Research Article

TWO DIFFERENT VIEWS ON THE PROBLEM OF EVIL: THEIST AND ATHEIST APPROACH

İsmail ŞİMŞEK

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	As human being is an intelligent and knowledge able creature, he has tried to name the events and phenomenons and labeled them as bad or good during the process of his existence. There have been different views about the source of good and bad which are within the life and observation field of humanbeing. When considering the absolute goodness of Godinteism which views God as the creator of every thing and almighty, there exists a conflict about the source of badness. Within our study, we have handled and evaluated the matter of badness- a very significant problem in the history of thought- from two different perspectives.

INTRODUCTION

In the last hundred years, eighty-four thousand people died in the earthquake that took place on 28 December, 1908 in Messina, Sicily; thirty thousand people died in Avezzano earthquake, on September 30, 1915; a hundred thousand people died in Chinese earthquake on December 16, 1920; one hundred and fifty thousand people died in Tokyo and Yokohama earthquake on 1 September, 1923; two hundred and fifty thousand people died in Indonesia's earthquake and tsunami on 26 December, 2004; approximately 40-50 million people died in the second world war, which lasted from 1939 to 1945, and in our country approximately thirty three thousand people died in the Erzincan Earthquake on 26-27 December, 1939; and in the earthquake on August 17, 1999, approximately fifty thousand people died according to unofficial figures. As Poidevin said, world history is filled with the most horrific anguish of sorrow that comes to mind as a result of natural disasters such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, disease and hunger, or human actions such as wars, environmental devastation and religious persecution. If we believe in a divine being that is capable of everything, knows everything, and is just good at absolute goodness, there is no doubt a situation we have to answer. If He knows everything, He will be aware of the suffering, and in addition, if He is a power-worthy existence, He will try to prevent pain and suffering by being able to do everything as required by his perfect good. However, it is seen clearly that God does not prevent pain; therefore, whether there is no such entity; or even if there is, it can happen if he desires, or he is not the one who knows everything, who is powerful in everything, and is not perfectly good (Poidevin, 2003, 138-139).

As it is known, whether it is theological or philosophical, the understanding of the God in the theology leads us to the existence of a heavenly entity that knows everything, is ultimately powerless, eternal, unlimited, good. So, everything, the good, the bad, goodness-malice that exists in the universe is known by God and everything is created by him. In this case, while it is possible to understand and give meaning to the good, beautiful and pleasant that happens in the universe, problems arise about the place and meaning of the bad things that we experience in various forms. Indeed, it is a fact that there are facts and events that are the source of suffering and trouble on earth, and that mankind consider them as evil. It is seen that these phenomena and events, which are understood as evil, somehow touch us all. As well as goodness and beauty, evil and ugliness come somehow into every person's direct or indirect observation life (Yaran, 1998; 79). So, the phenomenon of evil has occupied almost every time not only philosophers and God's scientists, but also everybody who thinks about the nature of existence, the world and where the human being came from and how it is determined (Werner, 2000; s. 7) As it is known, according to the theology;

1. God is almighty.
2. God knows everything.
3. God is absolute good.
4. There is still evil (Plantinga, 1967; 11).

Now, when the evils expressed in this group of proposals are considered in the natural point of view and everything falls into

Corresponding author: **İsmail ŞİMŞEK**

its place in the actual cause and effect chain, there are some difficulties in explaining this situation when viewed from the point of divine justice. Because if God knows everything, he will prevent evil which causes this pain. Moreover, at the same time, an entirely good being must prevent evil as by force good (İmamoğlu, 2004; 203; Işıklar, 1994; 203). These thoughts, which would then form the basis of the problem of evil were first handled by Epicurus as a philosophical problem and they were later created by Lactantius and the classic version of Leibniz as it is today. The main bearing of the problem is:

Does not God have the power to prevent evil even he wants to? Then He is weak.

He is powerful enough but does not want to prevent it?
If he is not well-intentioned and powerful enough, then why is there so much evil (Hume, 1979; 198; Hick, 1985; 5; Ward, 1982; 189)?

Every philosopher considered and evaluated this subject in the basis of his own thought and belief system. Some have tried to solve the problem by interpreting it in various forms, such as the absence of a positive reality of evil, the absence of goodness, everything that exists as a result of God's power and well-being (Augustine, 1949; 159; Hick, 1983; 43), that evil is a tool for the human being to mature (Hick, 2013; 423-435; Seneca, 1997; 33), on the basis of the principle that there is something for something with the ontological connection between good and evil, that there will be no good if it is not evil, that if there was not evil, the good wouldn't be appreciated (Eflatun, 1990; 33), the existing evils are relatively less than the good ones, the good things dominate the evils, so that the present world is the best of the possible worlds(Leibniz, 1985; 130-132; 1960; 410). On the other hand, many think since the time of Epicurus that the existence of evil poses a problem for those who embrace a Godly belief in the theological sense, because on one hand there is a being that is all-powerful and absolutely good and on the other hand the existence of evil cannot coexist with the good and thus those who have Godly belief either deny that God has one of all-powerful and absolutely good qualities- that is, these qualities are the essential qualities of God in theism-or they need to accept that their religious beliefs lack rational support. For example, McCloskey says:

"Evil is a problem for the theist in that a contradiction is involved in the fact of evil on the one hand, and the belief in the omnipotence and perfection of God on the other. (Closkey, 1960; 97).

Again, Mackie:
"…And he can still retain all that assential to his position, by holding that God's existence is known in some other, non-rational way. I think, however, that a more telling criticism can be made by way of the traditional problem of evil. Here it can be shown, not that religious belief slack rational support, but that they are positively irrational, that the several parts of the essential theological doctrine are inconsistent with one another, so that the theologian can maintain his position as a whole only by a much more extreme rejection of reason than in the former case" (Mackie, 1955; 200)

Therefore, there are basically two different approaches to the problem of evil in the history of thought. The first is a theological approach that attempts to prove that theism may actually be right and reasonable against evil that there is no contradiction between the basic propositions that a God who knows everything, who is powerful in all things, and is absolutely good, and the evils which are present in the universe or on which the problem of evil is based, even if there is, the contradiction is not as powerful as the atheists claim, there is a reason for the God to allow the evil, And the second is the atheistic approach that attempts to prove that there is a contradiction, which cannot be removed, between the propositions on which the problem is based and even if it is not so, the existence of evil makes the belief in God unlikely (Akdemir, 2007; 165-166). In our work, we will consider and evaluate Mackie's views as a representative of the theoretical perspective and Alvin Plantinga's views as the representative of the atheism, which represents two different approaches to the problem of evil.

Two Different Views on the Problem of Evil: Theist and Atheist Approach

As it is known, the atheistic approach to the problem of evil is based on the qualities which is attributed to the understanding of God by theism. Because according to theism,

1. God is almighty.
2. God is absolute good.
3. There are evils.

According to Mackie, theism is fundamentally incoherent when we consider the above propositions. It is therefore not rational. Because the evil that exists in the world does not correspond with the understanding of God, who is capable of everything, knows everything, and is absolutely good. It is a contradictory situation to think that a God who is all-powerful cannot create a universe without moral evil. The religious understanding of theism does not only lose its rational support through the problem of evil, at the same time, it can also be made clear that it is irrational. The most fundamental contradiction of the problem is that God is almighty, is absolutely good and evil exists. Because, if any two of these proposals are correct, the third proposition will be definitely wrong. At the same time, however, these three propositions are fundamental propositions of many theological approaches. The theists have to theorize these three propositions. But it seems that they cannot do it successfully (Mackie, 1955; 201; Peterson, 2013; 288)

According to Plantinga, it is necessary to look at the inconsistency and the strain that Mackie posed here. According to him, there are various kinds of contradictory propositions. The first is a clear contradictory proposition. If a proposition is a compound proposition which requires the denial or rejection of the other proposition, it is called a contradictory proposition. Suh as;

- Paul is a good tennis player, and,
- It is wrong that Paul is a good tennis player. (Plantinga, 2002; 12)

Just like propositions above, if a proposition clearly denies or rejects the other one, these propositions are contradictory propositions. The second set of inconsistent propositions is a set of formally contradictory propositions and a clear

inconsistency can be understood with the rules of logic from the set of propositions. For example;

1. If all people are mortal, then Socrates is also mortal.
2. All people are mortal.
3. Socrates is not mortal (Plantinga, 2002; 13-14). the set of propositions are clearly not contradictory.

What is important here is to be able to make explicit contradictions from these proposals using normal logic rules. According to Plantinga, for this reason we must derive a new proposition from the group of proposals which is clearly contradictory when added to the group. We can apply this with the rule of the logic: if *p* has occurred, then *q* has occurred; *p*has occurred and so has *q* occurred. So, we can make the contradiction from the propositions (1), (2) and (3) that (4) Socrates is mortal. On doing so, as the proposition that (3) Socrates is not mortal among the (1),(2),(3) and(4) propositions is the denial and rejection of the proposal that (4) Socrates is mortal, these propositions are the set of contradictory propositions (Plantinga, 2002; 14).

The third inconsistent proposition group, according to Plantinga, is an implicit contradictory proposition. Accordingly, if we add a mandatory proposition to another set of propositions, then the set of propositions becomes a formally contradictory proposition, in this case the set of propositions becomes an implicit contradictory proposition. For example;

1. Ali is older than Mehmet.
2. Mehmet is older than Ayşe.
3. Ali is not older than Ayşe.

Let's consider the propositions above. According to him, such set of propositions neither formally nor clearly contradictory propositions. We cannot deduce the rejection of one proposition from the other propositions by moving from logic rules. But common sense and intelligence say that these sets of propositions are contradictory. Because it is not possible that these three proposals are correct at the same time. Then,

The proposition "If Ali is older than Mehmet and Mehmet is older than Ayşe, then Ali is older than Ayşe" is mandatorily correct.

If we add the proposition (8) to the above propositions group, the propositions 5, 6, 8 require the rejection of the proposition (7) with the reason for the normal logic rules (Plantinga, 2002; s. 16)

After expressing on what conditions the set of contradictory propositions is inconsistent, Plantinga deals with the inconsistencies separately suggested by Mackie among the propositions "God is almighty, God is absolute good and there are evil." Because none of the propositions in this set of propositions deny or reject other propositions. Therefore, there is no clear contradiction between the proposals 'God is almighty, God is absolute good and there are evil.' If we take into account the inconsistency between Mackie's proposals with reference to the definition of the second contradictory proposition, as a formally contradictory set is a set which can make a clear contradiction from the propositions of the set with the rules of logic, there is also no formal contradiction between these propositions that Mackie suggests which are inconsistency and contradiction (Plantinga, 2002; 13-14) If we

consider the third contradictory proposition, that is, the definition of the implicit contradictory proposition, The inconsistency may be such a contradiction between the proposals 'God is almighty, God is absolute good and there are evil' suggested by Mackie according to Plantinga. Mackie already argues that there is a contradiction between the propositions that form the basis of theism and he is aware that such objection suggested by Plantinga may arise. That is why he clearly states that the contradiction and inconsistency that he claims to exist between these proposals will not occur immediately.

"Now once the problem is fully stated it is clear that it can be solved, in the sense that the problem will not arise if one gives up at least one of the propositions that constitute it. If you are prepared to say that God is not wholly good, or not quite omnipotent,or that evil does not exist, or that good is not opposed to the kind of evil that exists, or that there are limits to what an omnipotent thing can do, then the problem of evil will not arise for you"(Mackie, 1955; 201)

So, Mackie adds two additional propositions to his set of propositions in order to reveal the contradiction he claims to exist among these propositions, which are basic doctrines of theism. In this case, the set of propositions which he claims to have contradictions and inconsistencies is as follows:

1. God is almighty.
2. God is absolute good.
3. There are evil.
4. A good entity is enough to remove the evil.
5. There is no limit in what an Omnipotent entity who is almighty can do (Mackie, 1955; 201).

According to Plantinga, if Mackie wants to show that there is a hidden contradiction between these proposals, he should also show that these two propositions he adds are not only true but also essential. However, even though the proposition (13), that is, there is no limit in what an Omnipotent entity who is almighty can do possible that the thought may be correct, it is not necessarily correct. Because, according to him, God's power to do all things is limited by the fact that he cannot make illogical, impossible events happen. For example, can God create square circles, married singles? Can it both exist and not exist? Therefore, the power to do anything in the understanding of God in theism does not mean that there is no limit in the power of God. What is meant here is that there are not illogical limits what God can do (Plantinga, 2002; 20; 1967; 120)

According to Plantinga, Mackie's proposition (12), that is to say, a good asset is enough to remove the evil, the proposal is not necessarily correct. For example, on a winter day, while you are sitting in your warm home, and you have spare fuel in your car at the door, let's imagine that the car of a friend of yours is stranded on the road because the fuel of his car is burnup at a distance of 40 km. This is a bad situation for your friend. At the same time, it is a bad situation that you can go and solve. But you do not do this. That does not mean that you are not a good person. Because you don't know the situation that your friend experiences. Therefore, Mackie's proposition (12), that is to say, a good asset is enough to remove the evil, the proposal is not necessarily correct. Here, Mackie talks about the ability of the good to remove the evil, to the extent it is good. However, the proposition (12) is by no means

compulsory, since it is impossible to resolve an evil that a good being could have, as it is in the example. According to Plantinga, the proposition that Mackie adds to reveal a formal contradiction between the propositions underlying the problem of evil should be as following:

An entity who is entirely good removes each evil which he knows and he can (Plantinga, 2002; 18; 1967; 118)

In this case, it will be seen that there is no formal contradiction between the propositions (9), (10), (11), (13) and (14) which form the basis of the problem. If we want to find a formal contradiction, it is necessary to add to this group of suggestions that God has knowledge of every evil situation. But is not God already knowing in the basic understanding of God theism? Is not Mackie right in his opinions when we add this to set of proposition?

According to Plantinga, the proposition (14) that an entity who is entirely good removes each evil which he knows and he can., is necessarily not true. For example, as in the example above, let's say another friend in the same situation is stranded on the wrong side of the road. In this case, you will be able to save one of your friend from the bad situation s/he in but you will not be able to save the other. Therefore, removing an evil is within your power while removing the other is not. However, you know both of the situations. It does not mean that you are bad because while you save one from the bad situation s/he is in and you are not able to save the other, to do more. Therefore, the proposition (14) that an entity who is entirely good removes each evil which he knows and he can., is necessarily not true (Plantinga, 2002; 19). We need another proposition (15) which has a fine detail to make this proposition necessarily a correct proposition.

An entity who is entirely good removes evil which he knows and he can without removing a greater good and causing a greater evil (Plantinga, 2002; 20; 1967; 119).

According to Plantinga, even if Mackie adds such a proposal to the group of proposals that form the basis of the problem of evil, the set of propositions is not a set of contradictive propositions. Because this proposition is not completely compulsory. For example, let's suppose that an entity removes a bad situation without causing a bigger evil, and without destroying a greater good. In this case, it may be the case that any entity can find itself in a situation where it can completely eliminate any two evils and cannot solve both evils. Imagine that you climb into a large mountain on a day when there is a violent and dangerous storm, and that two of your mountaineer friends are stranded about forty meters below the slope. You have the opportunity to rescue only one of the stranded mountaineers. If you try to save both of them, the storm is going to ruin the whole group. In this case, you can remove an evil without causing another evil or removing a greater good. However, you can completely remove the other evil. However, it is not possible to do both. That you do not save your other friend does not show that you're not a good person. Therefore, neither the proposition (14) nor the proposition (15) is necessarily correct for Plantinga (Plantinga, 2002; 21; 1967; 120). We would like to point out that this example given by Plantinga is not as accurate and prophetic as the statements he's made so far in our opinion. Such an example is not appropriate for the theism's understanding of God who is almighty. It is

quite possible that if an Almighty is capable of removing all evil, he can remove both evils that exist at the same time. In fact, Plantinga himself is aware of this. However, he tries to avoid the situation by stating that this is not the case. According to Plantinga, these proposals, which Mackie should add in order to reveal that there is a hidden contradiction between the basic propositions on which the problem of evil is based, are not necessarily correct propositions. What atheist theologians who advocate themselves for such contradiction should do is to add a necessarily correct proposition.

If we add the proposition;
(14)   "The Omnipotent who is almighty and Omniscient who knows everything entity removes all evil that he can remove in a proper manner"

to the set of propositions that form the basis of the problem, will any implicit contradiction arise? If we reformulate the group of propositions that form the basis of the problem by accepting that this proposition is necessarily correct, will there be a formal contradiction between the propositions?

1. God is almighty.
2. God is absolute good.
3. God knows everything.
4. There is evil.
5. The Omnipotent who is almighty and Omniscient who knows everything entity removes all evil that he can remove in a proper manner.
6. There is no illogical limit to what an Omnipotent can do for all things (Plantinga, 1967; 120).

According to Plantinga, the set of these propositions is also not formally contradictory. If there is a formal contradiction between them, we need to deduce that any (5) proposition rejects (6) the proposition as a result of logic rules with reference to the definition of formal contradiction. Or if the set of propositions is inconsistent, the proposition (4), there is evil, will be rejected by other propositions. That is, the propositions (1), (2),(3),(16) and (17) would require the proposition (4), There is no evil. However, what the propositions requires formally is not that evil does not even exist, but the absence of the evil that the God can remove (Plantinga, 2002; 20-21; Moore, 1996; 263)

According to Plantinga, we must add the proposition (18), 'If the God is almighty and know everything, he, then, removes all evil about the subject in a proper way', to the set of proposals above in order to reveal that there is an implicit contradiction among these proposals. In this case, the set of propositions including the propositions (16), (17) and (18) is contradictory. If (16), (17) and (18) are necessarily correct, there is an implicit contradiction between these proposals. Plantinga has already stated that the proposals (16) and (17) are necessarily correct. Now the question is whether the proposition (18) is necessarily correct or not, but according to him, this proposition is not correct. Because some good situations cannot exist without evil.

Neither one is morally faulty because she has prevented an evil which would cause a greater good, nor s/he is morally perfect as s/he has allowed a good which would cause a greater evil (Plantinga, 1967; 119).

According to Plantinga, as the atheist theologians have expressed, it is difficult to find the necessarily correct propositions that will form a set of propositions formally contradictory when added to the set of propositions that constitute the basis of evil. These propositions are neither clear nor formally contradictory propositions. Perhaps it can be suggested that they are implicit contradictory. For this, the representatives of the atheistic approach like Mackie need to find the necessarily correct propositions that will form a set of formally contradictory propositions when added to the set of propositions. Such a necessarily proposition was neither put forward by Mackie nor by other philosophers advocating the atheistic approach. It can be said that the set of these proposals are implicitly consistent with reference to the principle 'It is assumed that a proposal is consistent until it is proven to be otherwise', but it cannot be said that it is proven. To do this is to find a proposition that is consistent with proposition (1) and necessary for proposition (3) among the propositions which are the basis of the problem (1) God is almighty, (2) God is absolute good and (3) there is evil. Which is;

God crates a world which consists of evil, and there is a good reason to do so (Plantinga, 2002; 26).
In order to defend this view, Plantinga makes the following claim:

It is not possible for God to create a world which consists of moral good without creating a world which moral evil (Plantinga, 1967; 122; Moore, 263).

If the proposition (20) is true, then it is possible that the proposition (19), that is, God has a good cause for allowing the world to contain evil. There is a good reason that an entity who is almighty, knows all things, and is absolutely good allows evil as he will not do anything without purpose. The reason is, according to Plantinga, the creation of people who are free to act.

Well, can we link the evils that exist in the world to the misuse of the people's free will only? For example, how can we describe the causes of the evils that are defined as natural evils in the history of thought, such as diseases and natural disasters which are not even brought into being by the people, are out of their own will and neglect and consists of metal pain in both humans and animals? Or why has God created people free if the reasons of the evil which is suggested by Plantinga that God allows evil are the free will which is the cause of the evil in this world? Is responsibility a good thing? Moreover, could not God create free people who always do what is good? This is the last question Mackie asks. According to him;

"…I should ask this: if God has made men such that in their free choices they sometimes prefer what is goodandsometimes what is evil, why could he not have made men such that they always freely choose the good? If there is nologicalim possibility in a man's freely choosing the good on one, or on several, occasions,there cannot be a logical impossibility in his freely choosing the good on every occasion. God was not, then, faced with a choice between making innocent automata and making beings who, inacting freely, would sometimes gow rong : there was open to him the obviously better possibility of making beings who would act freely but always go right. Clearly, his failure to avail himself of this possibility is inconsistent with his being both omnipotent and wholly good. (Mackie, 1955; 209).

Now, according to Mackie, if God is almighty, knows everything and is absolute good, He is able to create certain situations that are reasonably possible. It is logically possible that all free people do what is good in any case. God can always create free people who do good. So, if God can create free people who do what is right and if he is absolute good, in this case the free people created by God always do the good and never do anything that is evil in morals.

According to Plantinga, the idea Mackie expressed that "it is logically possible for all people who are free to do what is good in any case" is true. However, if the God is almighty, absolute good and know everything, there is a problem in the idea that 'He can create certain situations that are reasonably possible'. With reference to the same logic and if we accept the idea that the God is almighty as a criterion, it is also reasonably possible that God has created people he had not created, which does not make any sense. Instead of saying that the Omnipotent creates some certain situations which are reasonably possible, we can say that the Omnipotent can create any situation which is consistent. Even expressed like this, it does not require the sentence that God can always create free people who do the right thing (Plantinga, 1967; 138; Şimşek, 2014; 424). According to Plantinga, a world that is largely full of free beings that do good freely more than evil is more valuable than a world full of non-free beings on the same terms. God can create free creatures. However, he does not only cause them to do good. God has to create creatures who can do moral evil to create creatures who can do moral good. It is not possible for God both to give these creatures the freedom to do evil and to prevent them from doing evil. Therefore, God could only prevent moral evil to happen by removing the moral good (Plantinga, 2002; 30). God can also create free beings that are free to do evil but that are merely appreciated causatively to do good. But this means that God can create beings that are free to do evil, however that are retained to do evil, which is contrary to the nature of freedom. When it comes to a world which consists of free beings that can be created by God, the fact that providing the free beings to do evil cannot be considered within the basis of the fact that God is almighty. That a being is free in terms of the action A in the time of T can only be possible if and only any reasonable law or a by pre-existing condition oblige him to do or make him to avoid doing the action A in the time of T (Plantinga, 1974; 171). It is then possible to have a world that only possesses moral good and no moral evil, but whether such a world actually exists is left to the free beings that exist in this world (Peterson, 2013; 182)

In our view, Mackie's objection that the creation of innocent automats constantly doing good is within the power of God, and therefore he must create free people who do good to keep moral evil out of sight, is very consistent. Because for God, there is no point in creating machines that are programmed to live 'virtuous' lives. Human life is only value to the extent that s/he can seal his/her own destiny. God has actually given man the power to choose between good and evil. When we think that God has created automats that choose good constantly, our lives will follow a predictable course, and every action will follow an initial state set by God. In this case, what would it mean to create such a universe? The universe will not be able

to do any good; because, it is nothing but the expression of God's own goodness. Accordingly, if our choice in the form of moral actions and decisions that are not the result of God's preprogramming brings any innovation, we must be free in the sense that we can choose to do otherwise in the conditions we've already done. There is no point in creating human beings for God to follow through the God's own way for their choices (Poidevin, 148).

In contrast to Mackie, Plantinga believes that it is consistent to suggest that an 'almighty, all-knowing and entirely good being' will create people who can sometimes do moral evil. According to him, that God is almighty, absolute good and knows everything does not makes it necessary to create people who have moral evil actions. What needs to be done is to show that it is consistent that the propositions "God is almighty, absolute and an almighty and absolute good entity can create people who sometimes conduct moral evil actions" collate, and to find a proposition which is logically adequate to reject the proposition "God does not create beings who conduct moral evil actions." Plantinga formulates this as following:

God is almighty, absolute good and knows everything.
God creates free beings.

A truly free being conducts at least one moral evil action.
God creates beings who conducts moral evil actions (Plantinga, 1967; s. 12). (from 21 and 22).

According to Plantinga, this evidence is valid evidence. (1), (21) and (22) are clearly consistent and the first three propositions require the proposition (23). Proposition (23) requires the rejection of the proposition "God does not create beings who conduct moral evil actions", which shows that the proposition "an almighty and absolute good entity can create people who sometimes conduct moral evil actions" is consistent. (Plantinga, 1967; 140)

The inevitable evil in the world as an indispensable end to the fulfillment of a greater good may not contradict with the absolute goodness of God. However, another question arises here. Is freedom really a good thing? Is it worth to suffer and go into too much trouble for just freedom? Or is freedom enough for God to allow so much evil? Wouldn't the idea of Ivan, the protagonist in the Brothers Karamazov novel "if the price of freedom is so heavy, I will return this ticket" be true? From this point of view, is it not true that God creates sinless, innocent automats that constantly do good in a determination?
In order to solve the above-mentioned problem, it is necessary to determine whether the amount of evil that exists in the world is more than goodness. If the existing evil is dominant in the world and the goodness is less than the evil, the thoughts expressed in this case are justified. According to Plantinga, there is no way to measure and determine the amount of moral evil. Let's say there is moral evil in the amount of Q in the world. In this case, the proposition "God is almighty, absolute good and knows everything" is consistent with the proposition "God creates some being who conducts moral evil in the amount of Q." We can formulate the proposition as following:
(1) God is almighty, absolute good and knows everything.

God creates an S bunch consisting of free beings, and moral good is relatively more balanced compared to moral good with regard to the members of S.

There is an S bunch consisting of completely free beings, in fact, moral good is relatively more balanced compared to moral good with regard to the members of S and the members of S1 conducts moral evil in the amount of Q (Plantinga, 1967; 148).

When we form a set of propositions in this way, the S bunch consisting of the free beings is obviously a representation of a concrete S1. For this reason, the members of S conduct Q moral evil. Therefore, the propositions 'God is almighty, absolute good and knows everything' (1), 'God creates an S bunch consisting of free beings, and moral good is relatively more balanced compared to moral good with regard to the members of S' (24) and 'there is an S bunch consisting of completely free beings, in fact, moral good is relatively more balanced compared to moral good with regard to the members of S and the members of S1 conducts moral evil in the amount of Q' (25) are not contradictory but consistent with each other. Thus, the proposition 'God is almighty, absolute good and knows everything' is consistent with the proposition 'God creates some free beings which conducts moral evil in the amount of Q', and there is no contradiction between the amount of the evil existing in the world and that God is almighty, absolute good and knows everything (Plantinga, 2002; 94).

So far, the evidence suggested by Plantinga to show that the evils existing in the world do not contradict with God's absolute good and almighty seems to be successful to solve the problem that is generally defined as moral evil in the history of thought such as war, cruelty, injustice, murder by human being who has basically a moral obligation and freedom or which is caused a result of abusing his will compared to Mackie. Because God created a considerable amount of free human beings. Some of them used their freedom in a wrong way. That the human beings use their freedom for a wrong cause does not constitute a contradictory evidence to God's absolute goodness or almighty. Because God could only prevent the evil arising from the free will of human being by cutting back the opportunity of moral good (Plantinga, 1974; 165). However, another problem which the theist approach should solve is that whether the evil, like earthquake, fire, flood disaster, storm, famine which is called natural evil and on which human beings' free will has no effect, correspondsto the understanding of God described by theism. Actually, this is the subject which the theist approach has more difficulty in describing and presenting that there is no contradiction against the atheist approach. Because the moral evils that arise from the will of human beings are easily connected to the freedom given to man. But when it comes to evils that do not originate from the free will, it becomes different.

According to Plantinga, natural evils such as earthquakes, floods, and storms are the result of free acts of free and rational but non-human spiritual beings at significant levels or it is possible to be like this. In this respect, he links natural evils to the freedom of non-human spiritual beings like Satan. Therefore, the natural evils for him can be evaluated in the category of moral evil from a wider perspective. What is important to him is that it is not definitely true but it may be true. Such a possibility is enough for him. Therefore;

God creates free non-human beings (spirit, Satan) that do more moral good than moral evil.

There are beings which are free and non-human and do more good than evil.

All of the evil in this world is the result of the free actions of the free and non-human beings (Plantinga, 1967; 150).

Plantinga ultimately tries to solve the problem of natural evil by assigning freedom to nonhuman beings similarly to the proposed solution for moral evil. As a result, he links the cause of natural evils to the free will of nonhuman beings. It is not within the power of God to create such a world consisting of that much of goodness without allowing the free will of these beings that allow them to do evil, as it is expressed in the problem of moral evil. (Plantinga, 2002; 58)

CONCLUSION

In this study, which deals with the problem ofevil which is the most important problem of the history of thought, we have mutually evaluated the thoughts of Plantinga and Mackie who we chose as the representatives of theism and atheism. First of all, we should state that both philosophers came to a solution or presented the problem by addressing it on a mental basis and suggesting some reasonable propositions. For Mackie, the existence of evil does not match the qualities that theism has attributed to God. This is not immediately apparent when looking at the set of proposals, but with additional suggestions it can be made clear. But according to Plantinga, there is no implicit contradiction between these proposals, and there is reason why God allows evil. This is the freedom given to man. While Plantinga seems justified in the defense of free will, this defense may only apply to the solution of moral evils that exist in the world. Plantinga does not seem as successful as Mackie, especially in the case of earthquakes, floods, storms etc., at least in the solution of moral evils. Above all, the fact that natural evil is based on the free will of a number of evil spirits is not at all successful when it is thought that there is no concrete indication or acceptance of such beings. Accepting the real existence of evil, which should be done in regard to natural evil, is to find a good reason for why God allows evil. We, maybe, cannot find the best reason for God to allow evil. However, the fact that we do not know this reason doesn't show that there is no such thing. This is possible when one considers the finite and limited knowledge of man compared to the infinite and absolute knowledge of God. However, although Plantinga seems unsuccessful in explaining the cause of natural evil in solving the problem of evil, it does not justify that Mackie concludes the absence of God with reference to this. The deduction to make from the propositions that form the basis of the problem is not the absence of God, but the inability to understand why God allows evil.

Bibliography

Augustine, Saint. (1949). *the Confessions of Saint Augustine.* (Trans. Edward B. Pusey) New York: The Modern Library.

Akdemir, Ferhat. (2007). *Alvin Plantinga ve Analitik Din Felsefesi. Ankara: Elis Yayınları.*

Eflatun. (1990). *Tebeatetus,* (çev. trans. Macit Gökberk), Istanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.

Hick, John. (1985).*Evil and The God of Love*, London: Macmillian Publishing.

_____. (1983). *Philisophy Religion*, New Jersey.

Hume, David. (1970). *Dialogues on Concerning Natural Religion*, (ed. Nelson Pike). New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc.

Işıklar, Erhan,. (1994).Tanrı Bilim ve Felsefe Konuşmaları. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları.

İmamoğlu, Tuncay.(2004) *BirTartıKanıtlamasıOlarak Berkeley İdealizmi*, İstanbul: YeniZamanlarYayınları.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm. (1985). *Essays on theGoodness of God, theFreedom of Man andtheOrigin of Evil*, (Trans. Austin Farrer).Oxford: Bibloobazaar.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm (1960), Discourse On Metaphysics. *The Rationalists*, (Trans. George Montgomery). New York:Anchor Books.

Mackie, J. L. (1955). Evil and Omnipotence, *Mind*, New Series, Vol. 64, No. 254.

McCloskey. (1960). God and Evil.*Philosophical Queterly*, V: 10, No: 39, April, 1960.

Moore, Scott H. (1996). Comments on Alvin Plantinga's Free Will Defense. *Philosophy of Religion: Selected Reading*, (ed. Michael Peterson). New York: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, Michael and others. (2013). Akıl ve İnanç, Din Felsefesine Giriş, (trans. Rahim Acar), İstanbul: Küre Yayınları.

Plantinga, Alvin. (1967).*God and Other Minds*, Ithaca: Cornel University Press.

_____. (2002).*God, Freedom and Evil*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____. (1974). *the Nature of Necessity.* Oqford: Clarendon Press.

Poidevin, Robin Le. ((2003). Ateizm, İnanma ve İnanmama Üzerine BirTartışma. (trans. Abdullah Yılmaz). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Senaca. (1997). *Tanrısal Öngörü, (trans. Çiğdem Dürüşken). İstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınları.*

Şimşek, İsmail. (2014). Tanrı'nın Mükemmelliği ve Özgürlük Problemi. EKEV Akademi Dergisi, Yıl: 18, Sayı:19.

Ward, Keith. (1982). *Rational Theology and Creativity of God.* Oxford.

Werner, Charles. (2000). *Kötülük Problemi, (trasn. Sedat Umran). Istanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.*

Yaran, Cafer S*., KötülükveTeodise: Batıve İslam Din Felsefesinde "Kötülük Problemi" ve Teistik Çözümler. İstanbul: Vadi Yayınları.*

****