

Reflections on the Wrath of God

Marvin Moore

Paul's comments in Romans 1:18-32 provide us with significant insight into God's wrath. This issue has become somewhat controversial within the Adventist church in recent years.

The Bible speaks repeatedly of God's wrath. Psalm 2:5 says, for example, that God rebukes the kings of the earth in His anger "and terrifies them in his *wrath*." God said to Jeremiah, "Take from my hand this cup filled with the wine of my *wrath* and make all the nations to whom I send you drink it" (Jeremiah 25:15). Revelation echoes the same theme in the New Testament. In the most vivid description of God's wrath anywhere in the Bible, it says that those who accept the mark of the beast will "drink of the wine of the *wrath* of God, which is mixed in full strength in the cup of his anger" (Revelation 14:10, NASB). And Paul spoke several times about God's wrath in both Romans 1 and 2:

- "The *wrath* of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness" (Romans 1:18).
- "Because of your stubbornness and your unrepentant heart, you are storing up *wrath* against yourself for the day of God's *wrath*, when his righteous judgment will be revealed" (Romans 2:5).
- "For those who are self-seeking and who reject the truth and follow evil, there will be *wrath* and anger" (Romans 2:8).

The Bible clearly speaks of God's wrath, including what Paul said in Romans. So what's the Adventist debate all about? Why is anyone questioning what the Bible seems to teach so clearly?

Active, Passive, and No Wrath

The issue is whether God's wrath is active or passive—or whether He has no wrath at all. Each alternative has its proponents. So let's examine them.

Active Wrath. The "active wrath" model proposes that God has intervened personally, intentionally, and in some cases forcefully (violently) to put down

MOORE: REFLECTIONS ON THE WRATH OF GOD

evil in the past and that He will do so even more forcefully in the future. The purpose of His active exercise of wrath is either to punish evil people for their sins or to deliver His own people from their grasp, and often both purposes merge into one. An obvious example of God's active wrath in the past is His destruction of the sinful world at the time of the Flood. Another is His destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah with fire and brimstone. A third example is His deliverance of Israel from Egyptian slavery with hail and fire and storm and the slaying of the first born of Egyptian animals and people. The destruction of Pharaoh's army in the Red Sea was also active wrath.

The Bible also predicts that at least twice in the future God will intervene actively to punish evil and deliver His people. Most Christians are familiar with Revelation's description of fire coming down from heaven and devouring the wicked in the lake of fire at the end of the millennium (Revelation 20:9). God will also intervene forcefully in human history at the beginning of the millennium with the second coming of Christ. Revelation 6:12-17 and 16:17-21 picture God destroying the earth with a violent, global earthquake at Christ's second coming, and chapter 19:11-24 shows Christ engaging the world's armies in a violent war that concludes with the destruction of the forces of evil.

Paul spoke of this active form of God's wrath in Roman 2. In verse 5 he said, "Because of your stubbornness and your unrepentant heart, you are storing up wrath against yourself for *the day of God's wrath*" (verse 5). "The day of God's wrath" is clearly a reference to the second coming of Christ, and Paul said that unrepentant Jews were preparing themselves to experience that wrath. He said essentially the same thing in verse 8: "For those who are self-seeking and who reject the truth and follow evil, there will be wrath and anger." Again, the words "there will be wrath and anger" are in the future tense, suggesting that the wrath and anger will be manifested at Christ's second coming.

Passive Wrath. The active model of God's wrath has prevailed exclusively within the Adventist church throughout most of our history. However, the passive wrath model gained a small but resolute following during the last three decades of the twentieth century. This model proposes that God's wrath is primarily exercised by His abandonment of evil and evil people to the natural outworking of their choices. And here is where Romans 1 is particularly relevant. In chapter 1 Paul said that "the wrath of God is being revealed from heaven against all the godlessness and wickedness of men who suppress the truth by their wickedness" (verse 18). This verse could be interpreted to support the active wrath model. However, Paul wrote in the present tense—"the wrath of God *is being revealed*"—and there's scant evidence of God's active intervention in the lives of evil people at that time in history. Furthermore, several other statements Paul made in chapter 1 suggest that the passive wrath model is what he had in mind:

- "Therefore God *gave them over* [the pagan sinners] in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another" (verse 24).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

- “Because of this, *God gave them over* to shameful lusts,” and they “*received in themselves* the due penalty for their perversion” (verse 26).
- “[*God*] gave them over to a depraved mind, to do what ought not to be done” (verse 28).
- “Men committed indecent acts with other men, and *received in themselves* the due penalty for their perversion (verse 27).

These verses support the passive wrath model, because they state that God simply *gives sinful people over* to the natural outworking of their sins, letting nature take its course. They “receive in themselves the due penalty for their perversion.”

There is a third possibility: The “no wrath” concept. This is actually a common theme of those who propose the passive wrath model. They often argue the passive wrath model in no wrath terms, claiming that anger is contrary to God’s character of love. We’ll discuss this argument momentarily. For now, we need to ask, Is God’s wrath active or passive?

Active or Passive? Provided we exclude “no wrath” from the passive wrath model, I believe God’s wrath is both active and passive. Romans 1 makes it clear that God’s wrath is passive at times. In fact, the proponents of the passive wrath model are close to being correct when they suggest that this is the exclusive way God expresses His wrath. The incidents of His active intervention to put down evil with force in the history of our world are few and far between. And there’s a reason why. Throughout nearly all of history we humans have lived in probationary time. During this time God has for the most part allowed evil to run its course as a demonstration to the universe of what evil is really like.

However, I believe it’s a mistake to make the passive model the complete explanation of God’s wrath. There’s too much biblical evidence that God has intervened actively to put down evil in the past and that He will do so again in the future.

Anger, Force, and God’s Love

Several years ago we received a letter at *Signs of the Times*[®] that illustrates the objection many proponents of the passive and no wrath models have to the idea that God’s wrath can also be active. This letter was in response to an article about Armageddon that appeared in the November 1999 issue of the magazine:

I believe the view presented pictures God as arbitrary, vengeful, and severe, using His power to put down evil—the very characteristics that Satan attributes to God but that are actually characteristics of Satan himself. I do not believe that in the end God will finally resort to force to put down evil.

MOORE: REFLECTIONS ON THE WRATH OF GOD

This letter raises a very significant question: How does the idea of God's wrath—especially the concept of his active wrath—square with the primary attribute of God's character, which is love?

The Relationship of Love to Evil. We can safely begin by saying that any teaching about God's ultimate dealing with sin and sinners must be consistent with His love. The problem for us humans is how to bring together everything we know about God without creating unacceptable contradictions. How should love respond to evil? Does love always sit back and wait for evil to resolve itself by itself, or does love at times intervene actively to prevent evil from carrying out its harmful designs? I propose that active intervention may be the most loving thing that a loving being, divine or human, can do. Several years ago I heard a couple of stories that illustrate the point well.

The first story is about a family in which the father sexually abuses his daughter. One day he goes into the girl's bedroom, and a few minutes later the mother hears the daughter crying out, "No, Daddy, No! Please, Daddy, stop!" So the mother goes to an adjoining room, kneels down, and prays for God to intervene.

In the second story, the teenage daughter of a black sharecropper gets pregnant, but she hesitates to tell her parents, because she fears that her father will kill her. Finally, however, it becomes impossible to hide the evidence, so before her father guesses the problem, she approaches him on the front porch of their cabin. When he learns that she's going to have a baby, he attacks her violently. In the midst of her screams, the front door to the cabin bursts open. The girl's mother leaps out, points a rifle at her husband, and shouts, "You strike my daughter one more time and you're a dead man!"

The question is, which mother showed the most love for her daughter—the one who prayed passively or the one who intervened actively? I think the answer is obvious. In the face of severe abuse, active intervention is the most loving thing that a loving being can do. Not to do so would be unloving.

Is Anger Bad? Those who favor the no-wrath concept argue that God doesn't get angry. That's what the correspondent who wrote to *Signs of the Times*® apparently believed. He said that the active wrath model "pictures God as arbitrary, vengeful, and severe." However, I believe this view involves a fundamental misunderstanding of anger, namely, that it's always bad. Unfortunately, many Christians have grown up with the idea that anger is bad. I can recall as a child being told that anger was bad, but "righteous indignation" was OK. Nobody ever defined righteous indignation, but plain old anger was always bad. And the proponents of the passive model of God's wrath argue that, just as hot is the opposite of cold and light is the opposite of dark, so love is the opposite of anger and therefore anger is sinful, which is why a loving God will never get angry.

But let me ask you a question. What feeling would you experience if you saw a mother beating her five-year-old child on his bare back with a piece of

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

garden hose? Name the feeling you'd have if you saw a father hold the lighted end of a cigarette against his son's bare skin. Or how about the parents who keep a child tied to the bed post or locked in a dark closet day after day for weeks on end, wallowing in its own excrement. These are extreme examples, to be sure, but they do happen. So what feeling did you get when you read about these examples of abuse?

I hope you said *anger*! Anger is our normal human response to injustice, and it's also a very loving response. Anger is bad only when we respond to it inappropriately, such as when we lose our tempers.

God's Anger. God never loses His temper, but I propose that God's anger—His wrath—is a very appropriate and a very loving *divine* response to injustice. We all want an angry God from time to time. The cry, "Where was God when . . . ?" is a plea for an angry God. If we can feel anger over the little bit of abuse humans perpetrate against each other that we observe, how must God feel, who sees all the abuse that ever has happened and ever will happen? I hope He feels intense anger!

I have a friend who believes that anger is contrary to God's character of love, so I asked him one day how he would feel if an intruder were to break into his house and rape one of his teen-age daughters. He said, "Murderous." Then I asked him how he would want God to feel. He thought a moment, and then he said, "Murderous." I rested my case.

My wife and I visited the World War II concentration camp in Dachau, Germany, a number of years ago, and we felt profound anger as we saw how Hitler treated Jews and other "undesirables." That was an entirely appropriate response.

Those who propose that God doesn't get angry are rightly concerned to avoid compromising His mercy. But mercy and justice need each other. Justice without mercy results in tyranny, abuse, and torture. But so does mercy without justice, for mercy without justice allows evil people to take charge, as in the case of the mother who prayed instead of intervening with force to protect her daughter. Justice that refuses to intervene to protect the victims of abuse is very unmerciful.

How About Force? But should anger intervene with force? Our *Signs* correspondent said No. Claiming that force is a characteristic of Satan, he said, "I do not believe that in the end God will finally resort to force to put down evil." However, the stories of the two mothers that I shared with you a moment ago help us to understand that sometimes forceful intervention against evil is the most moral and the most loving thing we can do. The mother who loved her daughter the most was clearly the one who felt so much anger over the abuse her husband was inflicting on their daughter that she took strong steps to stop it. The other mother should have felt angry, and she should have intervened forcefully. In some situations, love has failed if it doesn't intervene with force.

MOORE: REFLECTIONS ON THE WRATH OF GOD

My correspondent at *Signs* said that force is a characteristic of Satan. It's true, of course, that Satan uses force—but to *impose* suffering, not to *prevent* it. Often, Satan uses force to get people to obey him. That God will never do. All who obey Him must do so by choice.

But does God ever use force? Is force ever an appropriate response for any loving being? I believe the answer has to be Yes. Force is simply the exercise of power to bring about a desired result, and situations do exist where it's absolutely essential that good people exercise force in order to prevent horrible evil from gaining control and creating chaos and suffering. I propose that in the presence of intolerable evil, force is also an entirely appropriate response from a loving God. The Bible says that when Lucifer and his angels chose to rebel against God's law of love in heaven, Michael and His army of angels cast them out. That was force—God using His power to expel rebellion and evil from heaven. And the Bible teaches that an all-wise God will eventually exercise the same force to expel rebellion from the entire universe.

The Final Destruction of the Wicked

What about God's wrath in the final destruction of the wicked that's described so graphically in Revelation? Those who argue for passive wrath as the exclusive way God exercises His wrath point out, correctly, that Revelation is highly symbolic. However, it doesn't follow that everything in Revelation is symbolic. Certainly the image of Christ riding a white horse at His second coming is symbolic. This is simply a way of stating the literal truth that His second coming will be a time of war. *And war is always an act of violent intervention.* The images of birds eating the flesh of the wicked and of beasts being thrown into a lake of fire are highly symbolic, but the idea behind these images, that Christ will destroy evil and evil people with force at His second coming, is very literal.

The proponents of the passive and no wrath models are quite horrified at the suggestion that God will exercise His active wrath in the final punishment and destruction of the wicked. I suspect this is because they consider all anger to be bad. But when we consider anger an appropriate response to evil and injustice, then it makes perfect sense for a loving God to be active as well as passive in dealing with it. And the biblical teaching about the final punishment of the wicked in the lake of fire is simply a picture—symbolical, perhaps, but true in a very real sense—of God intervening actively to put an end to evil.

Let's consider the prospect of God truly refusing to intervene with force to destroy the wicked, allowing their eternal demise to be simply the natural outworking of their choice to be evil. To do that, God would have to place them in a world all by themselves long enough for them to become extinct through degeneration, disease, and the reign of "tooth and claw." They would suffer a miserable, prolonged, pathetic extinction. When I have a dog or cat with a painful terminal illness, in mercy I ask the veterinarian to "put it to sleep." In the same

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

way, I see God's forceful destruction of the wicked as a merciful alternative to truly allowing nature to take its course.

The Revelation of God's Glory. A common explanation suggested by those who support the passive model of God's wrath is that, rather than God Himself bringing fire down on the wicked, they'll be destroyed by the revelation of His glory in the final judgment. But to absolve God of the responsibility for the death of the wicked by saying "He'll just unveil His glory" hardly gets Him off the hook. Imagine for a moment that I have a laser beam in my forehead that will kill people if I take my hat off in their presence. If I ever did that and were hauled into court for murder, what do you think the judge and jury would say to my plea that "I didn't kill anyone; I just took off my hat"? If it's within my power not take off my hat, then I'm responsible for those who die when I take it off, even if I didn't strike them.

The Bible's description of the final destruction of the wicked—fire coming down from God out of heaven—sounds like a releasing of the forces of nature that heretofore God has held in check. That's pretty violent! A proponent of the passive model of God's wrath might argue that God won't personally destroy the wicked in the lake of fire; He'll simply release the forces of nature. That's like saying that I'm not responsible if my pit bull attacks and injures you, because all I did was let go of the leash. I hardly think a judge would acquit me on that basis. If it's within my power to restrain the dog, then I'm responsible for the consequences when I let it go. Similarly, if it's within God's power to restrain the forces of nature, then it's hardly an argument in favor of the passive model of His wrath to say that the destruction of the wicked in the lake of fire is simply the result of His releasing the forces of nature.

Is God Vengeful and Severe? My correspondent at *Signs* said that "God is not arbitrary, vengeful, or severe." It's true that God isn't arbitrary in His dealings with the wicked. An arbitrary God would destroy them with no consideration for what His loyal subjects thought. That's why God refused to eradicate sin the moment it arose in heaven many eons ago. He allowed it to continue for several thousand years so that all created beings could pass judgment against it for themselves.

Is God vengeful? No—by which I mean He isn't spiteful. Is He severe? If by *severe* we mean "malicious," No, but if we mean "strict," Yes. God is always strict in dealing with evil.

I propose that the life of every creature is ultimately in God's hands. Therefore, when the time comes that the wicked are permanently destroyed, God will be responsible for their death, and whether He takes personal action to make that happen or merely "allows" it to happen is irrelevant. I also propose that His justice is the reason why He'll not only allow it to happen but will actually initiate its happening. And in the long-range scheme of things, that tragic event will be the most merciful thing a loving God could *do*!

MOORE: REFLECTIONS ON THE WRATH OF GOD

Implications for the Atonement

The idea that God doesn't get angry—that He doesn't experience wrath—has major implications for our understanding of Christ's atonement for sin. In order to explain the problem, I need to share with you a couple of theological explanations for why Jesus died.

One explanation is called the "substitutionary model" of the atonement. The substitutionary model is based on the very biblical concept that the punishment for sin is death. However, a loving God didn't want to see His children die, so He devised a plan whereby Jesus would take the guilt of their sins upon Himself and suffer God's punishment in their place. His death would *substitute* for theirs. This would meet the demands of God's justice for the death of the sinner and give His erring children another opportunity to accept Him and allow His Spirit to control their lives. This model is strongly supported by both the Old and New Testaments.

The Substitutionary Model in the Old Testament. The sacrificial system described in Leviticus is an excellent example of the substitutionary model of the atonement. When a person sinned, he was instructed to bring a lamb, a goat, or a bullock to the altar of sacrifice, confess his sins over it, and kill it in the presence of the priest. The priest would then sprinkle the blood of the sacrificial victim either on the altar or on the curtain inside the tabernacle. The Bible says that "in this way the priest will make atonement for the man's sin, and he will be forgiven" (Leviticus 4: 26). The conclusion seems inescapable that the animal took the sinner's guilt symbolically upon itself, died in the sinner's stead, and released the sinner from both the guilt for his sin and its punishment. It would be difficult to find a more obvious illustration of sacrificial substitution.

Isaiah 53 applied this concept to the suffering Servant, that is, the Messiah: "He was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed." "For the transgression of my people he was stricken." "The Lord [made] his life a guilt offering." "He was numbered with the transgressors. For he bore the transgression of many" (Isaiah 53:5, 8, 10, 12).

It's impossible to miss the concept in these verses that the suffering Servant took upon Himself both the guilt of human sin and its punishment. And there's an obvious use in verse 10 of the language of the Old Testament sacrificial system: "The Lord [made] his life a guilt offering." The King James Version says, "Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin," and the New American Standard Bible says, "He would render Himself as a guilt offering."

The Substitutionary Model in the New Testament. Several New Testament passages affirm the concept of sacrificial substitution. One of the best is Galatians 3:13: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, for it is written, 'Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree.'" The tree is a reference to Christ's cross, by which Paul obviously means His death on the cross. And notice that Paul said, "Christ became a curse for us," and by His

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

death Christ “redeemed us from the curse of the law.” That’s clear substitutionary language.

The concept of substitutionary sacrifice is also evident in Ephesians 5:2, where Paul said that “Christ loved us and gave himself up for us as a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God.” In 2 Corinthians 5:21 Paul said, “God made him who had no sin to be sin for us, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God.” And Peter said that “Christ suffered for you,” and “He himself bore our sins in his body on the tree” (1 Peter 2:21, 24).

There’s no question that the Bible teaches sacrificial substitution in both the Old and New Testaments.

The Moral Influence Model of the Atonement. According to the moral influence theory of the atonement, Christ didn’t die as a substitute for sinners. His death on the cross was simply a demonstration of God’s supreme love for human beings. Seeing this profound example of love, sinful people will be *influenced* to respond by seeking His forgiveness.

There’s no question that Christ’s sacrifice on the cross was a marvelous demonstration of God’s love for the human race. Many texts in the New Testament attest to that. One of the best known and best loved is John 3:16: “For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life.” Ephesians 5:2, which I cited a moment ago, also declares clearly that Christ’s death on the cross demonstrated His love for us: “Christ loved us and gave himself up for us as a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God.” The idea of the cross as a demonstration of God’s love for lost sinners is so pervasive in the New Testament that it hardly needs further corroboration.

So what are we to make of these two theories of the atonement? It would be impossible for any one model of the atonement to encompass all that Christ’s death on the cross accomplished. Human analogies are too limited for that. Our best understanding of the atonement is provided by examining the strengths of each model (including several that we haven’t considered here). The moral influence model helps us to understand the great love that God and Christ have for human beings and the great drawing power of their love. The substitutionary model helps us understand something of God’s justice, the importance of His law, and the seriousness of sin in His sight.

The problem with the moral influence theory is in what it denies rather than in what it affirms. As I pointed out a moment ago, the moral influence theory denies that Christ died as a substitute for human sin. It claims that God didn’t need satisfaction for His justice. The law didn’t demand a penalty that had to be paid. Christ’s death was exclusively for the purpose of drawing human beings to Himself in love. And I have a major problem with that.

The Atonement and the Wrath of God. But what does this have to do with God’s wrath? The issue can be summed up in one simple question: What did Christ suffer on the cross? According to the substitutionary model of the

MOORE: REFLECTIONS ON THE WRATH OF GOD

atonement, by His death on the cross Jesus paid the price for human sin. *And the price of human sin is to suffer the wrath of God that He will exercise against the wicked in the second death.*

So did Christ suffer God's active wrath or His passive wrath on the cross? Certainly, He suffered God's passive wrath—God's abandonment of sinners to the results of their sins. Jesus cried, "My God, My God, why have you forsaken me?" That's passive wrath.

Did God take an active hand in the death of His Son? The Bible isn't so clear on that. However, if God took a hand at all in removing life from His Son on Calvary, that would be active wrath. If wrath is God's punishment for sin, and if sinners will suffer God's active wrath at the time of the second death, then it would certainly be consistent for God to have taken an active role in the death of His Son on the cross.

If Jesus didn't suffer God's wrath for sin on the cross in any sense, then the substitutionary model of the atonement makes no sense, and we're left with the moral influence model. Jesus' death was a demonstration of God's love for His children and nothing more. But this would make about as much sense as a father jumping off a high bridge and drowning in the river below to show his son how much he loved him. If the son had fallen into the river, then the father's jumping off the bridge to save him would truly be a demonstration of his love for his son. But jumping for no good reason would be a demonstration of the father's foolishness, not his love.

I conclude that at the very least, Christ suffered God's passive wrath on the cross and very likely His active wrath as well.

In conclusion, the wrath of God that Paul spoke about in Romans 1 was largely God's passive wrath. But in Romans 2 he clearly had in mind God's active wrath at the end of the age, because in verse 5 he said, "Because of your unrepentant heart, you are *storing up wrath against yourself for the day of God's wrath.*" That's an eschatological statement. Again, in verse 8 he said, "For those who are self-seeking and who reject the truth and follow evil, *there will be wrath and anger.*"

I conclude, then, that God *does* have wrath, and that this quality is perfectly in harmony with His character of love. Indeed, if He didn't experience anger over all the pain and suffering He observes in our world, He'd be like my cat, that could observe all manner of abuse going on around it—and sleep through it all. I don't want a God like that!

Marvin Moore is the editor of *Signs of the Times* and has written more than twenty books on popular religious topics. His knowledge of Bible prophecy and end-time events keeps him in constant demand as a speaker at churches and camp meetings in the U.S. and internationally. Prior to his career in editing and writing, he worked as a pastor for fifteen years in California and Texas. He earned an MA in Church History and an M.Div. from Andrews University and an MFA in Creative Writing from the University of Dallas.