

JÜRGEN MOLTMANN AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

JOHN DAVID JAEGER

Jürgen Moltmann's theology, in large measure, has been articulated in light of the reality of pain and suffering in the world. In fact, the theodicy question has been a primary shaping influence on Moltmann's theological perspective. He has written that "it is in suffering that the whole human question about God arises."¹ The theologian also has called the issue of theodicy "the all-embracing eschatological question."² His work has involved impassioned calls to fight oppression and injustice in their various forms. Likewise, his writings have sought to show how God relates to such a world where bad things happen on a regular basis.

While Moltmann has not yet written systematically on the problem of evil, one can pull together elements from his various writings and form a good outline of his perspective. The following article covers three basic themes related to this perspective. First, a sketch of key influences on Moltmann's theodicy will be provided. Then, an outline of his theological position, giving focus upon the theodicy issue, will be given. This will follow a Trinitarian framework based on a three-fold movement of God's outpouring love, God's passionate love, and God's all-embracing love. After this, I will summarize and critique the theodicy.

KEY INFLUENCES ON MOLTMANN'S THEODICY

While a variety of influences have certainly played a part in Moltmann's thinking concerning the theodicy issue, four general areas are of vital importance. For the present purpose, only a brief discussion of them will be given. The theologian's personal experiences as a prisoner of war, his biblical perspective, Jewish influences, and philosophical influences all were of central importance.

The theologian has written in various places of the traumatic effect his imprisonment in England from 1945-48 had on his life. His post-war country was in sham-

John David Jaeger is a Ph.D. candidate in systematic theology at Baylor University in Waco, Texas, and is a reference librarian at Union University in Jackson, Tennessee.

THE ASBURY THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL

FALL 1998 • VOL. 53 • NO. 2

bles, he was isolated from home and family, and his identity as a person was replaced with a number. For him, all hope was gone.³ In prison he experienced terrible depression “and lost the desire to go on living.”⁴ But in this situation of despair, through an encounter with God, Moltmann found renewed hope and desire for living. He returned to Germany inwardly scarred but also hopeful of assisting in making a “new, more humane Germany,” and also a “liberated, liberating church of Christ.”⁵ Therefore, personal suffering, and response to it, were at the very beginning of Moltmann’s theological thinking. Additionally, this personal experience perhaps partly accounted for his emphasis upon moral and political evil as opposed to natural evil. He wrote that the twentieth century equivalent to the Libson earthquake of 1755 was Auschwitz.⁶ This emphasis partly came from his personal experience.

Another key to understanding his thought was his strong emphasis on the Bible as a primary authority. This played a significant part in molding the eschatological focus displayed in *Theology of Hope* and in subsequent writings; it also encouraged a teleological format to his views on theodicy.⁷ Also, the stress upon scriptural authority helped lead Moltmann to a view of God as passionate and helped him appreciate the *theologia crucis* advocated by Luther.⁸

A third major influence was writings from Jewish sources. In particular, Abraham Heschel’s pathetic theology, which described God as freely and passionately involved with His people, has been influential.⁹ Moltmann has appreciated some of these ideas in moving away from the traditional theistic idea of God as being apathetic. Also significant were the early rabbinical and kabbalist traditions, with their doctrine of the *shekinah*. This idea conceived of God going out of Himself, dividing from Himself, in association with His covenant people as they followed their path in history. It especially emphasized God’s close presence with them, apart from His exalted presence, during periods of suffering and exile.¹⁰ This found a place in Moltmann’s concepts of divine self-humiliation and close involvement in the suffering of creation. His historical panentheism showed elements of the *shekinah* doctrine in it.

The fourth key element contributing to his ideas on the theodicy issue comes from the field of philosophy. Ideas from Ernst Bloch, Hegel, and advocates of protest atheism all were important here. Bloch was significant in shaping the futuristic elements of Moltmann’s thought. His emphasis on hope as a central philosophical category became vitally important in Moltmann’s eschatological orientation. Also, Bloch’s dialectical principle of knowledge, which asserted that like is known by unlike, showed forth in Moltmann’s theology of the cross.¹¹ The theologian used this in providing an alternative view of God’s nature to the one advocated by traditional theism. Hegel’s ideas about negative and painful elements in human history being included in God’s history found expression in Moltmann’s Trinitarian thought.¹² This formed part of his broad approach to suffering as addressed by and overcome through God. Protest atheism, with its rejection of God in the face of overwhelming suffering and evil, and its accusations about the church’s complicity in the institutional systems of evil, has had a profound effect on Moltmann’s ideas. It has helped shape his response as to the true nature of God and the proper role of the church in a hurting world.¹³

Having briefly examined elements contributing to Moltmann’s perspective on suffering

and evil in the world, it is time to examine his theodicy in some detail. The framework of his theological view as a whole will be displayed, with attention given to theodicy themes revealed at each point. A Trinitarian structure of creation, redemption, and reconciliation is presented under the themes of God's outpouring love, God's passionate love, and God's all-embracing love.

GOD'S OUTPOURING LOVE

For Moltmann, the source of God's creative work began in the fellowship between the persons of the Trinity. For, from the beginning, God's being existed in the form of a loving, triune relationship. He wrote that "the triune God reveals Himself as love in the fellowship of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."¹⁴ This relational, abundant sharing love formed God's essence. But God did not wish to limit this love to the Trinitarian community. This love in Trinity was from eternity an open love, "open to man, open to the world, and open to time."¹⁵ The theologian was careful to show that God did not open Himself creatively out of loneliness or from an internal deficit, but rather from a "divine abundance and superabundance of being."¹⁶ God's "seeking love" wished to overflow into creativity.¹⁷ His creative impulse was a kind of inner compulsion based on deep, communal love. Moltmann also stated that the triune God created from a desire for a partner who could respond freely to Him. This served as the theologian's form of the free-will argument. He commented in *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God* that creation existed "because the eternal love seeks fellowship and desires response in freedom."¹⁸

This same work detailed with somewhat poetic language what was entailed in God's creative work. God had to pull himself back, which involved a "withdrawal of himself."¹⁹ He had to open up a space for creation, and this required limiting himself voluntarily. This was necessary to "give the nihil the space in which God becomes creatively active."²⁰ Moltmann used terms such as "nihil" and "nothingness" to depict the chaos or uncertainty in which all things exist. God pulling himself back to open a space for creativity meant a certain vulnerability, instability, and risk. Moltmann could write of creation occurring "within the sea of nothingness."²¹ He also showed the risk element in writing about the Genesis creation accounts:

The creation is therefore an open creation. It is open for its own destruction as well as its redemption in a new creation. It is not perfect but perfectible. It is good, but that does not exclude the possibility that it can become worse or the possibility that it can become better ... the experimental field of destructive and constructive possibilities is laid out.²²

This concept of creation in the midst of nothingness showed how Moltmann differed from traditional theism influenced by Augustine. Rather than envisioning a perfect creation and then questioning why things went so wrong, he viewed creation as an ongoing event being molded out of chaos. This process involved openness to nothingness and risk of flaws and evil developing in creation.

Another important way of understanding God's creative work was discussed in *God in Creation*. In this work, devoted primarily to the doctrine of creation, the theologian wrote of

how the word "ecology" meant "the doctrine of the house."²³ From this he noted that God's intention for creation was to make it a home for himself. He pointed out that by his Spirit God indwelt creation and had distinct plans for it. He wrote, "if the creative God Himself dwells in his creation, then he is making it his own home...."²⁴ Thus in understanding God's original intention for creation, one must look toward the goal of making it a home for the divine dwelling and glory.

Along the same line of thought as above, God's determination to create out of the overflow of his love and from his desire for fellowship opened up the experience of history. God, by involvement with creation and its historical process, opened himself "for history and the experience of history."²⁵ Thus history was an avenue of action not only for humanity and creation as a whole, but even for God. And even at this initial stage, the eschatological vision for the completion of history and perfection of all reality was present. Moltmann could write of the need to view "the Creator, creation, and the goal of creation in a Trinitarian sense...."²⁶ God chose to initiate a Trinitarian process involving historical participation between God and creation and moving toward a future goal.

In this creation, Moltmann viewed humans in a special way. They could experience history uniquely, being part of creation and also something beyond it in God's plans. Humans alone were "created and destined as the image of God upon earth."²⁷ The theologian could write about humans that "in his image the Creator wills to find his partner, his echo and his honor."²⁸ God intended for humans to be participants with him in the created world and in its future. Paradoxically, this also meant the purpose humans were created for had a hidden dimension to it.²⁹ Humans did not know of their own glorious purpose and instead used potential freedom for idolatry and sin. Moltmann stated that "man always creates for himself symbols and values which become for him the basis of trust of his existence."³⁰ So while God's intention was for humanity to become His partner and image, in its blindness and open-endedness, humanity instead turned to false gods and systems of sinful powers.³¹ Humans were created for joyous freedom but instead became entwined in oppressive bondage. Humanity created a system of isolation and oppression in various personal and institutional forms.

GOD'S PASSIONATE LOVE

Having examined the various aspects of God's outpouring love and its implications for humanity and all creation, it is necessary to discuss God's passionate love. Warren McWilliams has rightly called this theme Moltmann's primary contribution to recent discussion of the theodicy issue.³² The major source for analysis of the passion of God comes from *The Crucified God*, but other works also address the subject in some measure. The theme of Moltmann's theology of the cross drew heavily from Martin Luther. Luther attacked medieval scholasticism's natural theology in favor of his own scripturally oriented theology of the cross.³³ In a similar way, Moltmann attacked traditional theism and its attempt to understand God's nature and attributes from the principle of *analogia entis*. This attempt to view God from the natural world led to a distorted and inaccurate depiction of him. Moltmann understood this approach to be heavily influenced by Greek philosophical thought and saw it as creating an inaccessible and aloof God. He wrote concerning the position held by theism: "God is good and does no evil. God is perfect and cannot suffer. God is

sufficient unto Himself and does not need friends. Apathy, freedom from suffering, belongs to the divine perfection.³⁴ In another place he wrote of the "philosophical concept of God," which understood God as "incorruptible, unchangeable, indivisible, incapable of suffering and immortal."³⁵ Yet a God who could not suffer was separated from His creation and unable to participate with it or even fully care for it. "Were God incapable of suffering in any respect... then He would also be incapable of love."³⁶ Moltmann rejected this approach, and with it, a centuries-old line of Christian tradition.

Instead, like Luther before him, Moltmann turned to the Bible and discovered a God of passion and emotion, love and suffering.³⁷ In particular, he followed Luther in asking what the cross of Christ meant for the being of God. He determined that Jesus' death on the cross was the "center of all Christian theology."³⁸ The cross was God's ultimate revelation of His nature and character. And what was revealed in the crucifixion was God's "unconditional love," expressed in His "willingness to suffer at the hands of His creation."³⁹

The cross event was rich in meaning both concerning God and his creation. For God, it was a defining point in his Trinitarian history. It was an event within God. While the crucifixion occurred at the hands of Roman rulers and Jewish leaders, it ultimately occurred by an act of God.⁴⁰ The Father handed over the Son to death and the Son experienced abandonment by the Father. And this profound event "between God and God" formed the basis of a new experience for the deity.⁴¹ Moltmann even wrote of a change happening in God through the event of the cross. God experienced the fullness of suffering. And while the theologian was reluctant to write of the death of God, he certainly wrote of death occurring in God. He stated that "God himself suffered in Jesus, God himself died in Jesus for us."⁴² This process brought nothingness into the very being of God. God in Christ "revealed himself and constituted himself in nothingness."⁴³ And by bringing nothingness into his own being and history, God began a process of eliminating all transitoriness and nothingness.

The cross also, therefore, showed God in active resistance against evil. By the cross, God brought suffering history into his own history and opened the process leading to liberation from all suffering. God "becomes vulnerable, takes suffering and death on himself in order to heal, to liberate, and to confer his eternal life."⁴⁴ God's passion on the cross was not only an act of participation with suffering but also involved a protest against suffering.

The cross of Christ also had great significance for humanity. It revealed humankind's profound godlessness. The cross showed humanity's entrapment in forms of illusory freedom and multifarious idolatry.⁴⁵ Yet the cross also revealed the way to true freedom in Christ. In *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, Moltmann described the threefold work of Christ as liberation from the tendency toward sin, liberation from idols of power, and liberation from godforsakenness.⁴⁶ All these were made new possibilities for humanity by the work of God in Christ. These were opened up as eschatological realities for the future.

A final element of the passion of God involved solidarity. Alienated and isolated humanity was brought together by the experience of a new kind of love and a new kind of corporate reality—the fellowship of believers. This new community could unite in love and caring on the basis of the passionate reality of God in its midst.⁴⁷ This community could work together as a new fellowship, as participants in God's history, in opening up new spaces of freedom in the world. Such work would involve struggles for economic justice, human rights, human solidarity, peace with nature, and personal wholeness.⁴⁸

GOD'S ALL-EMBRACING LOVE

Having examined God's creative love and His passionate love in some detail, it is necessary to complete the Trinitarian structure with discussion about His redemptive love. From the beginning, at which point God chose to create from His overflow of Trinitarian, communal love, the eschatological goal was in sight. This goal was for all reality to become the home of God's glorious presence. Moltmann wrote about that future point: "Heaven and earth will become God's dwelling, the surroundings that encompass him, his milieu."⁴⁹ At this future point, all creation will be redeemed and made perfect. Human history comes to a close and is to be fully integrated into the glorious history of God. God's Trinitarian presence will be made complete through this "eschatological consummation."⁵⁰ This future completion unites the Trinitarian God, humanity, and all creation in a bond of eternal love and joy. All would experience the fullness of freedom in the atmosphere of loving fellowship. This final objective was described in one place as the "all-comprehending and therefore eternal felicity of God."⁵¹

Moltmann was emphatic in stating that God took upon himself all the evil and suffering in the world, transforming it by bringing it into his own history. He wrote, "as evil has been overcome it is integrated in the very being of God."⁵² One might think that the theologian viewed all evil as therefore necessary for the good derived from it. Or, one might imagine he would minimize the significance of pain experienced, noting that it will be overcome in the future. Neither was true of Moltmann's thought. Rather, he avoided any defense of evil, holding that "we cannot go beyond the fact of evil, for which no reason can be given."⁵³ He was interested in seeing how evil was overcome in the future, but this did not make present evil insignificant: "A dialectical Trinitarian doctrine of the crucified Jesus does not lead with logical cogency to the declaration that evil is necessary for the sake of good. It really only leads to the removal of evil's potency; it is no longer necessary."⁵⁴ Moltmann's Trinitarian integration of all history and nothingness into the reality of God did not involve a minimization or complete explanation of human suffering. It did give a way of seeing those experiences in some sense salvaged and redeemed by the Trinitarian God.

SUMMARY

From the Trinitarian structure of Moltmann's thought discussed above, a general outline of his theodicy can be summarized. To the question of why there was evil and suffering in the world, given God's love and power, Moltmann had fairly detailed answers. He first noted that the determination to make a world at all came from the loving, generous character of God. The initial intention to create derived from a gracious, loving God in Trinitarian fellowship. This decision came not from a careful analysis of "the best of all possible worlds" but from a joyous determination to open a space for free creativity. And Moltmann understood this opening of a space of creative life as involving risk and opportunity. Creation was not so much a paradise atmosphere as a realm for creative possibilities, both good and bad.

Yet God, from the beginning, had wondrous plans for His world. He intended for creation ultimately to be a part of His glorious environment, and He intended for humans to be free partners in glorious fellowship. In time he would, in Christ, begin a process of pulling all history into his own wondrous history. The creation of life and the initiation of

history were gifts from God; ultimate plans to perfect creation and bring all history into the Trinitarian history had already been laid out.

In the actual reality of the world, suffering and evil became major elements. Moltmann did not go into great detail describing how this occurred, but it seemed to come from the chaotic dimensions involved in creating a world at all. The power of nothingness seemed to be a cause of general instability in the natural world and a factor leading to sinful tendencies in the human world. Humanity, blinded of its wondrous calling as created in the divine image and its wondrous future in God's kingdom, turned toward idolatry and oppression. Isolating and selfish tendencies pulled humanity away from its true nature and into personal and corporate oppression.

Moltmann viewed God as actively involved in overcoming the suffering and evil present in the created world. God sent the Son to open up for himself the experience of pain and even death. While the oppressive forces put Jesus on the cross, the Father in his suffering love participated in the event as well. In the passion of the Son, God took the entire human history of suffering into himself and began the process of overcoming all suffering. Thus in Christ God revealed his nature of suffering love and showed his personal devotion and involvement in creation. God also showed his resistance to all evil and oppression by opening up a new realm of freedom for believers. By the strength of the divine Spirit, humans joined in battle against all forms of earthly evil.

The theologian ultimately viewed the answer to suffering and evil in the future kingdom of God. The very real history of pain would be completed, and all evil and nothingness overcome in the realm of God's totality. The Trinitarian God who had gone out of himself in seeking love would be unified with creation in a realm free from all pain and full of divine glory.

CRITIQUE

Having displayed a summary of Moltmann's ideas concerning the problem of evil, a critique will now be given. His theodicy has several important strengths. First, it takes evil seriously and understands God as deeply concerned about it. No aspect of the theodicy attempts to ignore the stark reality of earthly suffering. The emphasis upon the cross as a key to understanding the nature of God placed suffering at the very center of Moltmann's theology. God is not depicted as an aloof observer but as an active participant in the history of the world and its suffering.

Also, the theodicy involves steadfast resistance against evil in its various forms. Unlike some approaches, Moltmann moves away from pure speculation and encourages a serious type of activism. In so doing, it answers a major problem raised by protest atheism. The theodicy shows Christianity generally, and the church specifically, as fighting against injustice. In fact, it depicts the fight as undertaken by God alongside his people. God even brings the struggle against evil into his own Trinitarian nature in a panentheistic manner.

Besides this, Moltmann's approach involves an eschatological victory over all forms of evil. It does so in a way that encourages present hopefulness. And it does so without either ignoring evil's reality or advocating tolerance of existing oppression. No other major theologian has combined a theology of eschatology with a theology of the cross in this manner. The result is a balanced theodicy that energetically points to the future goal and

also honestly faces present earthly problems.

Many criticisms could be made against Moltmann's theodicy as well. Some of these prove more effective than others. Kenneth Surin noted in an article that the theologian's handling of the subject is not a theodicy in the full sense of the word.⁵⁵ Rather than reconciling the dilemma of God's love and power in light of experienced evil, Moltmann limited the power of God. His concept of divine kenosis, or self-limitation, aimed at an intellectually defensible position, but only at the price of redefining divine power. This point has some validity. Yet what is involved here is an attempt at refutation through an attack on one of the horns of a dilemma; Moltmann is reshaping the concept of God's power in a way he deems more biblically and theologically appropriate.

Some have suggested that Moltmann has fallen into full-fledged patricapianism. The theologian certainly tried to avoid this problem. He wrote in one place that Trinitarian thought allowed for the idea of "patricapianism."⁵⁶ He noted that while death occurred in God through the cross, one could not fully speak of the death of God. Along these same lines, McWilliams pointed out that while both Father and Son suffered in the cross, they did so in different ways.⁵⁷ The Father suffered the grief of losing the Son, while the Son experienced godforsakenness. Thus, the theologian seems to have maintained key distinctions among the persons of the Trinity.

D.G. Atfield noted in one article that even if God suffered as Moltmann described, the suffering was not the same as what humans experience.⁵⁸ For God suffered by his own determination, even if external forces carried it out. Humans, on the contrary, suffer randomly and have no choice in the matter. This gives humans more of a sense of being victims. Yet this position appears to be weak. Jesus the Son experienced the fullness of suffering, even if he did so willingly. The sense of abandonment by the Father allowed him to experience suffering as a victim of violence. Also, a key point of the cross event was precisely the element of choice. God, out of deep suffering love, chose to undergo the same pain encountered in his created world.

Two remaining criticisms appear more significant. First, while the theodicy could justify evil on the basis of its ultimate transformation, the sheer magnitude of evil suffered leaves questions open. God's creation of a world with so much evil makes even a transformed earth a questionable idea. Why is there so much pain and evil needing transformation? It is true Moltmann never attempted to fully justify evil by its ultimate perfection. And his concept of nothingness present in the creation process perhaps accounted for the possibility of some evil. Yet the abundance of experienced suffering raises serious questions about the whole project of creation. These questions have not been fully answered in the theodicy to date.

Also, Moltmann may have compromised human freedom by his eschatological panentheism. If all persons and all creation are destined to be in God's kingdom of glory, they lack freedom to choose otherwise.⁵⁹ In defense, the theologian could point to such statements as one made in a sermon: "No one can be forced into freedom. One can only be invited and asked to reconciliation. Thus God asks, not commands us to reconciliation."⁶⁰ He also would argue that while all elements of creation are incorporated into the coming kingdom, they do so freely. Yet the definiteness about the eschatological future and its process of arrival puts real freedom into question. Could humanity actually, in its history,

have ultimately ever rejected God's glorious kingdom? If its history was to be ultimately incorporated into God's Trinitarian history, could things have ever turned out differently?

Moltmann has provided a thoughtful, carefully considered theodicy. While it has never been articulated in detail in any of his writings, it can be sketched out from various works. The theodicy described a loving God freely choosing to limit himself and open a space for creation. In the creative process, a history of humanity and all other creation was begun. In Jesus the Son, God revealed his true nature of suffering love, and by him, He began a process of redeeming all evil. This pointed toward a future time when all the evil would be transcended and humanity, creation, and God would be reconciled in a glorious kingdom of joy and freedom. This will complete the pantheistic history in which the Trinitarian God was actively transforming all elements of history into his own one. While this model does not answer all questions, it does successfully address the issue raised by protest atheism and hurting humanity. It strives to balance present activism with future hope, social engagement with spiritual devotion, and human freedom with divine guidance. In this sense, the theologian's approach to the problem of evil is successful.

NOTES

1. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God: The Doctrine of God*, Margaret Kohl, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1981), p. 47.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
3. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Passion for Life: A Messianic Lifestyle*, M. Douglas Meeks, trans. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 97.
4. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Power of the Powerless*, Margaret Kohl, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1983), p. 142.
5. Douglas M. Meeks, *Origins of the Theology of Hope* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), p. 4.
6. Jürgen Moltmann, *Religion, Revolution, and the Future*, M. Douglas Meeks, trans. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), p. 205.
7. Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: On the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology*, James Leitch, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 75.
8. Warren McWilliams, "The Passion of God and Moltmann's Christology," *Encounter* 40 (Autumn, 1979): 317.
9. Moltmann, *Religion, Revolution, and the Future*, p. 77.
10. Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation: An Ecological Doctrine of Creation*, Margaret Kohl, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1985), p. 15.
11. Richard Bauckham, "Moltmann's Eschatology of the Cross," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977): 304.
12. Meeks, *Origins of the Theology of Hope*, p. 18.
13. Waite Willis, Jr., *Theism, Atheism, and the Doctrine of the Trinity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), p. 4.
14. Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, p. 56.
15. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit: A Contribution to Messianic Ecclesiology*, Margaret Kohl, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), p. 56.
16. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Future of Creation*, Margaret Kohl, trans. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), p. 86.
17. Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, p. 60.
18. Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*, p. 59.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*, p. 109.

21. Moltmann, *Religion, Revolution, and the Future*, p. 35.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
23. Moltmann, *God in Creation*, xii.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
25. Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, p. 56.
26. Moltmann, *God in Creation*, xiii.
27. Jürgen Moltmann, *Man: Christian Anthropology in the Conflicts of the Present*, John Sturdy, trans. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), p. 108.
28. *Ibid.*
29. Jürgen Moltmann, *Hope and Planning*, Margaret Clarkson, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 26.
30. Moltmann, *The Gospel of Liberation*, p. 101.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
32. Warren McWilliams, *The Passion of God* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985), pp. 33-34.
33. McWilliams, "The Passion of God and Moltmann's Christology," p. 317.
34. Jürgen Moltmann, "The Passion of Life," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 4 (February, 1977): 4.
35. Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God: The Cross as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology*, R.A. Wilson and John Bowden, trans. (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), p. 204.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 230.
37. Moltmann, "The Passion of Life," p. 6.
38. Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, p. 204.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 248.
40. *Ibid.*, pp. 128-45.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 249.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 192.
43. *Ibid.*, p. 214.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 191.
45. Moltmann, *The Future of Creation*, p. 103.
46. Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*, pp. 85-98.
47. Moltmann, *The Passion for Life*, pp. 123-26.
48. Moltmann, *The Future of Creation*, p. 77.
49. Moltmann, *God in Creation*, p. 98.
50. Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, p. 258.
51. Moltmann, *The Future of Creation*, p. 95.
52. *Ibid.*
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.*
55. Kenneth Surrin, "The Impassibility of God and the Problem of Evil," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 60 (1978): 114.
56. Moltmann, *The Future of Creation*, p. 73.
57. Warren McWilliams, "Divine Suffering in Contemporary Theology," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 33 (1980): 38.
58. D.C. Atfield, "Can God be Crucified?" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 30 (1977): 48.
59. Surrin, "The Impassibility of God," p. 106.
60. Moltmann, *The Gospel of Liberation*, p. 37.