the embodiment of Evil, also had to be dismissed. Yet, the 20th century (if it is not surpassed by the 21st) was perhaps the most brutal century in human history, as evidenced by genocides, famines, concentration camps, world wars, and millions of victims of totalitarian regimes. After the end of the "Cold War" and amidst the anticipa-

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

tion of the "end of history" with the final triumph of the liberal-democratic world, the concept of evil seemed incompatible with postmodern existence at the beginning of the 21st century.

For most of us, until 2014 (and for some, even until 2022), the concept of evil was not associated with daily life, our routines, or everyday occurrences. Evil appeared to us in literary characters, video games, and media: we used it as a characteristic of the virtual world, reading or watching reports about crimes, genocide, wars, terrorist acts, and senseless cruelty.

However, God, the unyielding *Weltgeist*, or invisible forces of global historical progress have made our country a kind of epicenter of the confrontation between the forces of Good and Evil: aggression and homeland defense, violations of international law and resistance to these violations by the majority of the world's nations, cynical disregard for moral norms, and basic humanity. The significance of the ongoing war in Ukraine also lies in the fact that it has compelled a reevaluation of the concept of evil and the acknowledgment of its reality.

It should be noted that from the late 20th to the early 21st century, numerous publications on this issue appeared within the socio-philosophical, anthropological, and psychological discourses. From Jean Baudrillard's (2005) "The Intelligence of Evil" to Lars Svendsen's (2010) "A Philosophy of Evil", which have become almost classic works, Western intellectual spaces have witnessed a proliferation of studies dedicated to this topic. Among the English-language literature of recent years, particular attention should be given to the dialogues of Zygmunt Bauman and Leonidas Donskis, published as standalone works. In Ukrainian philosophy, the analysis of the nature of evil as such had not been given much independent attention until recently. Certain exceptions include works by M. Mazuryk, M. Popovych, V. Malakhov, and O. Khoma, in which this issue was usually examined within the context of other problems. Only in recent years have studies emerged where this issue takes center stage, such as the works of Adam Dobzhynski, Oleksandr Kulyk, Nataliia Lishchynska (2021), and Hanna Savonova (2020).

### Purpose

Our article aims to identify the main paradigms of the reasonable concept of evil in Western philosophical and psychological thought.

### Statement of basic materials

In the middle of the 19th century, a racist fable about a missionary and a Hottentot was quite popular in Western humanities, according to which, when asked by a clergyman about his understanding of evil and good, the aboriginal answered quite simply: "Evil is when a neighboring tribe stole our cows, and good is when my friends and I stole cows belonging to our neighbors". The Eurocentric racist enlightenment of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries tried to find the primitive human ideas of good and evil in the most primitive (from the European point of view) tribes that the colonizers encountered. One of them was a tribe in South Africa, which was given the offensive name of "Hottentot" by Dutch settlers (in our time of political correctness, representatives of this ethnic group are called Khoi). The above anecdote became especially popular in Russian philosophy and journalism: from V. Solovyov and S. Frank to L. Trotsky and contemporary bloggers of various political orientations. This kind of idea is called "Hottentot Morality", although in modern Western thought, this expression (given its explicitly racist connotations) is not used (they speak of "right-wing-centered morality" or "double standard").

Nevertheless, this fable testifies to the existence of the binary opposition "good-evil" in the oldest, deepest layers of the human consciousness and subconscious. The cosmogonic myths of

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

most peoples of the world are based on the confrontation between two primary ontological entities: good and evil (ἀρχή), which take on natural or anthropomorphic forms. Dualistic motifs in mythologies can be observed on all inhabited continents.

Based on these primordial myths, the original understanding of evil is formed within the paradigm of moral and religious dualism. Dualism or *dualistic paradigm* is a moral or religious belief in the existence of two fundamental forces: Good and Evil, which oppose each other. Moral opposites can, for example, exist in a worldview that has one god, more than one god, or none.

The first explicit concept of dualism emerged in the ancient Persian religion of Zoroastrianism around the middle of the fifth century BC. Zoroastrianism is a religion built on the preaching of the prophet Zoroaster, who proclaimed Ahura Mazda (Ormuzd) the creator of Good, light, and wisdom, and his antagonist, Anhra-Maynu (Ariman), the personification of Evil, the source of natural disasters, diseases, crop failures, the creator of poisonous plants, predatory animals; all physical and moral calamities come from him. Subsequently, Zoroastrianism underwent significant transformations, sometimes approaching monotheism, sometimes strengthening the original dualism. Zoroastrianism, which was the dominant religion of the powerful Persian Empire, had a strong influence on ancient Judaism, Gnosticism, early Christianity, and especially on Manichaeism and Christian "heresies" such as the Bogomils, Cathars, and others.

In primitive Christianity, the influence of the dualistic paradigm on the understanding of evil is quite tangible; evil is seen as an inherent attribute of both sinful humanity and a certain substance of the world that a true believer must prevent. The devil is seen as the personification of evil, the one who tempted Jesus Christ, that is, evil is a certain entity that opposes the victorious advance of the forces of Good, which are personified by God. And so, in a sense, the original (pre-Nicene) Christianity in its understanding of evil was close to the dualistic concept of Gnosticism.

The traditional Christian understanding of evil is usually associated with the so-called *privative paradigm*. According to it, evil is a lack or shortage (in Latin, *privatio*) of good, i.e., evil has no essence of its own, it is only a "shadow" of good, its absence. Christianity borrows this concept from ancient philosophy, more specifically from the neo-Platonism of Plotinus, although its preconditions can be found in the works of Aristotle. However, in Stagyrus, the privatization paradigm does not yet take the form of conceptual completeness.

Plotinus (2018), in his work eloquently titled "On What Evil Is and Where It Comes From", raises the question of evil as such and identifies with its matter, the poor-quality substrate of the physical Cosmos. However, Plotinus contrasts his understanding of evil with the dualistic concept of Gnosticism, which considers any corporeality to be the source of evil. The Manichaeans offered a similar solution.

The Church Fathers, relying on Plotinus but reinterpreting his doctrine in the biblical spirit, view evil as a lack of good. The classical form of the privative concept of evil is found in the formula of St. Basil the Great: "...στέρησις γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ κακόν (evil is only the absence of good)" (Basilus Caesariensis, 2005).

To demonstrate this point, Basil of Caesarea gives the following example: the eye is a certain entity that is good in itself, and evil is a violation of its functioning, mutilation, that is, a diminution of the good of this entity. That is, it is in patristics that ancient metaphysics is combined with the biblical worldview: God creates only good, so the world is "very beautiful (καλὰ λίαν)" (Genesis 1:31). But if the world structure is beautiful, and it largely remains so even after the Fall, then the problem of evil naturally shifts to the domain of anthropology: "real evil" is sin, some subjective instance that is nested in human arbitrariness; "imaginary evil" is a non-being, a

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

---

path to non-being, which is understood as an objective process of destruction, moreover, it is axiologically neutral, because various deviations can bring good. This understanding of evil is characteristic of the theocentric anthropology of Augustine Aurelius and other church fathers.

Some changes to the privative paradigm in the understanding of evil occur in the context of solving the problem of theodicy (that is, the justification of an all-powerful and all-good God in the light of existing evil). It should be noted that in medieval Christianity this problem is practically absent, since there is nothing to blame God for: "imaginary evil" or suffering are not meaningless, they lead to some good goal, even if it is unknown to a person, while "real evil", or sin, has as its source a person's free will – and only hers.

The first clear formulation of *theodicy* in the form of a hypothesis or imaginary argument from evil appears in Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theology*, as one of two objections to the existence of God. For the first time, a careful development of this problem, as well as the term "theodicy" itself, appears in G. W. Leibniz (1710), who objected to P. Bayle that Manichaeism cannot be overcome with the help of reason alone, and therefore rational theodicy is impossible (Hickson, 2013, p. 13).

One of Leibniz's certain innovations was his proposed classification of types of evil. In particular, he singles out three types of evil: metaphysical, physical and moral. He "justifies" God for the existence of these three types of evil. The first type of evil is justified by the fact that God is constantly "improving" the world and what is considered evil is only the "motivator" of this improvement. Physical evil is justified as a natural punishment, and since "these sorrows will not only have a sincere reward, but will even serve to increase bliss, and such evil is not only useful, but necessary" (Leibniz, 2005).

Instead, moral evil can never be a means of good. Arguing with the Epicureans and Manichaeans, Leibniz introduces an important distinction between the will that acts and the one that allows: the evil of guilt is never for God the object of the will that acts, only sometimes that which allows, because God never does evil himself, only sometimes allows it – it cannot be the content of God's will. The same rule applies to people when we talk about sin – it can be allowed and not prevented only when it does not involve the wrong action itself, that is, when it is appropriate, morally possible or necessary. However, this belonging is determined not in human categories, but in the categories of Divine Providence. Thus, according to Leibniz, a world freed from evil would lose its ability to exist. Phantom evil, on the other hand, contributes to the achievement of a more complete future predetermined harmony (Leibniz, 2005).

Theodicy is usually associated with the philosophical heritage of Leibniz, however, both in the Modern era and later, there are other variants of "theodicy". In particular, J. Locke, N. Malebranche, H. Wolff, S. Clarke, A. Shaftesbury and other thinkers of that time left their thoughts on the justification of God for the existing evil in the world and in human souls. Leibniz's theodicy caused harsh criticism from Voltaire and I. Kant. The Lisbon tragedy of 1755 was an event that destroyed Leibniz's Enlightenment optimism and led to a critical attitude towards the possibility of building a rationalist theodicy. Voltaire and Goethe, Kant and Rousseau were deeply affected by the earthquake and mass death of people in the Portuguese capital. The young Kant, who had just begun to teach at Albertina, refused to see in the event under consideration a formidable punishment of God and turned to the problem of theodicy later based on critical philosophy. The Königsberg philosopher pointed out the theoretical impossibility of solving the problem of theoretical justification of God in the face of world evil since theodicy is not a subject of pure, but only of practical reason and has only a moral dimension.

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

However, Goethe and Kant, as well as other representatives of German idealism, in their views on the nature of evil, already go beyond the classical private paradigm and can be considered as the founders of a new *dialectical-romantic paradigm* of understanding evil. This paradigm is no longer a justification of God as the bearer of absolute good, but a kind of justification of evil and its personifications. To Mephistopheles as the primordial spirit of evil, Goethe (2015) in his "Faust" adds a phrase that most accurately reflects the essence of this dialectical concept: "...part of that force that always wills the evil and always produces the good (Ein Teil von jener Kraft, die stets das Böse will und stets das Gute schafft)".

However, in the Modern era, the attention of thinkers increasingly turns not to metaphysical and physical evil (according to Leibnitz), but to moral evil, which may be rooted (or not) in the human essence. At the same time, two opposite versions of the nature and essence of man are gaining popularity. The first, which is close to biblical sources (the narrative of the original fall) and deepened by Protestant anthropology, belongs to the English philosopher T. Hobbes and considers man as an incorrigible egoist prone to evil and violence, the second is the concept of the French thinker J.-J. Rousseau is about an originally good savage whose essence was distorted by civilization.

Despite Kant's sympathy for Rousseau, the German thinker is more inclined to the Hobbesian version. At the end of his creative journey in 1792, Kant published the essay "On Radical Evil in Human Nature", which was later included in the work "Religion within the Limits of Simple Reason". Kant defines evil as the possibility of human freedom to act contrary to the "objective laws of morality", which, for him, determine good. According to Kant, evil is radical (das radikal Böse) because it is rooted in human nature as a disposition or "tendency to evil". But if a person is smart and conscious enough, he can overcome evil. For Kant, moral goodness is a regular, persistent overcoming of one's nature. That is, according to Kant's "theodicy", God is not responsible for evil, which is a consequence of natural rootedness in human freedom. At the same time, evil ceases to be interpreted as something metaphysical, and becomes primarily something moral, and therefore – evil that a person commits (Kant, 2017).

At the same time, Kant in the work "Critique of the Power of Judgment" rethinks the category of the sublime, which will become the main one in romanticism. According to Kant, there is positive pleasure, which is beautiful and has its expression in calm contemplation, and there is negative pleasure, which is sublime, formless, and infinite, which causes not joy, but surprise and admiration. Romantics emphasize the Kantian understanding of the sublime, seeing in it a certain justification of evil, its ennoblement, and praise of its creative power.

A similar "apology of evil" is also characteristic of Hegel's dialectic. Even in the "Phenomenology of the Spirit" he considers good and evil as abstract opposites that must be "removed" in the "Religion of Revelation". Moreover, he claims that "evil in itself is the same as good... Since evil is the same as good, then evil is not evil and good is not good, but both evil and good are rather canceled, evil in general – it is a self-absorbed being-for-itself, and the good is a simplicity devoid of the Self" (Hegel, 2019, p. 426).

In his more mature works, Hegel, in contrast to Kant, objectifies evil and gives it a metaphysical meaning. In his "Lectures on the Philosophy of History" and "Philosophy of Law" evil is considered as a necessary element of the historical process, an eternal companion of human society, and the formation of an individual in history. He seeks to prove the necessity of evil, because for him it is a form of affirmation of good, and in the religion of revelation and dialectical philosophy, the opposition between them is removed. According to Hegel, evil, taken by itself, is

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

a certain abstraction that exists only as the opposite of good. He singles out two aspects of evil – it is embedded in the historical process as such, but in the future, it is defeated by the power of "cunning" of the World Spirit.

However, the dialectical-romantic paradigm of the understanding of evil probably reaches its apogee in the philosophy of Friedrich Schelling. His views are most fully expressed in the work "Philosophische Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit und die damit zusammenhängenden Gegensten" (1809), written under the influence of the mysticism of the German theosophist Jacob Böhme and his contemporary Baader.

Schelling clearly rejects the privative conception that considers evil to be a purely negative concept of the lack or absence of good. In contrast to this view, he sees evil as a positive force directed against the force of good. Although evil is a force hostile to God, only through its mediation is God's self-manifestation possible. According to Schelling, in God, one must distinguish the basis (Grund) of existence and existence itself. The named basis of God is His nature; this dark, irrational foundation enables God's self-division, and therefore evil. In human nature, evil consists in asserting one's separateness, in striving from the original center of the absolute to the periphery (Schelling, 2006).

To defeat evil, according to Schelling, it is first necessary to overcome the dark beginning of elemental nature. Standing at the climax of nature, man naturally tends to rush back into the abyss, just as one who has climbed to the top of a mountain is seized with vertigo, threatening to fall. But the main weakness of a person is the fear of good because good requires self-denial and mortification of one's selfishness. However, man by his/her nature can overcome this fear and desire for evil. Schelling concludes that it is precisely in this ability that freedom lies. Thus, the philosopher who was called the "prince of romanticism" substantiates the foundations of a new paradigm of understanding evil – dialectical-romantic.

This paradigm was embodied in the so-called "dark romanticism" and the nihilistic concept of F. Nietzsche. Schwarze Romantik (Dark Romanticism) as a literary movement aestheticizes evil, delights in demonic characters, and proclaims a rebellion against a world of optimistic mediocrity. In the works of E. T. A. Hoffmann, Friedrich Schiller, Lord Byron, S. Baudelaire, E. Poe and many others, evil seems to be rehabilitated and acquires its own dark beauty in its rebellion against everyday life. Their works are filled with stories of the personal suffering of social outcasts, sometimes glorifying the beauty and majesty of Lucifer and other dark forces.

The most radical rethinking of the concept of evil occurs in the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, who tried to overturn the entire Western Christian value system. In his work "Genealogy of Morality" (1887), he tries to establish a fundamental difference between the binary opposition "good-bad" (Gut und Bose) and "good-bad" (Gut und Schlecht). In his opinion, the concept of "good" originally meant "worthy" (vornehm), "noble", "aristocratic" (edel), and "bad" – simply "ordinary" (gemein), "simple, vulgar" (pobelhaft), "niedrig" (Nietzsche, 2002). Later, due to the influence of Platonism and Christianity, this binary opposition was replaced by the opposition of moral concepts based on the illusory Platonic metaphysics and turned into a tool of "slave morality".

"What one age perceives as evil is mostly just an untimely echo of what was once considered good: the atavism of an ancient ideal" (Nietzsche, 2002, p. 72).

Applying the "will to power" criterion, Nietzsche reactivates the values of good and evil in a modified form. Good and evil do not belong to any ethical system, morality, or religion, but they manifest themselves as the realization of action according to the character of the individual.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

---

Good is that which brings development to an individual, and evil is that which delays or reverses the development of his abilities. An enemy is good because it can be fought against, pain is good because it makes a person stronger, and anything is good if it promotes the manifestation of the will to power. "Evil", therefore, is a secondary concept and denotes only that which weakens the "will to power".

The radicality of Nietzsche's views lies precisely in the radical rethinking of the concepts of good and evil, which sometimes even change places on the axiological scale, but his concept of evil is related to the privative paradigm, since evil does not have its own essence, but is only a deficiency, a "weakening" of the will to authorities. It is interesting that Nietzsche attributed his teachings not to philosophy, but to psychology, which corresponds to the general trends of the spiritual life of Europe at the end of the 19th century.

Therefore, the transition from purely philosophical to psychological concepts of evil, which have become dominant since the beginning of the 20th century, is logical. The primacy in the formation of psychological views on the nature of human evil undoubtedly belongs to the creator of psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud. He can also be considered the founder of the *psychoanalytic paradigm of understanding evil*. According to the Austrian scientist, the source of evil is the human subconscious, and its external manifestation is aggression. Aggression is the result of the disharmony of three layers of the psyche: "I" (Ego), "It" (Id), "Super Ego". Instincts and subconscious drives make up the realm of the subconscious Id. They are a source of mental energy that prompts active action and contradicts the culture and norms of social life for which the Super Ego is responsible. That is, he was a supporter of the fatal determination of man to evil, which is determined by the constant conflict between "Ego", "Id" and "Super Ego" (Freud, 2021).

The American-Austrian psychologist Erich Fromm also developed his views within the psychoanalytic paradigm of understanding evil. Reflecting on the nature of evil, he concludes that it lies in the desire to dominate other people, which almost always turns into violence, and the main danger to humanity is not "sadists and inhumans", but ordinary people, in whose hands power is concentrated. He tried to understand the tragic events of the 20th century: the rule of totalitarian regimes, world wars, the Holocaust, etc. through the prism of the synthesis of the Freudian concept of evil, while also considering its social sources and forms of manifestation (Fromm, 2017).

The psychoanalytic paradigm of evil continues its existence in modern psychological science. The problems of evil and destructiveness, narcissism, and aggression are currently being developed by such outstanding representatives of various psychoanalytical schools as O. Kernberg, S. Benvenuto, H. Kehele, M. Solms, and many others. At the same time, this paradigm was subjected to fundamental criticism and strong external influences, as a result of which other psychological approaches to understanding the essence of evil were formed.

Contemporary philosophy and psychology were greatly influenced by political philosopher Hannah Arendt's concept of the "banality of evil", in which she asserted that evil things can be done by ordinary people without any terrible intentions. In her work devoted to the trial of Adolf Eichmann, accused of crimes against humanity for his participation in the genocide of European Jews, she formulated the idea that people like Eichmann should not be considered exceptions, monsters, or sadistic perverts; they are ordinary mediocrity. Eichmann's defense was based on the fact that he was simply following orders. Based on this, Arendt concludes what has become a classic about "banal evil":

ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

---

The trouble with Eichmann was precisely that there were so many people like him, many of whom were neither perverts nor sadists, that they were, and still are, incredibly and terrifyingly normal. From the point of view of our legal institutions and our moral standards of judgment, this normality was far more frightening than all the horrors put together, for it implied... that this new type of criminal... commits his crime under conditions which make it almost impossible for to know or feel that he is doing evil. (Arendt, 2013, p. 235)

The concept of the "banality of evil" had a great influence on American social psychology. Even before the appearance of Arendt's book, social psychologist Stanley Milgram (Stanley Milgram) began a series of experiments aimed at discovering how people are inclined to follow orders that cause pain to other participants in the experiment. Based on the analysis of his experiments, Milgram concluded that people who do evil are usually driven not by the desire to do evil, but by the conviction that they are doing something worthy and noble.

The concept of the American psychologist Philip Zimbardo, the leader of the infamous Stanford prison experiment, gained even greater popularity in psychology. According to his approach, any ordinary people can do evil things if they find themselves in the right circumstances. In his book "The Lucifer Effect" (Zimbardo, 2017), he described the process by which an ordinary good-minded person falls into situations or systemic dependencies that plunge that person into a state of evil and commit evil actions. In other words, Zimbardo argues that

...good people can be induced, tempted and trained to behave badly...

each of us can easily become a hero or a villain, depending on what situational factors affect us. Therefore, it is very important to understand how to limit, restrain and prevent the situational and systemic forces that drive some of us to social pathology. (Zimbardo, 2017, p. 276)

The experiments of S. Milgram and F. Zimbardo became the empirical basis for the new *postmodern paradigm of understanding evil*. In the most vivid and paradoxical form, this paradigm was presented by the French philosopher Jean Baudrillard. In his work "Fatal Strategies", he argues that modern philosophy must reject all previous concepts of evil and return to the oldest dualistic Manichean paradigm. The philosopher writes:



ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

---

We need to reawaken the principle of Evil active in Manicheism and all the great mythologies in order to affirm, against the principle of the Good, not exactly the supremacy of Evil, but a fundamental duplicity that demands that any order exists only to be disobeyed, attacked, exceeded, and dismantled. (Baudrillard, 1990, p. 77)

That is, Baudrillard claims that Evil has a positive meaning as well as a negative one. The great religious and political revolutionaries (Jesus, Che Guevara, Nelson Mandela) are clearly "evil" in terms of the system of law and order they challenge, and they are punished accordingly.

Baudrillard's position on the essence of evil also develops in his later works. In them, Baudrillard (2005) explores what he understands as the disappearance of Evil from the culture of global technomodernity, which imposes the "hegemony of the culture of happiness" (p. 139). Good leads to happiness, and evil leads to unhappiness. In modern times, evil is seen as something accidental, something that can be controlled and eventually eliminated, for example through a culture of surveillance, insurance, and risk assessment. Although many instances of unhappiness can be eliminated, perhaps through welfare spending or international aid, Evil is something else entirely: for Baudrillard, it is ineradicable, it will reappear again and again, especially where it is not expected or where it was considered defeated.

Thus, Baudrillard completely rejects the Enlightenment humanist tradition, which understood the human personality as essentially good and rational, as well as the Christian privative concept of Evil. Baudrillard's (2005) concept of evil as a "primordial force" is consistent with Manichaeism: "Evil is the first hypothesis, the first assumption. Good is simply a transposition and substitute product: a hypostasis of evil" (p. 141).

However, such "justification of evil" should not be considered a fundamental feature of the postmodern paradigm of its understanding. On the contrary, modern philosophers, including postmodernists, are concerned about its transparency and widespread use. Postmodernism is not some kind of normative theory, but rather a strict diagnosis of the diseases of modern social consciousness, which is increasingly losing moral sensitivity.

This is evidenced by the philosophical dialogues of the Polish-British postmodernist philosopher Zygmunt Bauman and the Lithuanian philosopher and politician Leonidas Donskis. One of them was reflected in the book "Limited evil. Life without alternatives". The dialogue participants agreed that the dualistic concept of Manichaeism is reviving in the modern world. A separate section of the book is devoted to the modern military confrontation between Russia and Ukraine since 2014, which is interpreted in the context of the evolution of the understanding of evil from Kafkaesque (permanent evil) to Orwellian (fluid evil that recruits supporters). In their opinion, one of the carriers of Orwellianism is Russian Putinism, which includes both nostalgia for the lost past on the part of the population and attempts to control the politics of memory on the part of the state (Bauman & Donskis, 2016, p. 130).

The dialogues of Bauman and Donskis testify that in the second decade of the 21st century, the concept of evil undergoes significant modifications, and new forms of manifestation of evil become more and more acute and visible in the modern world, which is increasingly polarized

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

around the pole of Good and the axis of Evil. It is impossible not to agree with L. Donskis, exactly "Ukraine has become a litmus test for global moral (in)sensitivity at the beginning of the 21st century" (Bauman & Donskis, 2016, p. 6).

Indeed, nowadays Ukraine has found itself at the epicenter of the confrontation between Good and Evil, and understanding this should become an impetus for rethinking the concept of evil and, perhaps, forming a new paradigm for its understanding.

### Originality

For the first time in Ukrainian philosophical literature, a systematization of the evolution of the concept of evil in the philosophical and psychological sciences has been carried out.

### Conclusions

The analysis of the main mythological, theological, philosophical, and psychological concepts of evil provides an opportunity to systematize them in the form of the main five paradigms. The primordial paradigm can be considered dualistic, which retains its influence until our time. Evil is understood in it as the personification of natural disasters, diseases, human crimes, and a force opposing Good. Ancient philosophy and Christianity try to deprive evil of its ontological status: evil does not exist as such but is only a lack of Good. Based on this understanding, a privative paradigm was formed, which dominated the European philosophical and theological consciousness for more than a millennium. It became the basis for philosophical theodicy: the justification of the all-good God in the face of clearly existing evil. But at the end of the 18th century, it gave way to the dialectical-romantic paradigm, the most vivid representatives of which are Schelling, Hegel, and Nietzsche. The concept of evil is reinterpreted and considered as a necessary component of the world, which, along with good, belongs to a higher reality. The concept of evil receives a new understanding in the psychoanalysis of Freud, Jung, and Fromm: its source is determined by the human subconscious, and its external manifestation is aggression. A similar understanding of evil is inherent in many other psychological schools, some of which also conducted psychological experiments on the originally evil nature of man. However, such "experiments" are characteristic of the social practices of totalitarian regimes, based on which the concept of the "banality" of evil arises. The appearance of the latest postmodern paradigm of understanding evil is connected with the attempt of some thinkers to reject all previous concepts of evil and a kind of return to the oldest dualistic paradigm. It would seem that the fall of most totalitarian regimes and the expectation of the "end of history" did not give grounds for popularizing this paradigm. Still, the events of the early 20s of our century indicate the need for its actualization.

### REFERENCES

- Arendt, H. (2013). *Eichmann in Jerusalem. A Report on the Banality of Evil* (A. Kotenko, Trans.). Kyiv: Dukh i litera. (in Ukrainian)
- Basilus Caesariensis. (2005). *Homily Explaining that God is Not the Cause of Evil* (N. V. Harrison, Trans.). St. Vladimir Seminary Press. (in English)
- Baudrillard, J. (1990). *Fatal Strategies*. New York: Semiotext(e). (in English)
- Baudrillard, J. (2005). *The Intelligence of Evil or The Lucidity Pact*. Oxford: Berg. (in English)
- Bauman, Z., & Donskis, L. (2016). *Liquid Evil*. Cambridge: Polity Press. (in English)
- Freud, S. (2021). *Vstup do psykhoanalizu. Novi vysnovky*. Kyiv: Navchalna knyha – Bohdan. (in Ukrainian)
- Fromm, E. (2017). *Mystetstvo liubovi* (V. I. Kuchmenko, Trans.). Kharkiv: KSD. (in Ukrainian)

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

- Goethe, J. W. von. (2015). *Faust* (B. Taylor, Trans.). Retrieved from <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/14591/14591-h/14591-h.htm> (in English)
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2019). *The Phenomenology of Spirit* (P. Fuss & J. Dobbins, Trans.). University of Notre Dame Press. (in English)
- Hickson, M. W. (2013). A Brief History of Problems of Evil. In J. P. McBrayer & D. Howard-Snyder (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to the Problem of Evil* (pp. 1-18). John Wiley & Sons. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118608005.ch1> (in English)
- Kant, I. (2017). *Religion within the Limits of Bare Reason*. Retrieved from <https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/kant1793.pdf> (in English)
- Leibniz, G. W. (2005). *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man and the Origin of Evil* (E. M. Huggard, Trans.). Retrieved from <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/17147/17147-h/17147-h.htm> (in English)
- Lishchynska, N. (2021). Paradigm of evil in philosophy and psychology. In *Culture in the spiritual life of Slavic nations: Proceedings of an international conference* (pp. 345-370). Košice: VERBUM (in Ukrainian)
- Nietzsche, F. (2002). *Po toi bik dobra i zla. Henealohiia morali* (A. Onyshko, Trans.). Lviv: Litopys. (in Ukrainian)
- Plotinus. (2018). *The Enneads* (L. P. Gerson, Ed.). Cambridge University Press. (in English)
- Savonova, H. I. (2020). *Ontolohiia dobra i zla v suchasniy yevropeiskii filosofii: Monohrafiia*. Kharkiv: Drukarnia Madryd. (in Ukrainian)
- Schelling, F. W. J. (2006). *Philosophical Investigations into the Essence of Human Freedom*. Albany: State University of New York Press. (in English)
- Svendsen, L. Fr. H. (2010). *A philosophy of evil*. Champaign: Dalkey Archive Press. (in English)
- Zimbardo, P. (2017). *Efekt Liutsyfera. Chomu khoroshi liudy chyniat zlo*. Yakaboo Publishing. (in Ukrainian)

## LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Арендт Х. *Айхман в Єрусалимі. Розповідь про банальність зла* / пер. з англ. А. Котенко. Київ : Дух і літера, 2013. 376 с.
- Basilus Caesariensis. *Homily Explaining that God is Not the Cause of Evil* / trans. by N. V. Harrison. St. Vladimir Seminary Press, 2005. 125 p.
- Baudrillard J. *Fatal Strategies*. New York : Semiotext(e), 1990. 232 p.
- Baudrillard J. *The Intelligence of Evil or The Lucidity Pact*. Oxford : Berg, 2005. 215 p.
- Bauman Z., Donskis L. *Liquid Evil*. Cambridge : Polity Press, 2016. 192 p.
- Фройд З. *Вступ до психоаналізу. Нові висновки*. Київ : Навчальна книга – Богдан, 2021. 552 с.
- Фромм Е. *Мистецтво любові* / пер. з англ. В. І. Кучменко. Харків : КСД, 2017. 192 с.
- Von Goethe J. W. *Faust* / trans. by B. Taylor. 2015. URL: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/14591/14591-h/14591-h.htm>
- Hegel G. W. F. *The Phenomenology of Spirit* / trans. by P. Fuss, J. Dobbins. University of Notre Dame Press, 2019. 476 p.
- Hickson M. W. A Brief History of Problems of Evil. *The Blackwell Companion to the Problem of Evil* / ed. by J. P. McBrayer, D. Howard-Snyder. John Wiley & Sons, 2013. P. 1–18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118608005.ch1>
- Kant I. *Religion within the Limits of Bare Reason*. 2017. 124 p. URL: <https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/kant1793.pdf>
- Leibniz G. W. *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man and the Origin of Evil* / trans. by E. M. Huggard. 2005. URL: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/17147/17147-h/17147-h.htm>
- Ліщинська Н. Парадигма зла у філософії та психології. *Culture in the spiritual life of Slavic nations. Proceedings of an international conference*. Košice : VERBUM, 2021. С. 345–370.
- Ніцше Ф. *По той бік добра і зла. Генеалогія моралі* / пер. з нім. А. Онишко. Львів : Літопис, 2002. 320 с.
- Plotinus. *The Enneads* / ed. by L. P. Gerson. Cambridge University Press, 2018. 938 p.
- Савонова Г. І. *Онтологія добра і зла в сучасній європейській філософії* : монографія. Харків : Друкарня Мадрид, 2020. 356 с.
- Schelling F. W. J. *Philosophical Investigations into the Essence of Human Freedom*. Albany : State University of New York Press, 2006. 222 p.
- Svendsen L. Fr. H. *A philosophy of evil*. Champaign : Dalkey Archive Press, 2010. 306 p.
- Зімбардо Ф. *Ефект Люцифера. Чому хороші люди чинять зло*. Yakaboo Publishing, 2017. 584 с.

В. Ю. ПОПОВ<sup>1\*</sup>, О. В. ПОПОВА<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Донецький національний університет імені Василя Стуса (Вінниця, Україна), ел. пошта popovmak@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0003-3097-7974

<sup>2\*</sup>Вінницький державний педагогічний університет імені Михайла Коцюбинського (Вінниця, Україна), ел. пошта popovaelena2667@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0002-0157-4642

## Головні парадигми концепту зла в західних антропологічних та психологічних студіях

**Мета.** Автори ставлять за мету дослідити еволюцію парадигм концепту зла в західній філософській та психологічній думці. **Теоретичний базис.** Дослідження ґрунтується на новітніх методологічних підходах до встановлення взаємозв'язку між філософським, психологічним і теологічним розумінням сутності зла та його проявів. **Наукова новизна.** Уперше в українській науці здійснено систематизацію еволюції концепту зла у філософському та психологічному розумінні. **Висновки.** Аналіз основних міфологічних, теологічних, філософських та психологічних концепцій зла дає можливість систематизувати їх у вигляді п'яти головних парадигм. Примордіальною парадигмою можна вважати дуалістичну, яка зберігає свій вплив до нашого часу. Зло розуміється в ній як уособлення природних катастроф, хвороб, людських злочинів і силою, що протистоїть Добру. Антична філософія та християнство намагаються позбавити зло його онтологічного статусу: зло як таке не існує, а є лише відсутністю Добра. На основі такого розуміння формується привативна парадигма, яка панувала в європейській філософсько-теологічній свідомості понад тисячоліття. Вона стала підґрунтям для філософської теодицеї: виправдання всеблагото Бога перед лицем зла, що насправді існує. Але наприкінці XVIII сторіччя ця парадигма поступилася місцем діалектико-романтичній, найбільш яскравими представниками якої є Шеллінг, Гегель та Ніцше. Концепт зла переосмислено й подано як необхідну складову світу, яка разом із добром належить до вищої реальності. Нове розуміння концепту зла отримує в психоаналізі Фрейда, Юнга та Фрома: його джерелом визначено підсвідоме людини, а зовнішнім виявом – агресію. Подібне розуміння зла притаманне і багатьом іншим психологічним школам, деякі з них проводили навіть психологічні експерименти щодо первісно злої природи людини. Утім, подібні "експерименти" характерні для соціальних практик тоталітарних режимів, на підставі чого виникає концепція "банальності" зла. Поява ж останньої постмодерністської парадигми розуміння зла пов'язана зі спробою деяких мислителів відкинути всі попередні концепції та повернутися до найдавнішої дуалістичної парадигми. Здавалося б, падіння більшості тоталітарних режимів та очікування "кінця історії" не давали підстави для популяризації цієї парадигми, але події початку 20-х років нашого століття вказують на необхідність її актуалізації.

**Ключові слова:** зло; дуалістична парадигма; привативна парадигма; теодицея; діалектико-романтична парадигма; психоаналітична парадигма; "банальність зла"; постмодерністська парадигма; прозорість зла; плинність зла

Received: 14.06.2024

Accepted: 15.11.2024