



## **Divine Lament and the Problem of Systemic Evil: A Participatory Theodicy of Tragic Agency**

**Alma Espartinez**, Associate Professorial Lecturer, De La Salle-College of Saint Benilde, Manila, Philippines; Assistant Professor, Providence College, Providence, RI, USA, [alma.espartinez@benilde.edu.ph](mailto:alma.espartinez@benilde.edu.ph)

---

This article proposes divine lament, God's active grief over creation's vulnerability to systemic evil, a grief intrinsic to divine love's participatory structure, expressing covenant fidelity. Expanding biblical precedents where divine grief expresses covenant faithfulness rather than moral failure, I argue that divine lament emerges through constructive appropriation of participatory ontology, process theology, and evolutionary cosmology. These frameworks converge on a crucial insight: genuine divine-creaturely relationship entails divine grief over creation's wounds. The framework distinguishes covenant grief from moral culpability. God bears relational sorrow over structures that make evil possible without culpability for evil's actualization by free agents. Tested against the Holocaust, colonial slavery, and climate collapse, divine lament proves adequate where classical immunity and contemporary co-suffering falter, offering both ontological coherence and pastoral solidarity. The framework reveals a consistent pattern across systemic failures: participatory structures weaponized (Holocaust), persuasion's intergenerational inadequacy (slavery), and scalar-temporal mismatch (climate). Divine lament materializes through practices—Holocaust remembrance, reparations initiatives, climate liturgies—transforming theodicy from justification into embodied solidarity.

---



## Introduction

When Elie Wiesel witnessed a child's slow death by hanging at Auschwitz, he heard someone ask, "Where is God now?" The answer came: "Here He is; He is hanging here on these gallows." This haunting response captures theodicy's central crisis: not why evil exists but whether God remains present within it, and if present, whether divine presence includes genuine grief. Classical theodicies, such as Augustinian free-will defenses, Leibnizian optimization, and Thomist impassibility, systematically evade this question. They absolve God through ontological remoteness, offering Terrence Tilley's (1991) "theodicies of justification," which prioritize divine innocence over relational engagement. Against systemic evils like genocide, slavery, and ecological collapse, such frameworks prove pastorally inadequate as communities facing historical trauma seek not explanations that protect God's reputation but a theology capable of genuine solidarity.

This study reconceives theodicy through a participatory framework of divine lament: God's active grief over creation's vulnerability to systemic evil. This grief constitutes an ontological necessity of divine-creaturely relationship and a pastoral imperative for traumatized communities. This claim builds upon biblical precedents where divine grief expresses covenant faithfulness rather than moral failure. When God declares after the flood, "I will never again curse the ground because of humankind" (Genesis 8:21), when divine anguish cries through Hosea, "How can I give you up, Ephraim? My heart recoils within me" (Hosea 11:8), and when Christ weeps over Jerusalem's coming destruction (Luke 19:41–44), scripture establishes a pattern: God experiences genuine sorrow over creation's ruptures without compromising divine perfection or moral integrity. Yet biblical theology has insufficiently extended this pattern to address contemporary systemic evils operating through mechanisms biblical authors could not envision, such as industrialized genocide, centuries-long enslavement creating intergenerational trauma, and anthropogenic climate collapse triggering consequences across geological timescales.

This study develops divine lament as a theologically coherent response to systemic evils by integrating three complementary frameworks: David Bentley Hart's participatory ontology, John Cobb's process theology, and John Haught's evolutionary cosmology. Hart locates divine lament in ontological intimacy, showing that divine-creaturely participation (*methexis*) entails grief as the inherent cost of love's entanglement rather than an emotional contingency (Hart 2013, 2004). Cobb's process vision interprets divine power as persuasive rather than coercive, making grief the responsive awareness of love encountering resistance within corrupted systems (Cobb and Griffin 1976; Cobb 2007). Extending this participatory structure to cosmic scale, Haught's evolutionary theology portrays divine solidarity as encompassing the world's long history of suffering and extinction while sustaining eschatological hope (Haught 2007,

2017). Taken together, these perspectives reveal divine grief not as weakness but as the constitutive expression of participatory love, the affective depth of a God who suffers with creation's becoming rather than ruling over it.

Grounding this convergent insight requires a critical distinction between divine covenant grief and moral culpability. God sorrows over having created a universe whose relational structures are vulnerable to exploitation, a vulnerability this study terms systemic evil. Systemic evil arises from interlocking social, economic, and cultural systems rather than from individual transgressions (Jennings 2010; Rüländ, von Lübke, and Baumann 2019). More precisely, systemic evil names the emergent property of interlocking structures; structural sin names the institutional perpetuation of those systems; participatory corruption names the ontological distortion of the relationship itself that makes such systems possible. These distinctions clarify how divine lament addresses evil not only ethically but ontologically. The Holocaust instrumentalized bureaucratic rationality; slavery corrupted economic exchange and theological imagination; and climate collapse distorts atmospheric chemistry and photosynthetic life. Divine lament thus names God's grief over the tragic necessity that authentic relationship entails freedom capable of profound corruption without attributing culpability to the divine for its misuse by free agents. This distinction remains pastorally vital: communities confronting historical trauma seek neither to absolve God of involvement nor indict God as perpetrator but to affirm that God genuinely mourns the very structures that make such evil possible while holding humanity responsible for its actualization.

### **The Participatory God: Why Relationality Necessitates Lament**

The case for divine lament stands on a prior theological commitment: whether God's relationship to creation operates through constitutive participation or external causation. Classical theodicies preserve divine innocence by assuming the latter. God acts upon creation from a transcendent distance, making suffering a problem of permission rather than presence. Within this framework, divine grief becomes theologically optional. Because the relationship operates through efficient causation rather than constitutive participation, God's perfection remains intact whether or not God experiences emotional response to creaturely suffering; the causal work is complete regardless of divine affect. Impassibility doctrines articulate this logic explicitly: St. Anselm's (1979) God remains "compassionate in terms of our experience" yet "not compassionate in terms of [divine] being," preserving perfection through emotional immunity. Contemporary modifications soften this stance—Richard Swinburne's (1998) God experiences "sympathetic pain" without genuine suffering, Stump's (2010) God knows pain "by acquaintance" without vulnerability—but retain the fundamental move: divine transcendence as protection from creation's wounds.

Participatory frameworks reject this subject–object dualism entirely. If divine–creaturely relationship operates through what Hart terms *methexis*, mutual participation where being itself is shared rather than externally bestowed, then God cannot remain ontologically insulated from creation’s ruptures without negating the relationship that constitutes creation’s existence (Hart 2013, 289). If being itself is shared rather than hierarchically distributed, the participatory relationship constitutes both poles. God’s being is not diminished by creation, but God’s relational experience is genuinely affected—otherwise “participation” collapses back into external causation, with participatory language masking classical ontology. Co-creative engagement replaces unilateral control, making God genuinely vulnerable to creaturely responses. Persuasive invitation replaces coercive sovereignty, so that God’s aims depend on creaturely cooperation. Temporal involvement replaces eternal stasis, so that God’s experience is genuinely responsive to evolving contexts, and vulnerable love replaces impassible detachment, so that divine grief becomes constitutive rather than contingent. This is a metaphysical consequence, not an anthropomorphic projection. If creation participates in divine being rather than merely being caused by divine will, then creation’s wounds become wounds within the participatory relationship itself, and God’s grief over those wounds expresses the faithfulness that refuses to withdraw participation even when it proves costly.

The theological necessity becomes clear through contrast. A God who creates through external causation might justifiably remain emotionally detached from creation’s suffering, as an architect remains detached from a building’s earthquake damage when structural integrity was the sole obligation. But this analogy fails for participatory creation: here, God is not the architect but the indwelling life within the structure itself. God cannot withdraw from creation’s wounds without withdrawing the participatory being that sustains creation’s existence. Divine lament thus names not God’s culpability for creating a vulnerable system but God’s covenant faithfulness in refusing to abandon that system even when vulnerability manifests as catastrophic harm. Divine lament thus emerges not as emotional weakness but as relational integrity requiring acknowledgment: the perfect expression of a love that refuses detachment precisely because participation makes creation’s flourishing and creation’s wounds inseparable dimensions of the same relationship. This reconception transforms divine perfection from immunity to vulnerability, from sovereignty to solidarity, from transcendent observation to participatory grief. It is what Jürgen Moltmann (1974) terms “the crucified God” who reveals divinity most fully, not in power unaffected by suffering but in love that bears suffering’s full weight.

While this participatory framework shares kenotic theology’s emphasis on divine solidarity, it moves beyond its primary focus. Kenotic co-suffering, as in Moltmann’s “crucified God,” powerfully answers the question “Where is God in suffering?” with “Here, suffering with us.” This provides essential pastoral comfort.

However, participatory divine lament addresses a further, more structurally oriented question: “How does God respond to the creation of a world where such suffering is possible?” Kenotic theology locates divine vulnerability in the act of creation itself: God’s self-emptying to make space for creaturely freedom. Divine lament extends this insight temporally and structurally: God not only emptied Godself to create a world where suffering is possible but continues to grieve the systemic patterns through which that possibility becomes actualized across history. Where kenosis answers, “God suffers with us in the moment,” divine lament answers, “God mourns the interlocking structures that perpetuate our suffering across generations, and actively labors for their repair.” The implications for theodicy are profound: the question shifts from “Why do we suffer together?” to “How do we answer together?” Divine lament transforms theodicy from a meditation on pain into a summons toward accountability, toward action, toward the collaborative work of mending what has been broken.

Hart’s participatory ontology grounds this necessity metaphysically, revealing divine lament as inherent to *methexis* itself. Cobb’s process theology elaborates it temporally, showing how responsive love entails grief over persuasion’s inadequacy. Haught’s evolutionary cosmology scales it cosmically, extending divine solidarity across deep time. Together, they establish that if God genuinely participates in creation rather than merely observing it, divine lament becomes the necessary expression of co-creative fidelity. If divine participation makes grief necessary, how does scripture witness to this? The next section turns to covenant narratives where divine lament expresses fidelity rather than fault.

### **Biblical Foundations: Covenant Grief as Divine Perfection**

Scripture’s portrayal of divine grief requires careful interpretive framing to distinguish covenant faithfulness from moral culpability. Classical readings treat divine regret passages as anthropomorphic accommodations that are metaphorical concessions to human limitation rather than genuine revelations of divine character. Walter Brueggemann (1997, 269) describes the classical interpretive move in which texts depicting divine emotional responsiveness are dismissed as “primitive” theology requiring philosophical correction. The question is not whether God experiences grief. Scripture unambiguously affirms divine grief. The question is what such grief reveals about divine nature. Does it signal moral failure, emotional volatility, or covenant fidelity? A parent who conceives a child knowing a genetic predisposition to illness bears responsibility for creating conditions where suffering becomes possible, yet does not bear moral culpability for the illness itself if no alternatives existed short of not having children at all. The grief is covenant grief—sorrow over the relationship’s inherent vulnerability—not moral guilt. Similarly, God grieves creation’s structural vulnerability to evil without bearing culpability for evil’s actualization, mourning the tragic necessity that authentic relationship requires a universe where freedom can be profoundly corrupted.

Three biblical passages establish this pattern with escalating intimacy: from regret (Genesis) to anguish (Hosea) to tears (Luke). Genesis 8:21 presents divine regret following the flood: “I will never again curse the ground because of humankind, for the inclination of the human heart is evil from youth.” Terence Fretheim (1984, 78) identifies this as a divine lament over creation’s deep-seated proclivity toward violence, where God’s covenant commitment transforms through grief-driven recalibration. The human heart’s evil remains unchanged, yet divine strategy adapts. The relationship persists through God’s willingness to bear the cost of creaturely freedom. This is covenant grief: mourning structures that make devastation possible while refusing relational withdrawal. Hosea 11:8–9 intensifies this through covenantal anguish: “How can I give you up, Ephraim? . . . My heart recoils within me; my compassion grows warm and tender . . . for I am God and no mortal, the Holy One in your midst.” Brueggemann (1997, 94) describes this passage as the most anguished speech God delivers in the Old Testament, arguing that God’s holiness is expressed here not in aloof judgment but through profound sorrow and a persistent refusal to forsake a betraying people. The rhetorical questions raise the possibility of abandonment yet demonstrate a commitment stronger than justice’s demands. Divine perfection expresses itself through anguish because covenant love makes detachment impossible. Luke 19:41–44 completes the pattern through incarnational tears. Jesus weeps over Jerusalem: “If you, even you, had only recognized . . . the things that make for peace!” Joel B. Green (1997, 686) notes this represents “divine grief over predictable but preventable tragedy,” lament over persuasive engagement proving inadequate against structures blinding people to alternatives. The tears are public and embodied, making divine grief tangible in ways earlier passages could not. The covenantal pattern of divine grief in scripture anticipates the participatory logic articulated by Hart, Cobb, and Haught: fidelity through grief, not detachment through sovereignty.

### **Hart’s Participatory Theology: The Intimacy Imperative**

Classical theodicies treat God as a detached sovereign whose omnipotence remains uncontaminated by creation’s suffering. Hart’s participatory metaphysics dismantles this paradigm through *methexis*, a co-constitutive relation where divine power operates as collaborative love from within creaturely existence. This ontological intimacy generates what I call the intimacy imperative: if God and creation are mutually entangled in being, divine grief becomes inherent to the relationship itself. Lament is not emotional weakness but the grammar of participation—the acknowledgment of relational rupture and the pledge to repair it. To refuse lament would be to deny participatory reality itself.

Hart’s analysis of divine action clarifies this necessity. A master composer allows improvisation, aware that freedom may yield harmony or discord. Their knowledge heightens grief when discord arises—not because they caused it but

because they chose collaboration over control. Likewise, divine omniscience deepens rather than diminishes grief: God's comprehensive awareness makes creation's wounds personally borne, not merely observed. Within *methexis*, divine knowing is participatory intimacy—God knows suffering as the life in which creation shares. Grief thus becomes ontologically unavoidable: divine perfection expressed as love that bears the cost of participation.

This is not a limitation but a divine character. Relationship has ontological priority over isolation; thus, God knowingly embraces participation's grief. Divine lament is therefore not optional but necessary—God grieves suffering not as cause but as covenant partner, manifesting fidelity through active mourning. Lament reveals love's integrity: the perfection of a God who refuses detachment even when love entails vulnerability. This ontological insight prepares the way for Cobb's temporal elaboration: if Hart shows that God must lament, Cobb shows that God will not cease lamenting.

### ***Cobb's Process Theology: Lament as Responsive Grief***

Building on Hart's ontological grounding, Cobb shows how divine grief unfolds through time—lament as responsive, recalibrating love. Cobb describes this as creative—responsive love. God continuously adapts persuasive aims to creaturely decisions, making divine action responsive rather than unilateral. The risk of persuasion: divine invitations may fail to inspire resistance to injustice. A teacher is not responsible for every misuse of knowledge, yet grieves when students reject the curriculum designed to foster critical resistance. Likewise, God is not culpable for every rejection of love, but divine lament arises when lures fail to address entrenched harm structures.

Divine lament names not moral guilt but creative fidelity—God's grief when persuasive invitations fall short of systemic evil's scale and willingness to acknowledge this inadequacy through renewed commitment to recalibrating lures, even amid human resistance. Lament expresses responsive grief rather than resignation. This makes divine grief dynamic and ongoing: God continuously risks vulnerability by offering fresh justice possibilities, yet mourns when those possibilities prove insufficient against the ideological weaponization of creation's participatory structures.

Though Cobb's metaphysics differs from Hart's—persuasion rather than participation, temporality rather than ontology—their logics converge on grief. This convergence reveals grief as neither metaphysical accident nor processual contingency but the necessary expression of divine love, whether understood ontologically or temporally. Hart insists that God cannot *not* lament because intimacy entails mourning; Cobb insists God will not *not* lament because creative love requires grief over lure inadequacy and renewed engagement despite it. Together, they reveal divine lament as both ontologically grounded and processually responsive.

### ***Haught's Evolutionary Theology: Lament as Cosmic Grief***

Haught extends divine lament beyond human history to cosmic scales. While Hart grounds lament in being's rupture and Cobb in becoming's failed persuasion, Haught reveals a third dimension: God's grief encompasses 13.8 billion years of evolutionary creativity and loss, making divine lament as vast as the cosmos itself (Romans 8:22). If God cocreates with all creation, divine grief must scale accordingly.

Haught (2017, 2007) argues divine love operates through "cosmic curriculum," a pedagogical process where suffering emerges as creative advance's tragic cost. Unlike traditional approaches that treat suffering as divine permission or punishment, Haught locates pain within creative becoming's structure. Evolution requires risk, vulnerability, and extinction, not because God lacks power but because genuine novelty demands genuine cosmic freedom. This does not aestheticize suffering as necessary; rather, extinction and loss are genuinely mourned within the participatory framework.

Haught's "cosmic grief" functions as divine lament on the evolutionary scale: God's mourning over co-responsibility for creating a universe whose laws—natural selection's efficiency, predation's trophic necessity, mass extinction's catastrophic randomness—make profound beauty and loss two sides of one coin. These represent not flaws but evolutionary process' inherent tragic tensions, trade-offs between adaptive efficiency and systemic waste, competition driving specialization and cooperation enabling symbiosis. The divine heart breaks for the thylacine's last howl and silent forests where moa roamed, not as a distant observer but a co-sufferer in evolution's tragic theater. This is ontological grief—mourning the tragic structure of a universe where novelty requires vulnerability.

This cosmic grief operates through three essential transformations: from anthropocentric to cosmic scope (extending divine lament beyond human evil to the evolutionary universe's inherent vulnerability); from immediate resolution to eschatological patience (lament commits to future redemption, healing all loss—a theme central to Haught's (2017) theology of evolution that I refer to as "tragic hope"); from moral failure to creative cost (God laments not mistakes but the tragic beauty of creation's risky project).

Haught's "divine adventure" and "kenotic participation"—God's self-emptying into cosmic becoming's uncertainty—expresses participatory love's ultimate form. This generates divine lament operating through "ultimate empathy," God's complete solidarity with evolutionary suffering. The Permian extinction (252 million years ago), which eliminated 96% of marine species yet enabled mammalian diversification, presents a stark participatory dilemma. Haught's God bears grief for both the creative potential unlocked by mass extinction and the genuine, irreversible loss of unique lifeforms.

Haught's evolutionary theology achieves a crucial synthesis: providing the cosmic context (Hart's participatory communion) within which becoming occurs and describing the temporal mode (Cobb's creative–responsive love)

through which divine participation unfolds across deep time. Together, these constitute “evolutionary love,” divine commitment to cosmic creativity, making both creative risk and ontological grief necessary dimensions of God’s nature. This ensures participatory theodicy does not merely address human history but offers a vision of a God whose lament is vast as the cosmos itself, whose grief encompasses every extinct species, whose repair promise stretches to time’s very end.

The eschatological dimension of this framework, the promise of cosmic redemption, must be understood not as the resolution of divine lament but as its ultimate validation. The promise is not that God will one day forget the wounds of history but that they will be eternally healed yet held within the divine life, what Moltmann (1974) describes as God gathering our concrete, lived, and suffered history into his eternal life. This does not negate lament; it makes lament an eternal, meaningful activity rather than a temporary, hopeless one. The “tragic hope” of which Haught (2017) speaks is the trust that even the most horrible suffering will not be wasted but will be taken up into a future of unsurpassable beauty. It is the hope that our present participation in divine lament—through remembrance, reparations, and ecological care—is itself a genuine participation, as Hart (2019) might say, in the divine life and future healing of all things. Eschatology thus provides the stamina for lament, ensuring our finite solidarity is caught up in the infinite scope of God’s faithful, grieving, and repairing love.

The convergent vision of Hart, Cobb, and Haught establishes divine lament as ontologically necessary, temporally responsive, and cosmically comprehensive. Yet, this framework immediately faces a formidable objection: If God creates knowing that participatory structures can be weaponized for catastrophic evil, how does this differ from creating with foreseen harm? Does divine lament, despite its pastoral power, ultimately collapse into divine culpability? Three interlocking arguments clarify why covenant grief expresses tragic necessity rather than moral failure.

### **Resolving the Conceptual Tension: Why Covenant Grief Is Not Divine Culpability**

If God creates knowing participatory structures can be weaponized for catastrophic evil, how does this differ from creating with foreseen harm? Three interlocking arguments clarify why divine lament expresses tragic necessity rather than moral failure.

1. **The relationship priority thesis.** An authentic relationship is not one good among others but the ontological condition for any good at all. The issue is not whether a relationship’s benefits outweigh suffering but that the relationship itself constitutes reality’s fabric. To forgo creation to avoid risk would mean not a safer universe but no universe—no freedom, love, or repair. Even amid suffering, existence remains the precondition

for all meaning. As trauma witnesses like Viktor Frankl and Elie Wiesel attest, life retains value not because pain is justified but because solidarity and resistance still arise within it. A God who refuses relationship to evade grief would choose isolation over communion—what Hart calls ontological poverty. Love that refuses vulnerability is not love but self-protection. Divine lament thus expresses love's integrity: the willingness to bear the relationship's cost.

2. **The structural necessity argument.** Profound evil is not an avoidable accident but a structural consequence of genuine freedom. Authentic love entails the possibility of its rejection; persuasion presupposes the freedom to resist. To remove that risk would collapse freedom into design. God therefore faces a binary: a world of open relationship with tragic potential or a world of mechanistic safety without love. As Cobb and David Ray Griffin (1976, 69) note, the capacity for evil is “inseparable from the conditions of creativity itself.” God's grief acknowledges this tragic grammar without moral guilt.
3. **The conditions–causation distinction.** God bears responsibility for the conditions that make evil possible, not for its actualization. Parents who conceive a child knowing the risk of illness accept the possibility of suffering without moral culpability for the illness itself. Likewise, God grieves a world where authentic freedom allows catastrophic misuse but remains innocent of the acts themselves.

This grief—covenant grief—is sorrow over love's vulnerability, not remorse for moral error. Together, these three claims form a coherent response to divine culpability. Relationship priority explains why creation's risk is justified; structural necessity shows that alternative designs would nullify love; conditions–causation preserves divine innocence while grounding divine grief. God bears structural responsibility for creating a relational world where freedom can wound yet remains morally innocent because no alternative creation could sustain genuine love without the tragic possibility.

Yet, a deeper objection remains. Even granting this distinction between structural responsibility and moral culpability, if God possesses complete foreknowledge that creating through *methexis* will result in Auschwitz and creates anyway, how is this not complicity? This challenge requires examining the concept of tragic agency—situations where all available options produce genuine harm, making moral innocence structurally impossible.

### ***The Tragic Agency Response: Why No Alternative Creation Preserves Authentic Relationship***

The distinction between covenant grief and moral culpability faces a formidable objection: If God creates participatory structures while foreknowing their catastrophic misuse, how does divine grief avoid collapsing into complicity?

This challenge is best met by introducing the concept of tragic agency—situations where all available options produce genuine harm, making moral innocence structurally impossible.

Consider a triage physician in a mass-casualty event. They bear a sobering responsibility for the outcomes of their choices, yet we do not assign them moral culpability for the deaths of those they cannot treat. Culpability requires the availability of a viable alternative that avoids the harm. When no such alternative exists, responsibility and guilt diverge. This mirrors a key insight from protest and praxis-oriented theodicies, which argue that in the face of systemic evil, the demand is not for a theoretical justification but a participatory response (Surin 2004). The physician acts within this tragic frame, making difficult choices not to justify suffering but to alleviate it through available, albeit limited, means.

God faces an analogous, cosmic-scale tragic agency. The objection presupposes that God could have created beings with genuine freedom but constitutionally incapable of systematic genocide. This, however, misunderstands the nature of freedom and personhood. As John Hick's (1966) soul-making theodicy argues, a world capable of fostering genuine moral and spiritual growth cannot be one surgically immunized against the possibility of profound evil. Systemic evil like the Holocaust is not the result of a removable "genocide switch." It emerges from the hyper-application of the very capacities that define meaningful personhood: the abstract reasoning needed for science, the linguistic sophistication required for art, the technological skill that builds hospitals, and the social cooperation that forms communities. To create beings incapable of such evil would require creating beings incapable of the profound love, creativity, and justice that constitute the highest goods of existence. This reflects what process theologians describe as an inherent metaphysical constraint: God's power, being inherently persuasive rather than coercive, works with a created order characterized by freedom and relationality, making such constraints inevitable (Cobb and Griffin 1976, 53). God's choice is thus a tragic binary: create persons with the profound vulnerability that freedom entails or create no persons at all.

Might there be a middle path? Could God have created a world without tragic vulnerability while preserving genuine relationships? Three imagined alternatives reveal why such compromises prove illusory:

1. **Freedom with built-in constraints.** A creation where agents cannot conceive or enact profound evil would make moral choice illusory. Freedom constrained by design collapses into determinism disguised as virtue. As Cobb notes, persuasive power presupposes "the ability to reject divine aims"; without that capacity, response becomes mechanism (Cobb and Griffin 1976, 53). Authentic love requires genuine risk. A being programmed to always choose the good is not a moral agent but an automaton, incapable of the meaningful relationship that justifies creation in the first place.

2. **Participatory structures immune to corruption.** If God made bureaucracy, language, or economy impervious to distortion, communion itself would be impossible. The very traits enabling cooperation—efficiency, abstraction, scalability—are the same that make systemic evil feasible. Consider language: the symbolic abstraction that enables poetry and prayer also enables propaganda and deception. To remove language's capacity for lies would require removing its capacity for metaphor, irony, and imaginative truth-telling—the very features that make meaningful communication possible. Bureaucracy that coordinates disaster relief can also coordinate genocide; economic systems that distribute resources can also concentrate exploitation. To remove the possibility of perversion would destroy the possibility of a relationship.
3. **Immediate consequences for evil.** A universe where moral cause and effect are instant would require constant miraculous correction or rigid determinism, erasing the temporal stability that allows freedom, culture, and evolution. As Haught (2017, 78) notes, creation's patient unfolding depends on consistent natural law and open process. A world where every hateful thought immediately produces suffering for the thinker, or every act of violence immediately rebounds upon the perpetrator, would be a world without genuine temporal agency—without the space for repentance, growth, or collaborative repair.

Each alternative nullifies the very conditions of authentic relationship: freedom, participation, and temporal continuity. God therefore faces not a choice between safe and risky relationships but between a relationship with tragic vulnerability and no relationship at all.

Divine foreknowledge intensifies this tragic dilemma rather than constituting complicity. The choice is not between enabling or not enabling certain creatures within a world but between grounding a world of free creatures or no world at all. Foreknowledge reveals the full, horrifying cost of the only viable option for creating beings capable of love. A God who refused creation to avoid this cost would be choosing isolation over communion, what Hart (2013, 289) identifies as a state of “ontological poverty,” a refusal of the creative generosity that is inherent to divine nature. The objection therefore rests on a questionable premise: that detachment preserves greater moral excellence than costly engagement. But as the work of Marilyn McCord Adams (2000) on horrendous evils suggests, divine perfection is demonstrated not by remaining invulnerable but by being so powerful as to be able to defeat and integrate even the worst suffering through solidarity and redemption.

Divine lament reveals that love's ultimate perfection is expressed not through self-protective isolation but through bearing the full cost of relationship. The

question thus shifts from “Could God avoid responsibility?” to “Would a God who avoids responsibility by refusing creation express greater perfection than a God who bears it through eternal, costly solidarity?”

The framework of divine lament, grounded in this synthesis of participatory metaphysics, process thought, and a theology of solidarity, argues powerfully for the latter. Yet, this raises a further question specific to Cobb’s process framework: If persuasive love works through creaturely structures, and those structures proved catastrophically inadequate during the Holocaust, does this reveal not a tragic necessity but a strategic failure—a divine miscalibration of persuasive aims?

### ***Why Persuasive Inadequacy Reflects Structural Limits, Not Divine Failure***

If God’s persuasive love failed to prevent Holocaust-scale evil, does this imply divine miscalibration? Only if persuasion functions independently of the structures through which it operates. In fact, its efficacy depends entirely on those structures’ integrity.

Persuasive love can become “irresistible” only by turning coercive—negating freedom—or by working through intact channels of reason, empathy, and language. When those channels are corrupted, persuasion must either act through distortion or override it. Nazi ideology, for example, systematically destroyed the very capacities—moral imagination, compassion, communal truth—divine persuasion addresses. The limitation then lies not in divine effort but in the medium itself.

Cobb (2007, 98) states this clearly: “Persuasive power operates through structures created beings inhabit; when those structures are corrupted, persuasion must work through corruption or cease to be persuasion.” The persistence of moral heroism—the Righteous Among the Nations—shows that divine lures remained active though tragically obstructed.

Divine grief therefore names God’s sorrow over this structural bind: love’s fidelity to freedom encounters contexts where persuasion cannot succeed without ceasing to be love. This is lament over ontology not over performance—an acknowledgment of tragic necessity not divine failure.

### **Testing Participatory Lament: Paradigmatic Cases of Systemic Evil**

The framework is tested against paradigmatic cases where creation’s very structures are weaponized for evil, each revealing distinct dimensions of divine lament.

#### ***The Holocaust: Weaponization of Participatory Structures***

The Holocaust presents the most acute case of participatory weaponization, the systematic perversion of the very structures that make human community possible. The bureaucratic apparatus enabling mass murder, technological

innovations making it efficient, and linguistic frameworks making it thinkable all represent participatory structures turned against their intended purpose (Rüland, von Lübke, and Baumann 2019). As Hart's *methexis* makes clear, participation itself entails vulnerability; the very structures enabling communion can be weaponized for destruction. Divine presence permeated the camps as the ground of being, making relationality possible, meaning God grieves creation's vulnerability to such weaponization through creating a universe where love requires freedom. As Wiesel's account illustrates, the question shifts from God's location to God's grief over maintaining a world where such horror emerges from corrupted participatory structures. This is divine lament: not guilt over causing the Holocaust but grief over creation's tragic structure wherein participatory gifts could be so thoroughly perverted.

Cobb's process framework illuminates why divine lament becomes necessary through asymmetrical persuasion. While divine lures toward compassion and resistance were present—evidenced in the Righteous Among the Nations—they proved systematically inadequate against an ideological apparatus designed to corrupt moral perception (Cobb and Griffin 1976). Divine lament acknowledges not divine lures' absence but their tragic inadequacy against systematic corruption. This is honest grief: God mourns persuasive engagement's failure to inspire sufficient resistance, and this grief drives renewed commitment to more adequate engagement (Cobb 2007). The lament energizes rather than paralyzes, refusing to accept such failure as inevitable.

Haught's (2017) evolutionary perspective extends this lament to cosmic scales. The Holocaust represents not merely human moral failure but rupture in creation's evolutionary trajectory—the irreversible termination of Jewish intellectual, cultural, and religious developments that were irreplaceable threads in creation's unfolding complexity. God's evolutionary grief encompasses both individual suffering and this permanent alteration of civilizational possibilities: mourning six million deaths, plus silencing of future generations, the destruction of Yiddish culture, and intellectual traditions never recovered.

The framework's pastoral adequacy emerges through refusing explanatory comfort. Divine lament provides solidarity rather than answers—God's commitment to bear the relationship's full burden rather than remaining aloof (Rambo 2018). This transforms theodicy from defensive justification into collaborative mourning, embodied in practices like Yom HaShoah, where lament becomes the language of divine-human partnership in memory and resistance. Communities enter God's eternal grief over the Holocaust, making their remembrance participation in divine mourning, refusing forgetfulness, and driving commitment to “never again.”

### **Why Holocaust Remembrance Requires Divine Lament**

Why do communities return annually to trauma rather than moving toward resolution? Yom HaShoah exposes a theological gap that divine lament uniquely fills. Kenotic co-suffering explains God's presence within the camps but struggles to ground the practice's perpetual character. If remembrance merely acknowledges shared pain, why resist therapeutic closure?

Divine lament reveals the practice as sacramental rather than memorial: communities enter God's ongoing grief over *methexis* weaponized, not a phase God completes but an eternal dimension of divine relationship to creation whose, participatory structures have proven vulnerable to such corruption (Hart 2013). Human remembrance joins divine remembrance, making finite mourning genuine participation in infinite grief rather than a psychological choice.

The prophetic "never again" dimension requires Cobb's responsive grief specifically. God mourns not only that the Holocaust occurred but that divine lures proved inadequate against systematic corruption, and this honest grief over persuasion's insufficiency drives renewed engagement toward more adequate resistance (Cobb 2007). When communities practice Holocaust remembrance grounded in divine lament, they participate not merely in mourning past evil but in discerning renewed divine lures toward structural transformation—reparations, educational initiatives, genocide prevention. The practice becomes simultaneously backward-looking (refusing to forget) and forward-oriented (discerning fresh divine engagement), a temporal structure that kenotic co-suffering alone cannot generate. Without God's ongoing grief over participatory structures' weaponization, annual return to trauma lacks ontological warrant; it becomes duty rather than participation.

### **Addressing the Persistence Challenge**

A potential objection: Does this framework replace the "problem of evil" with a "problem of divine lament?" If God genuinely grieves, why does systemic evil persist and effective collaboration remain elusive?

The answer rejects transactional views of lament. Divine lament is not a magic ending suffering but a covenantal stance enabling collaborative repair. Following Hart's participatory logic, it represents God's eternal commitment to sustained solidarity within genuine relationship's constraints. Cobb's "lures for creativity" require creaturely response and cannot bypass human freedom without negating the relationship itself. Haught's "eschatological patience" reveals that cosmic healing operates within evolutionary becoming's nonlinear timelines.

Divine lament's efficacy is measured not in suffering's immediate cessation but in the genuine transformation of divine-creaturely relationship toward collaborative healing—a process respecting both creaturely freedom and a participatory universe's structural constraints. Lament is energizing grief,

refusing detachment, and driving persistent engagement, not passive sadness, accepting evil as inevitable.

This revised understanding strengthens the argument by making it less dependent on controversial metaphysical claims. Rather than requiring readers to accept participatory ontology, process temporality, and evolutionary kenosis, the framework asks only whether their combined insights—ontological intimacy, processual grief, cosmic scope—together support divine lament as participatory love's necessary expression. The resulting position is more modest but potentially more persuasive: divine lament emerges as a constructive theological proposal rather than a metaphysical necessity, supported by convergent insights from distinct traditions rather than their systematic unity.

### **Colonial Slavery: The Temporality of Intergenerational Trauma**

If the Holocaust exemplifies concentrated rupture, colonial slavery imposes a theological challenge of extended temporality and intergenerational trauma. This evil operated across centuries, and its legacy persists through systemic racism, wealth inequality, and cultural erasure. Divine lament here addresses not a single catastrophic event but a persistent structural harm where evil's consequences unfold long after formal abolition, demanding a grief that is itself extended across generations.

Cobb's logic of persuasive inadequacy explains divine grief over persistent injustice. His process framework becomes primary because God's responsive, temporally engaged love mourns the repeated failure of persuasion against slavery's enduring legacy. Divine lures toward reparative justice, from Reconstruction-era civil rights movements to contemporary reparations initiatives, persistently encounter ideological resistance rooted in the same participatory structures slavery corrupted: economic systems valuing extraction over dignity, legal frameworks prioritizing property over personhood, and theological traditions weaponizing scripture to justify hierarchy. Divine grief encompasses not only the Middle Passage's horrors but the foreclosed futures of descendants—physicians, philosophers, artists, and leaders who never emerged because structural racism systematically limited possibilities across generations.

Process theology reveals the divine response to slavery as creative-responsive love operating across intergenerational time (Cobb and Griffin 1976). God continuously adapts persuasive aims to evolving circumstances, yet each iteration encounters renewed resistance as underlying structures persist. Divine lament names God's willingness to acknowledge this ongoing inadequacy through renewed commitment to recalibrating lures, even when human agents remain resistant across generations. The lament expresses responsive grief—mourning driving fresh engagement rather than resignation.

Hart's (2013) participatory ontology reveals how slavery corrupted participatory structures' transmission. Family systems, educational institutions,

and economic networks enabling flourishing were systematically prevented from forming or destroyed when they emerged. Divine grief encompasses not just suffering inflicted but the corruption of mechanisms through which communities participate in being, create meaning, and transmit wisdom across generations.

Haught's (2007) evolutionary theology extends this to civilizational trajectories: African philosophical traditions, technological innovations, and agricultural knowledge systems violently interrupted. Divine cosmic grief encompasses not just individual suffering but the permanent alteration of humanity's developmental possibilities—paths not taken, innovations never realized, philosophical insights prevented from emerging.

While Cobb's framework illuminates the temporal failure of persuasion, Hart's ontology reveals the depth of the corruption—the *imago Dei* itself was negated within these participatory structures. Simultaneously, Haught's cosmic lens measures the scale of the loss—the civilizational trajectories and cultural wisdom permanently foreclosed, an evolutionary wound in humanity's collective becoming.

The distinctive claim: divine lament must be understood as temporally extended across generations, demanding practices mirroring this extension. Reparations become an ongoing commitment rather than a one-time settlement, mirroring God's persistent engagement across time. Annual commemorations like Juneteenth participate in God's refusal to let such wounds become normalized history, returning cyclically to trauma not as therapeutic failure but as theological fidelity.

### **Why Reparations Require Divine Lament**

Reparations for slavery expose a temporal problem: Why should repair be ongoing rather than settled? Classical theodicy reduces reparations to transactional justice—calculate damages, provide compensation, declare resolution. Guilt-based models generate defensiveness (“I didn't own slaves”) and paradoxically inhibit repair by reframing it as a quest for moral absolution rather than material redress. Both frameworks struggle with multigenerational commitment because they seek closure.

Divine lament transforms the foundation through Cobb's (2007) process framework: reparations participate in God's ongoing responsive grief over persuasion's continued inadequacy against slavery's structural legacy. Divine lament over slavery is not past tense (mourning what happened) but present tense (mourning that structures perpetuating harm remain active). This generates crucial practical distinctions. Reparations as guilt penance seek closure: adequate payment releases obligation. Reparations as participation in divine lament remain perpetually incomplete, mirroring God's refusal to treat slavery as resolved while structural racism persists.

The practice becomes energized by collaborative recalibration—discerning how divine lures toward justice must adapt as previous efforts prove inadequate. Communities ask not “Have we paid enough?” but “What does renewed divine engagement toward repair require in our specific context?” This is forward oriented rather than backward accounting, aligned with God’s persistent work rather than settling historical debt.

Hart’s participatory ontology clarifies the depth of this wound. Slavery did not merely exploit labor; it corrupted the mechanisms through which participation itself is transmitted—family formation, education, cultural memory, and moral imagination (Hart 2013). Repairing corruption at *methexis* level cannot be transactional; rebuilding such structures requires timescales exceeding individual lifespans, making reparations inherently multigenerational. The distinctively participatory element: reparations become sacramental expressions where finite human repair acts align with infinite divine commitment to healing, making repair efforts genuine collaborations with divine persistence rather than human initiatives seeking divine approval.

### Climate Collapse: Scalar Mismatch and Evolutionary Foreclosure

Climate collapse introduces a radical scalar mismatch, compressing the causes of evil into a human lifetime while triggering consequences across geological deep time. This inversion of slavery’s timeline reveals a distinctive dimension of divine lament: God’s grief over the irreversible foreclosure of evolutionary possibilities. The challenge is not just the corruption of human systems but the weaponization of creation’s most basic ecological grammar.

Haught’s cosmic patience reframes ecological despair into eschatological hope. His evolutionary framework addresses divine participation across temporal scales exceeding human comprehension (Haught 2017). Divine lures in 1850 necessarily operated through available frameworks—transcendentalist philosophy, early conservation, and Indigenous land ethics. Divine foreknowledge does not grant the ability to bypass temporal structures of created existence: gradual scientific development, evolutionary cultural change, and the historical emergence of global communication. God’s refusal to bypass these temporal processes is not limitation but participatory fidelity. To override these temporal constraints would negate the very relationship that makes love possible; coercion destroys the conditions for genuine response. Yet, this generates a tragic temporal structure. Divine lures for sustainability have been present throughout industrialization, evidenced in ecological movements and traditional wisdom. These have proven inadequate against exponentially accelerating extraction. By the time scientific consensus emerged, feedback loops were activating. The gap between human decision-making timescales (electoral cycles, quarterly profits) and climate system response (decades to centuries) means even optimal present persuasion arrives too late to prevent massive locked-in harm.

Divine lament thus operates at three temporal scales simultaneously: historical (grieving persuasion's inadequacy across industrial development), present (acknowledging that even optimal current engagement cannot prevent catastrophic consequences already locked into Earth systems), and evolutionary (grieving irreversible foreclosure of possibilities). Haught's (2007) unique contribution: coral reefs developed through 240 million years of symbiotic evolution bleach within decades; rainforest ecosystems representing billions of years of specialization face destruction in logging seasons; species are driven extinct before science catalogs them.

Cobb's process theology illuminates why persuasive power proves structurally inadequate against systems designed to externalize harm across time and space. Divine lures encounter structural temporal disconnection, such as decision-makers insulated from consequences by decades or geography, or economic systems discounting future harm through mechanisms that make distant catastrophe economically invisible (Cobb 2007).

Hart's (2013) participatory ontology reveals how climate collapse weaponizes creation's most fundamental structures: atmospheric chemistry, ocean circulation, photosynthesis itself. Where the Holocaust corrupted human relational structures and slavery corrupted cultural transmission, climate collapse corrupts creation's basic ecological grammar, the participatory infrastructure making all complex life possible.

### ***Why Climate Liturgies Require Divine Lament***

Climate lament liturgies confront a scalar problem: sustaining commitment to restoration projects exceeding individual lifespans. Classical frameworks make climate action either duty-based (obligation without relational grounding) or consequence-based (avoiding divine punishment), neither of which sustains intergenerational commitment. Guilt-based environmentalism generates paralysis: overwhelming guilt produces either denial or despair when the problem proves too vast for resolution.

Divine lament transforms climate liturgies into participation in God's cosmic grief rather than expressions of human guilt. Haught's (2017) evolutionary framework reveals these liturgies as entries into God's own mourning over evolutionary possibilities foreclosed—coral reefs developed through 240 million years now bleaching, rainforest ecosystems representing billions of years of specialization facing destruction. When communities practice climate lament grounded in divine grief, they mourn with God rather than seeking forgiveness from God. This distinction proves practically essential: participants engage in sustained action not to alleviate guilt (which the problem's scale makes impossible) but to align finite human efforts with infinite divine commitment to healing.

The temporal structure matters distinctively. Climate lament grounded in divine grief establishes that full restoration exceeds any present achievement—Haught’s (2017) “eschatological patience” means redemption operates across evolutionary timescales. This prevents both premature closure (“We’ve done enough”) and hopeless paralysis (“Nothing we do matters”). Practices like planting forests for future species or protecting ecosystems for beings humans will never encounter make theological sense specifically because they participate in God’s cosmic patience, aligning human action with divine grief across geological timescales.

Hart’s (2013) participatory ontology reveals why such practices prove ontologically grounded. Climate collapse weaponizes creation’s most fundamental participatory structures—atmospheric chemistry, photosynthesis, ocean circulation. Restoration efforts address not merely environmental damage but corruption of ecological *methexis* itself. Climate liturgies grounded in divine lament become sacramental: finite human restoration acts participate in infinite divine work toward healing creation’s basic grammar.

Without God’s own evolutionary lament over possibilities foreclosed, intergenerational ecological commitment lacks ontological warrant; it becomes either optimistic humanism (which empirical reality undermines) or dutiful stewardship (which temporal scales exhaust). Divine lament provides what neither offers: participation in grief vast as the cosmos itself, energizing action within acknowledged incompleteness.

## Conclusion

This study argues that divine lament—God’s active grief over creation’s vulnerability to systemic evil, refusal of detachment from its wounds, and commitment to collaborative repair—constitutes the most coherent and pastorally adequate response to historical trauma. Unlike theodicies preserving divine immunity through emotional distance, this participatory framework discloses grief as inherent to God’s entanglement with creation. Through constructive synthesis of Hart’s participatory ontology, Cobb’s process theology, and Haught’s evolutionary cosmology, divine lament emerges as both ontologically necessary, arising from participatory love’s structure itself, and pastorally imperative for communities seeking solidarity rather than explanation.

Expanding biblical patterns of divine regret and covenantal anguish into a systematic account of participatory grief, this approach demonstrates its adequacy when tested against paradigmatic ruptures—the Holocaust, colonial slavery, climate collapse—where participatory structures themselves become weaponized. In each case, divine lament reframes theodicy from a quest for justification into a practice of collaborative mourning, covenantal solidarity, and eschatological hope. The framework maintains a crucial distinction: humans bear causal responsibility for evil acts; God bears

covenantal grief over conditions making such evil possible and the tragic inadequacy of persuasive engagement against systematic corruption. This is not divine guilt but divine faithfulness, the refusal to remain emotionally detached when a relationship requires presence.

Beyond conceptual claims, this framework grounds theology in embodied praxis: communal lament joining divine grief, reparative justice responding to divine mourning, and ecological repentance aligning human action with God's persistent work toward healing. Such practices do not erase the temporal gap between cosmic grief and immediate suffering but transform how communities inhabit that gap—no longer as evidence of divine absence or indifference but as a space where finite creatures participate in infinite love's patient, energizing work of healing. The framework developed here recasts theodicy, moving it beyond the need for justification and into the realm of covenantal solidarity and collaborative repair.

This framework reconceives divine perfection from immunity to vulnerable fidelity, from sovereignty to solidarity, from transcendent observation to participatory grief. It establishes lament not as theological innovation but as recovery—rediscovery of the biblical God who weeps with Rachel, who cries “How can I give you up?”, who stands weeping before Jerusalem. A God whose grief transforms omnipotence into omni-compassion, whose sovereignty expresses itself through solidarity, making collaborative repair possible.

Three research trajectories emerge. First, interfaith extension: How does divine lament dialogue with Buddhist compassion's nontheistic framework or Jewish protest theology's confrontational stance? Second, trauma theology application: How might divine lament inform pastoral care in contexts of ongoing violence where neither resolution nor escape proves possible? Third, ecological ethics reconfiguration: How does framing environmental action as participation in cosmic grief rather than guilt-driven duty transform motivation and sustainability? Each trajectory would test whether divine lament's pastoral adequacy extends beyond the paradigmatic cases examined here, potentially revealing additional dimensions of participatory grief this study has not yet explored.

---

## References

- Adams, Marilyn McCord. 2000. *Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Brueggemann, Walter. 1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Cobb, John B. 2007. *Sustainability: Economics, Ecology, and Justice*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Cobb, John B., and David Ray Griffin. 1976. *Process Theology: An Introductory Exposition*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Fretheim, Terence. 1984. *The Suffering of God: An Old Testament Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Green, Joel B. 1997. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapid, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Hart, David Bentley. 2004. *The Beauty of the Infinite: The Aesthetics of Christian Truth*. Grand Rapid, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- . 2013. *The Experience of God: Being, Consciousness, Bliss*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hart, David Bentley. 2019. *That All Shall Be Saved: Heaven, Hell, and Universal Salvation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Haight, John. 2007. *God after Darwin: A Theology of Evolution*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- . 2017. *The New Cosmic Story*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hick, John. 1966. *Evil and the God of Love*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jennings, Willie James. 2010. *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. 1974. "The Crucified God." *Theology Today* 31 (1): 6–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004057367403100102>.
- Rambo, Shelly. 2018. *Resurrecting Wounds: Living in the Afterlife of Trauma*. Paperback edition. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Rüland, Jürgen, Christian von Lübke, and Marcel Baumann. 2019. *Religious Actors and Conflict Transformation in Southeast Asia: Indonesia and the Philippines*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429262364>.
- St. Anselm. 1979. *Proslogion* |. Translated by Charlesworth. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Stump, Eleonore. 2010. *Wandering in Darkness: Narrative and the Problem of Suffering*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Surin, Kenneth. 2004. *Theology and the Problem of Evil*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Swinburne, Richard. 1998. *Providence and the Problem of Evil*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tilley, Terrence W. 1991. *The Evils of Theodicy*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

