

John Wesley, Founder of Methodism & an Arminian [sermonaudio.com](http://sermonaudio.com)  
*Said He Did Not Love God*  
By Larry Wessels

**Preached on:** Thursday, June 7, 2012

**Christian Answers of Austin, Texas**  
9009 Martha's Drive  
Austin, TX 78717

**Website:** [www.biblequery.org](http://www.biblequery.org)  
**Online Sermons:** [www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers](http://www.sermonaudio.com/christiananswers)

Announcer. If you would like a free newsletter on this or other subjects, just give us a call at Christian Answers. The phone number is (512) 218-8022 or you could email us at [cdebater@aol.com](mailto:cdebater@aol.com). Thank you.

Hello, this is Larry Wessels, Director of Christian Answers of Austin, Texas, Christian Debater. Our websites are [biblequery.org](http://biblequery.org), which answers over 8,000 Bible questions; [historycart.com](http://historycart.com), covering early church history; [muslimhope.com](http://muslimhope.com), a classic refutation of Mohammad's Islamic religion. See our YouTube channel page CAnswersTV where we have all of our hundreds of videos we've produced over the years available for free viewings. Posted there are our 19 playlists categorizing our videos by subject matter. Playlists dealing with Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormonism, Seventh Day Adventism, phony TV preachers such as Benny Hinn, Kenneth Copeland, Fred Price, Paul and Jan Crouch of Trinity Broadcasting Network, and a host of other television heretics. Other playlists cover Louis Farrakhan's Nation of Islam, Orthodox Islam. We have over 50 videos on this subject alone. UFOs, witchcraft, satanism, spiritual warfare, Roman Catholicism, over 60 videos on this subject including many debates, world religions and new age cults, the Campbellism of the church of the Church of Christ and their baptism and works to be saved religion, our radio shows with nationally known Christian authors and speakers and many more. You can also type "Larry Wessels" and whatever subject you are interested in in the YouTube search box and bring up the relevant videos pertaining to that subject.

This particular video is dealing with the heresies of John Wesley who, by his own admission, claimed to be a non-Christian. We'll document that fact more thoroughly shortly but we did mention Wesley's influence of Charles G. Finney, a famous so-called Christian revivalist in our video on YouTube called "Beware of false prophets. Charles Grandison Finney, phony revivalist and arch-heretic." In that video, we mentioned this: Charles Grandison Finney was an early 19<sup>th</sup> century revivalist in the Northeastern part of the United States and a kindred spirit of John Wesley. Wesley was steeped deeply in the writings of Roman Catholic medieval mystics, claimed to have read them avidly and was instrumental in publishing a great number of these Roman Catholic works. This false mysticism stayed with Wesley all his life. Finney doctrinalized Wesley's "second experience" teaching. Finney's introduction of new methods for getting converts and the orchestrating of emotion and excitement in huge revival gatherings was clearly based on his heretical understanding of being born-again. Finney writes that he repudiated all the

fundamental doctrines of God's sovereignty in salvation, including the vicarious nature of the atonement of Jesus Christ. In the interest of preaching revival, Finney's purpose was solely to convince the human will and produce decisions and commitments.

Wesley's involvement with Roman Catholic mysticism began early. The following is an excerpt from Alan Morrison's excellent article entitled "The Evangelical Attraction To Mysticism." To read his entire article, please read it online.

#### "4. The Mystical Legacy of John Wesley

It is an interesting fact that Wesley's childhood was steeped in the Mystics. His parents were great fans of the mystical writers and Charles and John Wesley grew up in a home surrounded by their works.

Initially John was wholly accepting their teachings, and they made and left a deep impression on him during the formative years of his life. Eventually, he became involved in a protracted internal struggle with mysticism which never really abated. John Wesley wrote to his brother Samuel on 23rd November, 1736: 'I think the rock on which I had the nearest made shipwreck of the faith was the writings of the Mystics.' And in this connection he specifically names Johann Tauler and the Spanish Quietist, Miguel de Molinos.

In his Preface to the Collection of Hymns and Sacred Poems in 1739, John Wesley writes: 'Some verses, it may be observed, in the following Collection, were wrote upon the scheme of the Mystic Divines. And these, it is owned, we had once in great veneration, as the best examiners of the Gospel of Christ. But we are now convinced that we therein greatly erred, not knowing the Scriptures neither the power of God.'

And it was the Mystic's doctrine of 'perfection' which laid the ground for Wesley's own teaching in this area. In an article on 'Perfectibilists' in Blunt's Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, Ecclesiastical Parties and Schools of Thought (Rivington's, 1874), the writer states: 'Many mystical divines have believed that a life of profound devotional contemplation leads on to such an union with God that all which is base and sinful in the Christian's soul becomes annihilated, and there ensues a superhuman degree of participation in the Divine perfection. Such a doctrine was held by the great mystic whose works pass under the name of Dionysius, and from him was handed down to the Quietist Hesychasts, the strict Franciscans, the Molinists, the Jansenists, and the German Mystics [Dominicans such as Eckhart and Tauler], from whom it passed on to the English Methodists, among whom it has always been a special tenet that sanctification may, and ought to, go on to perfection.'

Doesn't this show how dangerous it can be to be undiscerning in what one reads for spiritual nourishment? Naive believers imagine they can pick out the 'good bits' and reject the 'bad bits.' But why involve yourself in such play when the result could be shipwreck, and when there are many genuinely devotional works to read, among the Puritans for example?

This is why Wesley was so confused through his entire Christian life. He rightly rejected certain aspects of mystical teaching, but never shook off others. One of his biographers, Robert G. Tuttle Jr. ('John Wesley: His Life and Theology,' Zondervan, 1978, p.341), says that for Wesley, 'the mystical disregard for the historical significance of the Incarnation became the greatest area of incompatibility — although Wesley continued to agree with the mystics that perfection was God's purpose for all men and that it involved total communion with God.'

In spite of his wise insights into certain Christian truths, the legacy of John Wesley's teaching on sanctification lived on to become a founding principle in Finneyite Revivalism, the Holiness Movement and Early Pentecostalism. As the first half of the 19th century progressed, the old-fashioned idea of revival had gradually turned into revivalism, in which man-centred emotional experience in conversion became the vogue. (See 'Revivals & Revivalism' by Iain Murray, Banner of Truth).

Revivalistic camp meetings reflecting this emphasis became widespread. And as one researcher of this period has put it: 'Those who attended such camp meetings...generally expected their religious experiences to be as vivid as the frontier life around them. Accustomed to braining bears and battling Indians, they received their religion with great colour and excitement'.

Often, these meetings would involve phenomena such as hysteria, falling, jerking, so-called 'Holy Laughter,' barking like dogs, etc. This is mysticism at its crudest, with people seeking a direct experience of what they believe to be the Divine, and making their own subjective experience the yardstick by which religious truth and efficacy would be measured. Enthusiasm is just a very crude form of mysticism.

What we discover during this period is that in place of the biblical conversion process of seeking to be declared acceptable to God through faith in a righteousness which is not our own, the emphasis began to fall on finding God through a powerful emotional experience. This is mystical revivalism by the mid-nineteenth century there had been a huge resurgence of interest in Wesley's sanctification teaching. Wesley had referred to this experience as (and I quote) 'immensely greater than that wrought when he was justified.' He and his followers urged people to seek this second blessing experience, and as this experience infected other

Protestant groups, the body which resulted came to be known as the 'Holiness Movement.'

John Wesley, who failed to discourage weird, gratuitous phenomena in his evangelistic meetings, unwittingly fathered the wayward Holy Spirit Movements of the nineteenth and 20th centuries."

In our volume 5, #1 issue of our Christian Debater Guide, we featured an insightful article by Pastor G. Richard Fisher who is a Christian researcher, conference speaker and an author of numerous articles for the Personal Freedom Outreach Quarterly Journal entitled "Confronting the Supersititious Church of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." Pastor Fisher states,

"For all the Athenians and foreigners who were there spent their time in nothing else but either to tell or hear some new thing.' Luke then concludes in verse 22 by quoting the Apostle Paul as saying, 'in all things you are very religious.' Indeed, the god of novelty was reigning in Athens.

The word 'religious' in Acts 17:22 (translated in some versions as superstitious) is the Greek word deisidaimon. It has to do with fear of the supernatural. It was a practice that was all-embracing and non-discerning with a reverence for all kinds of deities, religious notions, religious fads and religious claims. It lacked discretionary thought and would try anything with the word 'religion' tacked to it. It was mindless reverence and mindless religion with a love for novelty.

The parallels to our own age are stark and frightening. Just pick up a copy of Charisma magazine and glance at its advertisements and its promotional items. It is Athens all over again - with a vengeance. How can the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth be leading in so many contradictory paths? The confusion (and the nonbiblical mysticism) is palpable. Many of these new quirks are touted as the end time revival and people jump on the new bandwagon until they tire of it or a more exciting wagon rolls in.

We must come to grips not only with the reality of superstition in the Church but have a plan to resist that superstition.

The Reality of Superstition in the Church

Dr. Peter Jones, professor of New Testament at Westminster Seminary in Southern California, captures the large view as he surveys how our churches have moved toward experience-driven religion and eastern mysticism: 'Belief that the human is divine, and thus essentially good, helps explain the burgeoning quest for personal spiritual discovery, to the detriment of doctrine and truth. Mysticism has replaced true spirituality. Companies in the West, seeing commercial value in such optimism, are using these ideas to produce better sales personnel. Madison Avenue and the gurus could be an unstoppable, unholy alliance feeding the machine of

political correctness. As an expression of divinity, each self is a source of truth.'

If anyone doubts that this is an age of religious fadism, confusion and superstition, just visit a Christian bookstore. There you will find:

Hannah Hurnard - New Age occultist and aura reader.

Madame Guyon - a mystic heretic.

Madeleine L'Engle - who says the God of the Old Testament is 'a male chauvinistic pig.'

Many of the latest psychobabble theories.

Dream interpretation and prophetic words by so-called Vineyard prophets.

Alternative medicine and Bible Codes.

So-called revival stories with people acting like crass fools or animals as if this is biblical.

Instructions on how to get rid of ancestral demons and curses and do spiritual mapping.

And on and on, ad nauseam, ad infinitum.

Truly it is like Athens and like the second-century age of heresy described by Philip Schaff when he said of that era, 'strange medleys of Christian and unchristian elements in chaotic ferment.'"

In a different article by Pastor Fisher called "The Mindless Mysticism of Madame Guyon," he stated that the teachings of this Roman Catholic mystic are like "an amalgam of the teachings of Shirley MacLaine, Rebecca Brown, Joyce Meyer and Sister Angelica."

Although Wesley later repudiated many of these Roman Catholic mystics, he nevertheless remained influenced by them which was reflected in his theology. His theology influenced by mystics but also his own admission that he was not a true Christian revealed the following problems.

1. Wesley accepted Jacob Arminius who lived from 1560-1609, and his Arminianism. I have written two articles that are available for free to those who request them, entitled "The Doctrines of Grace," and "How Sovereign is God." The following is from my "Doctrines of Grace" article concerning Arminianism.

"We must take our starting point in Holland in the year 1610. James Arminius, a Dutch professor had just died and his teaching had been formulated into five main points of doctrine by his followers Gospel - known as Arminians. Up to this point, the churches of Holland, in common with the other major Protestant churches of Europe, had subscribed to the Belgic and Heidelberg Confessions of Faith, which were both set squarely on Reformation teachings. The Arminians wanted to change this position, however, and they presented their five points in the

form of a Remonstrance - or protest - to the Dutch Parliament. The Five Points of Arminianism were, broadly speaking, as follows:

1. Free will, or human ability. This taught that man, although affected by the Fall, was not totally incapable of choosing spiritual good, and was able to exercise faith in God in order to receive the gospel and thus bring himself into possession of salvation.
2. Conditional election. This taught that God laid His hands upon those individuals who, He knew - or foresaw - would respond to the gospel. God elected those that He saw would want to be saved of their own free will and in their natural fallen state - which was, of course, according to the first point of Arminianism, not completely fallen anyway.
3. Universal redemption, or general atonement. This taught that Christ died to save all men; but only in a potential fashion. Christ's death enabled God to pardon sinners, but only on condition that they believed.
4. The work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration limited by the human will. This taught that the Holy Spirit, as He began to work to bring a person to Christ, could be effectually resisted and His purposes frustrated. He could not impart life unless the sinner was willing to have this life imparted.
5. Falling from grace. This taught that a saved man could fall finally from salvation. It is, of course, the logical and natural outcome of the system. If man must take the initiative in his salvation, he must retain responsibility for the final outcome.

The Five Points of Arminianism were presented to the State and a National Synod of the church was called to meet in Dort in 1618 to examine the teaching of Arminius in the light of the Scriptures. The Synod of Dort sat for 154 sessions over a period of seven months, but at the end could find no ground on which to reconcile the Arminian viewpoint with that expounded in the Word of God. Reaffirming the position so unmistakably put forth at the Reformation, and formulated by the French theologian John Calvin, the Synod of Dort formulated its Five Points of Calvinism to counter the Arminian system. These are sometimes set forth in the form of an acrostic on the word 'TULIPS,' as follows:

T = Total Depravity (i.e. Total Inability)  
U = Unconditional Election  
L = Limited Atonement (i.e. Particular Redemption)  
I = Irresistible Grace  
P = Perseverance of the Saints

As can be readily seen, these set themselves in complete opposition to the Five Points of Arminianism. Man is totally unable to save himself on account of the Fall in the Garden of Eden being a total fall. If unable to save himself, then God must save. If God must save, then God must be free to save whom He will. If God has decreed to save whom He will, then it is for those that Christ made atonement on the Cross. If Christ died for them, then the Holy Spirit will effectually call them into that salvation. If salvation then from the beginning has been of God, the end will also be of God and the saints will persevere to eternal joy.

These are the so-called Five Points of Calvinism also known as the doctrines of grace, whose essence actually dates back to the work of St. Augustine a millennia before Calvin. Calvin himself again and again pays tribute to the work of Augustine and points out that what he is saying has been said before him by the Bishop of Hippo."

To illustrate the difference between Wesley's Arminianism and biblical predestination, the following is a clip from our six hour predestination video series entitled "The Biblical Doctrine of Predestination." This clip is from show #1, "Is Your God Too Small?" You can see this on YouTube.

Video clip:

Bob. This is really for those Christians who maybe are not theologically or biblically rooted in predestination, this is really what we're saying that God is doing in the world, that God is in control, that he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, and verses like Daniel 4:35, and numerous others...

Larry Wessels. Yeah, we'll bring all those up on the charts.

Bob. But the point I want to make is you said a while ago something about predestination being a rather awesome or fearful subject sometimes, I think it is to the people who don't love God but to the person who loves God, he would have nothing more to be done than that God would control everything and have his will and his way in the affairs of men and the inhabitants of the earth and work his will. Every time I've noticed that some people that are against, you would say, the theoretical views on predestination, yet they will pray the very opposite. They will pray that God will do the very things that when they quit praying they deny that he is doing.

Larry: This reminds me too of one of my favorite theologians, R. C. Sproul, a very good Reformed theologian, and he said, "If there is just one random molecule running around loose in the universe somewhere that God does not control, then how can God be God? If there is even just one molecule out there somewhere that God cannot control or have anything to do with, how can he be all the things the Bible says he could be? He'd have to be a no God instead of God." That's what R. C. Sproul says and I think it's a good point. For God to be God, he has to be in control. If he created everything, he has to be in control of every last molecule.

Bob: And this brings up another term which we use in referring to God's work, it's providence. Providence. God is at work. And in fact, in our confession of faith under the discussion of predestination, the actual chapter title has to do with providence. That's the term that's used because it's not merely a fixing of something in time past. It is actually God at work now as time is experienced in this world. God is at work and we think in terms of it being a predetermined thing because the truth is God has just always known and planned that he would be doing this and we think in terms of it being kind of a past decree or a past plan but actually it's just God active in time.

Larry: Working all things together for good.

Bob: And he can announce them in advance because he knows in advance and this brings up another point too, those who are so obstinate against God working, some of them have gone even to deny that God can foreknow.

Larry: Well, you know, that's an interesting point there because just a couple of weeks ago, I was at work and one of my fellow employees who is also a Christian but also very Arminian and doesn't believe in predestination at all but he knows I do and so he was taking a few potshots at me to try to see how I stood on it. But he was making a statement that, "Well, God, sure he intervenes now and then in human history. He kind of fiddles around with things." He was grabbing his hand and he said, "Yeah, God kind of fiddles around a little bit now and then with things and he can get some working out the way he wants to, but generally he kind of stands back and watches how things unravel." In the course of the discussion I said, "Well, you know, it's interesting that you had no choice in the fact that you were born in this country, you were born in this state, you were born to the certain parents you were born to and that you've even a Christian right now. That was all out of your control because what if you were born a thousand years ago in the darkest part of Africa where they had never heard the Gospel and there was no Gospel message given to you and you lived your whole life in heathen darkness worshiping trees and then you died?" He said, "Oh well, no, that couldn't happen because that wouldn't work that way." I said, "Wait a minute now, you had no control on being born at this point in time in the 20th century. That was totally God's choice to put you where he put you and all the circumstances of your life are based on the fact that God put you here at this certain time instead of somewhere else where maybe you never would have heard the Gospel. Maybe you'd be of a different race and different circumstances."

I then mentioned Jeremiah 1 and I said, "Take Jeremiah, for instance. It says right there," in fact I've even got the passage here. Jeremiah 1 around verse 4 and following it says, "Then the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." Here is God saying before you even came out of the womb and before you were formed and all this stuff, he already knew him and had ordained him to be a prophet long before he was even born. I said to my friend, "Well, what do you think of that?" His response was, "No, that can't be. That can't be. The word 'before' is not in the text." I said, "Yes it is in the text. The word 'before' is in the text." I



pulled out a Bible and I said, "Look, it's right here, verse 5, 'Before I formed thee.'" Predestination and, of course, he was at a loss to continue the discussion and he immediately had something else to do and that was the end of the conversation.

Bob: There is a verse in Romans, early in the book of Romans, that refers to God calling those things that be not as though they were and that example that you were reading there from Jeremiah, God calls those things that be not as though they were and why? Because he knows what his plan is.

Now, back to the thought of fatalism as an opposite of what the Bible teaches by way of providence or predestination, we have cults, Larry, operating today based on fatalism. If you stay up late at night sometime and watch some of these programs that they're having on tv now about these psychics and these people who are giving you readings and the card reading stuff and....

Larry: ...particularly astrology is particularly based on fatalism.

Bob: ...the astrology reading your signs or whatever, all this is based on fatalism and they think that they have calculated or put together a certain amount of information that is fatalistically determined. So therefore they can take you and based on their doctrine of fatalism, they can read your future and make these prophecies or predictions. Now, the problem with that is, with our position in the Bible, this rules out God. God is not involved in this. God is excluded. Now, you've heard the expression for years, "What is to be, will be," I'd like to correct that, "What God wills to be, will be." But what is to be, will be is fatalism, but what God wills to be, that is divine determinism and a true Christian who is submissive to God should not want God to be ruled out of anything. He should want God to have the rule in everything and so that's what we're pleading for, a biblical dependence upon God and a biblical looking to God as he works in human history, even in those things that we cannot comprehend at the current time. And we can look back in history and we can see things that at the time looked bleak and looked bad and looked like God was a thousand miles away, but as time went on, we can look back and we can see how God was putting the pieces together and bringing to pass his own will and his own purpose.

But we want to emphasize that we are not advocating fatalism because fatalism eliminates the will of God, it eliminates the Spirit of God, it eliminates dependence upon God and that's certainly not taught in the Scripture. What we're taught in the Scripture is to commit our way to the Lord. "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose," and Job is a good example of this. Although the things that happened in Job's life were negatives as we view them, Job looked back at it and he saw that God had blessed him doubly by what he had gone through and Job said, "Though God slay me, yet will I trust him."

Larry: That's right, and I'd like to mention too at this point that what Bob is talking about, how God is working, it's not fatalism but God is working all this out according to his plan so there is a divine mind of the Lord behind everything that takes place, whereas in

fatalism it's like "the force" in Star Wars. It's just mindless and impersonal.

Bob: Even God can't break it.

Larry: So predestination is determined by God who is a living ego.

Bob: Larry, if your destiny, for instance, is written in the stars, well, even God can't change it.

Larry: Right, because it supplants the power of God.

Bob: It's fate. It's just in cold cement there.

Larry: And the reason we're going through this in so much detail to refute this idea of fatalism when it comes to predestination is because that's one of the main attacks that all the people that hate predestination will bring against it.

Bob: They'll call it fatalism.

Larry: Right, they call it fatalism and a cheap shot attack which is not true at all. And you were saying something else too about how God works everything, even if something looks bad. There is a classic text in the first book of the Bible, Genesis. You go to Genesis 50 and you look around verse 19 and following and we have the classic tale of Joseph who was sold into slavery by his brothers who hated him and then, as God worked out events in his life, he went through prison and all these bad things, but he eventually ended up being Pharaoh's number 1 man to run the country and then suddenly Joseph's brothers are put at Joseph's mercy, the same brothers who had sold him into slavery back when he was a youngster, and his brothers think he's going to kill them now that he's got them in his power but Joseph tells his brothers something very interesting here in Genesis 50, around verse 19 and following. It says, "And Joseph said unto them, Fear not: for am I in the place of God?" Verse 20, "But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive." So they thought to do this evil thing which was to sell him into slavery but as Joseph says, "but God meant it unto good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive," which there was a famine in the land and Joseph being in power and had saved up food so everybody could be saved from the famine.

So here is a classic case of God taking an evil by the brothers who sold him into slavery, but actually uses that evil in his sovereign plan, his predestined plan, to work things out for the good in the end.

Bob: And one example such as that should demonstrate to the human mind of those who would object to the principle of God's sovereignty, this one example should show that we should not sit in judgment upon these things that happen that appear to us at the current time to be somehow conflicting or contradictory because here is Joseph's brothers selling him to the Ishmaelites and thinking they were ridding themselves of him and it was out of

a principle of hatred and they were, as he said, "You meant it for evil," but God was in it all along and God was overlooking and overseeing and overruling everything and ultimately bringing to pass that Joseph should be in a position to bless his brothers because he was the ruler in Egypt and now that they had this drastic need of food, he was in the position now to give it to them. So this is one example, just one biblical example to show us that we should not offer these wild and fanciful objections as if God is a thousand miles away when he may be much nearer than we discern.

Larry: And to go back to what you were originally saying, Bob, and you've mentioned it several times but I might as well read it now straight up out of Acts 2:23 where Peter is giving the day of Pentecost sermon and he says, "Him," talking about Jesus, "being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." He's going, of course, right back to some of the messianic prophecies, particularly I'm thinking of Isaiah 53, where God had predetermined and by his foreknowledge determined that Christ would come and be crushed for our sins and die for our iniquities. Here he says it point blank in Acts 2:23 but yet you have the human responsibility in there also because by you, by wicked hands, have crucified him. So God, even the most heinous evil act imaginable, the crucifixion of the very Son of God, was determined by a predestinating hand of the Almighty God.

Bob: And let me read Acts 4:28 on the same subject. It says, verse 27 of Acts 4, "For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel," here you have the whole collection of mankind being represented here. Herod, who was the ruler at that time in Israel, and Pontius Pilate who was the governor from Rome over this area, and then we have the Gentiles mentioned and the people of Israel, the Jews. They were gathered together and what were they going to do? "To do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done." So they were acting freely. They were acting by their own choice and yet they were acting out what had been determined before to be done.

Now, when people can explain this and show the consistency of this if they were looking for that because that's seemingly what people are running to when they come to the doctrine of providence and predestination. They come to these conflicting things, "Well, that contradicts my free will. That contradicts free agency." Well, here evidently it didn't conflict with anything because Peter said that they were gathered together and they were acting out of their choice. God wasn't there just forcing them and just beating them over the head to do this. They were choosing freely and yet they were doing exactly what the determinate counsel and the hand of God had determined before to be done.

Larry: It reminds also of John 6 toward the end of that chapter where, I believe, Jesus is talking about how he has chosen. He says something like, "Haven't I chosen you 12? And one of you is a devil." Now, here we have a case of Judas Iscariot. Judas had complete free will in this whole situation. Jesus already knew he was a devil. He says so there in John 6. But he picks him and Judas is just going to do his thing all along but he's going to do exactly an evil act of betraying Jesus into the hands of the scribes and the Pharisees so they can take him to a kangaroo court and then crucify him by the Romans. But Jesus

picked him sovereignly and then Judas, by his own free will, did exactly what Jesus, God the Father, Holy Spirit, had determined for him to do from all eternity. It starts to blow your mind when you start thinking about those kinds of things but it's all right there.  
[End of video clip]

Here's a clip from our four hour video series on YouTube entitled "Did Jesus Die For Everybody Who Ever Lived? Debate" between Larry Wessels, that's me, and Steve McCalip, an anti-Trinitarian Arminian. Please see this entire four hour debate on YouTube if you have a chance.

Video clip:

Bob. Okay, that concludes the four speeches and four rebuttals. Now we're going to have our interactive exchange. Larry Wessels, I'll let you start it.

Larry Wessels. Well, since Steve was asking the question about, you know, are you saved at the cross and way back then and all that kind of stuff, all I can say is respond, my main argument is I'm not coming from Calvin or Zwingli or Knox or all this stuff, I'm trying to stick to what the Bible itself teaches, what it says, and in Ephesians 1, Steve, he says, "just as He chose us," this is verse 4 and following, "in Him before the foundation of the world, that we would be holy and blameless before Him. In love," verse 5, "He predestined us to adoption as sons through Jesus Christ to Himself, according to the kind intention of His will," and as you go all through this, he basically says in verse 11, "also we have obtained an inheritance, having been predestined according to His purpose who works all things after the counsel of His will." And so basically just looking at what the Scripture says, we are in Christ, chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, before the world is even created. So that's going back. We were in God's mind. He has already shed his love on us just like before Jeremiah was ever born, God already knew Jeremiah, Jeremiah 1:5, and he had ordained him a prophet to the peoples.

So what we have here is God basically an operation. God is the one who's accomplishing. He's working events. You think of Joseph in Genesis, here he gets set up by Potiphar's wife.

Steve McCalip. Wait a minute, let me interrupt you there, you said you were chosen in him but my question was were you saved at the cross?

Larry. You're saved at a point and time in your life, in time and space. Like we were talking in the first hour about Passover being a time and space...

Bob. Can I add a word here? That's what Calvinism calls calling, you're called in time. I think that's what Steve is...

Larry. Yeah, well, I'm agreeing in time and space because let's face it, Romans 3:10 and following it says we're all sinners, there's none that seeketh after God, we've all gone astray, you know, .....

Steve. Larry, you're saying you're in Christ before the world was even created...

Larry. Ephesians 1.

Steve. So my point is, okay, yes, you were in Christ before the foundation of the world?

Larry. That's what it said.

Steve. But that means you were a Christian since you were in Christ...

Larry. That's not what the verse is saying.

Bob. You said you were a Calvinist. Do you in the past, did you understand as a Calvinist that you were saved before the foundation of the world? I don't see to where any Calvinist ever taught that.

Steve. No, but it doesn't really matter what I believed back then, it matters what Larry's teaching now and that is I'm trying to get him to answer did you become in Christ, actually in Christ when you were saved on earth or were you in Christ before you were born?

Larry. In God's sovereign providence, he already knew I was saved and one of the elect before the foundation of the world according to Ephesians 1 which I just read. Now in time and space, May 16, 1981, I'm sitting there reading a Roman Catholic Bible at my mother-in-law's house, I'm reading 2 Timothy 3:1-4 and it says in the last days men will be lovers of themselves, this [unintelligible] all this stuff, and then I got down to having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof. Right at that moment, that's when I was born-again by the power of the Holy Spirit. It was a supernatural experience which I will never forget ever.

Bob. Larry, let [unintelligible].

Larry. Okay, well, anyway that's the answer to his question. In time and space I became a Christian right there by the sovereign act of God in my life, and then I fell on my face and repented and cried to the Lord and asked him to save me. So I didn't know in this mortal life that I was in Christ, you know, before I had that salvation experience on that night, May 16, 1981.

Steve. Well, to be in Christ, Larry, to be in Christ and for anybody listening, to be in Christ you have to have Christ in you, okay? You cannot be in Christ without Christ being in you because you...

Larry. You have to be born again.

Steve. Yes.

Larry. You have to have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit which is what happened to me on that night.

Steve. And listen to what Romans 8:9 says, Romans 8:9 says, "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he," this man that has not the Spirit of Christ, "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." None of his. If any man have the Spirit, if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his so, Larry, with that verse right there...

Bob. Okay, Larry Wessels will now do a five minute closing on his affirmative speeches.

Larry. Alright, thank you, Bob. As I said, Jesus Christ only died for all the sins of all the true believers who ever lived and that goes way back in time to all the people of God. You can think of the Old Testament characters, Moses, King David and so forth, all the way up through the New Testament, those who were saved. They were all bought for, paid for by Jesus Christ but he did not die for, let's say, Cain or Pharaoh, we know in Romans 9 that God says why he brought Pharaoh along, he raised him up for the purpose of bringing the curses down on Pharaoh. It even talks about how God is the potter over the clay to make one lump of clay unto honor and another one to dishonor, and then he makes vessels of wrath, fit unto destruction. And the key to all this is understanding that we as people are made in the image of God and so therefore we mirror in many ways in a fallen nature state the image of God.

So God has his holy righteousness, everything about God is holy but he has holy justice, holy mercy, holy love, and he also has holy hate. God does not love everybody as I've already read in Romans 9 before in an earlier speech. Jacob God loved but Esau he hated, and as we get into these Scriptures, for instance, Psalm 5:4-6, "For thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness: neither shall evil dwell with thee. The foolish shall not stand in thy sight: thou hatest all workers of iniquity. Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing: the LORD will abhor the bloody and deceitful man." Psalm 73:18-20, "Surely thou didst set them in slippery places: thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment! they are utterly consumed with terrors. As a dream when one awaketh; so, O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their image."

I could go through passage after passage, we find that God, the reason he doesn't save these people is because he hates these people. Exodus 17:14 says, "And the LORD said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua: for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven." 1 Samuel 15:3, "Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." And as you go through verse after verse and I've got pages and pages I can't get to it all, we find that God simply does not like these people. He's not gonna do anything for these people. He's not gonna do anything special for these people other than work to destroy them and as we look at other passages of Scripture, Romans 2:5, "But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." We find in Romans 9:19-23, "Thou wilt say then unto

me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory." God prepares his people to glory and he fits those who are damned to perdition to destruction. He's the potter. He makes one or the other for wherever they end up.

Steve. Alright, well, if you notice, Larry, it's kind of getting into the doctrine of election and we really should be focusing on the limited atonement even though these two doctrines are very much related. He is going off into the doctrine of election and that's okay for a little bit of this debate.

You notice over and over that he said God doesn't love everybody and he quoted some Scriptures that said God does, in fact, hate people and I don't deny the fact that God does have those verses in the Bible where it says he hates workers of iniquity in Psalm 5:5, but you notice how he avoids John 3:16 and, you know, and everybody knows that verse and, you know, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." God so loved the world. Now, you know, Larry's answer to that is going to be, "Well, God so loved the world of the elect," but I challenge Larry and any Calvinist whatsoever to show me any passage of Scripture where the word "world" is translated "elect." He can't find it. It's not there. It's not in Scripture. He has to deal with the fact that God said himself in John 3:16 that he so loved the world, the world, and the world is never like I repeat, the world is never translated world of the elect or just elect, in fact, John himself, the author of John 3:16, uses the word "world" 80 times in his Gospel and in 1 John uses the word "world" never to mean the elect. I challenge Larry to find one time where the word "world" means the world of the elect. He won't find it.

So there we have John 3:16, God loving the world and shedding his blood for this world and that's what we're talking about in this debate, did God shed his blood for that world. Well, he sure did and when Jesus said in John 3 that God so loved the world, he mentioned just before that in John 3:14, he made a reference to Numbers 21 and he said, "Even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life." Jesus was making reference to a story in Numbers and I wonder if Larry has really read that story in Numbers 21 because in Numbers 21, if you remember and if you've read your Bible, it says that the serpent bit the Israelites and God told Moses to make a serpent of brass and whoever lifted, whoever looked upon that serpent of brass would be healed. And Jesus used that story that whosoever looked upon that serpent, just looked, would be healed of their poison, Jesus used that very story to say that whosoever believes in him would have everlasting life.

Now he's gonna have to say that, "Well, only the elect in Numbers 21 looked upon that serpent, only the elect." Now get this, he would also have to say, "only the elect were bitten by the serpent." Remember, Jesus used the story in Numbers 21 to teach us that just as all the Israelites that were bit by that snake could look upon that snake and be healed, Jesus himself used that story as the introduction to John 3:16 saying that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. And he would have to, again, teach that only the elect were bitten by those serpents and only the elect looked upon that brass pole and only the elect were healed, and nowhere in Numbers 21 does it say that.

And Jesus, again, used that story as the background of his John 3:16 passage, whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. God so loved the world and Larry and all Calvinists like him, run from that Scripture because, and the only way they can explain it is to change it and change the word "world" to mean the word "elect" and it doesn't mean that anywhere in the book of John or anywhere in Scripture.

Bob. Alright, Larry Wessels will make his third reply.

Larry. Thank you, Bob. Alright, he's bringing up Galatians 2:20, you know, basically anyone that looked at the reference there, has a Bible at home, we can see Paul is giving his testimony there, talking about himself and when you think about Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus in Acts 9, we find that once again here's Christ himself appearing to Paul on the road and God does something special for Paul that he doesn't do for just anybody in a general sense like Steve's trying to affirm in this debate. God does as he wills in all the armies of the heavens and the earth, as Nebuchadnezzar mentioned in Daniel 4:35, and I've already mentioned that passage before. But God does whatsoever he wants to do. He's got the power. He's Almighty.

So God wanted to save Paul right there so he appeared to him on the road to Damascus as he's going to Damascus, he's trying to kill the Christians and enslave them and bring them back to Jerusalem or whatever he was trying to do there. So God doesn't treat everybody the same. He doesn't. It's not an equal opportunity, God's not a union master where he's getting management to treat everybody the same. God doesn't do it that way. He does it the way he wants to do it. If he wants to save Paul and leave Caiaphas over here in his sin, then so be it, then high priest Caiaphas, he's gonna stay in his unbelief. Over here Paul who killed Stephen in Acts 7, he's going to save him and that's God's choice and that's why when we're looking at Galatians 2:20 as Steve mentioned here, it's ridiculous because context, context, context makes all the difference in the world.

In fact, I'd like to ask Steve this question: did Jesus give his life a ransom for all according to Matthew 20:28 and Mark 10:45 or for many? You see, just taking context of other Scriptures in with this Galatians 2:20 he's bringing up, shows that Paul is not saying that Jesus only died for him and him alone. He's gotta understand Paul's talking about himself in this case, that Jesus actually died for him in a meaningful personal way. And we find from this question did Jesus give his life a ransom for all or for many, and there's a difference between those two words, we get a clear answer to what's going on here.



Also I'd like to ask Steve another question: did Jesus die for both the sheep and the goats? If so, are not all their sins paid for including the sin of unbelief? Is not Jesus the Good Shepherd in John 10 and Matthew 25? So did Jesus die for all their sins? And if he did, why aren't the goats saved? If he's died for every sin including unbelief, how come the goats aren't saved like the sheep are according to Jesus?

Also, why does Jesus say few will be saved in Luke 13:22-28, and even when people cry out to him, he will still not open the door he has shut in their face? In fact, Jesus relates a similar situation of a shut door in Matthew 25:1-13 where you have the parable of the 10 virgins. Why doesn't God open the door to these people even though they are calling on him to let them in? Matthew 7:21-23 also ties into this about the people who yell to Jesus, "Lord, Lord," and yet Jesus is gonna say, "Depart from me, I never knew you."

So we have a different attitude by God and by Jesus to different people. I'd like to mention too on this thing, world, if you look at Genesis 41:57, "and all countries came into Egypt, to Joseph, for to buy corn because that the famine was so sore in all the land." John 15:18, "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you." Now he's trying to make John 3:16 and God so loved the world, like it always means every last person in the world but as you look at these verses and many more, Luke 2:1-3; Acts 2:5; and many others, there's no way that word "world" can mean every last man, woman and child. You have to take everything in context and, in fact, in John 3:16, Jesus was talking to Nicodemus at night and the Jews all thought that they were the only ones saved and Jesus explained, "No, it's gonna be not just the Jews but the Gentiles as well."

Anyway, go with the Scripture not opinions.  
[End of video clip.]

Okay, we're now returning to the other facets of Wesley's theology. What you're about to see here is taken from the free online encyclopedia, Wikipedia.

"John Wesley has historically been the most influential advocate for the teachings of Arminian soteriology. Wesley thoroughly agreed with the vast majority of what Arminius himself taught, maintaining strong doctrines of original sin, total depravity, conditional election, prevenient grace, unlimited atonement, and possibly apostasy. Wesley departs from Classical Arminianism primarily on three issues:

1 Atonement - Wesley's atonement is a hybrid of the penal substitution theory and the governmental theory of Hugo Grotius, a lawyer and one of the Remonstrants. Steven Harper states, 'Wesley does not place the substitutionary element primarily within a legal framework...Rather [his doctrine seeks] to bring into proper relationship the "justice" between God's love for persons and God's hatred of sin...it is not the satisfaction of a legal demand for justice so much as it is an act of mediated reconciliation.'

2. Possibility of apostasy. Wesley fully accepted the Arminian view that genuine Christians could apostatize and lose their salvation, as his famous sermon, 'A Call to Backsliders' clearly demonstrates. Harper summarizes as follows: 'the act of committing sin is not in itself ground for the loss of salvation...the loss of salvation is much more related to experiences that are profound and prolonged. Wesley sees two primary pathways that could result in a permanent fall from grace: unconfessed sin and the actual expression of apostasy.' Wesley disagrees with Arminius, however, in maintaining that such apostasy was not final. When talking about those who have made 'shipwreck of their faith (1 Tim 1:19), Wesley claims that 'not one, or a hundred only, but I am persuaded, several thousands...innumerable are the instances...of those who had fallen but now stand upright.'

3. Christian perfection. According to Wesley's teaching, Christians could attain a state of practical perfection, meaning a lack of all voluntary sin by the empowerment of the Holy Spirit, in this life. Christian perfection (or entire sanctification), according to Wesley, is 'purity of intention, dedicating all the life to God' and 'the mind which was in Christ, enabling us to walk as Christ walked.' It is 'loving God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourselves.' It is 'a restoration not only to the favour, but likewise to the image of God,' our being filled with the fullness of God.' Wesley was clear that Christian perfection did not imply perfection of bodily health or an infallibility of judgment. It also does not mean we no longer violate the will of God, for involuntary transgressions remain. Perfected Christians remain subject to temptation, and have continued need to pray for forgiveness and holiness. It is not an absolute perfection but a perfection in love. Furthermore, Wesley did not teach a salvation by perfection, but rather says that, 'Even perfect holiness is acceptable to God only through Jesus Christ.'

The underlying reasons as we have already stated for Wesley's theological views can best be explained by the following article found in the Lutheran publication, "The Christian News," May 5, 2008.

"John Wesley, Founder of Methodism 'I never believed.'

The March, 2007 Journal of Theology, of the Church of the Lutheran Confessions reviews, "John Wesley: A Biography," published by Eerdmans in 2003. It shows that Wesley lacked faith in the God he was preaching. Tomkins reveals that John Wesley wrote to his brother Charles in June of 1766, long after his 'conversion.' 'I do not love God. I never did. Therefore I have never believed in the Christian sense of the word. Therefore I am only an honest heathen and never had any other evidence of eternal or invisible world than I have now and that is none at all, unless

such as faintly shines from reason's glimmering ray. I have no direct witness of anything invisible or eternal.' From page 168.

Tompkins comments, 'It is pitiful to see his faith, even after all these years, still so dependent on the vicissitudes of his emotions. Constantly to put a burden on your disciples that you have constantly failed to lift yourself is monstrous.' Page 169.

The April 30, 2007 Christian News published a critique of LCMS President Jerry Kieschnick's Mission Ablaze program. Kieschnick and his supporters have complained that confessional Lutherans have been so involved with emphasizing doctrinal purity that they have failed to learn from what Schulz referred to as the Protestant-Fundamentalist missiology. The July 7, 2003 Christian News published a Religion News Service story titled '300 Years After His Birth, John Wesley Continues to Shape U.S. Church.'

RNS noted that, 'Wesley's most direct descendants are the 10 million members of the United Methodist Church, that's not counting nearly 4 million members of churches like that African Methodist Episcopal Church, the 70 million members of the World Methodist Council or still millions more in the Salvation Army, the Wesleyan churches, the Church of the Nazarene and countless Holiness churches.

'Add to that the 625 million Pentecostals around the world who claim Wesley as a spiritual forebear and you have the second-largest Christian movement in the world, outpaced only by the Roman Catholic Church.

'Now 300 years after his birth on June 17, 1703, perhaps no one would be more surprised by Wesley's enduring influence – and the host of churches he fathered than Wesley himself.

'Certainly he would be one of the three most influential Christian leaders as far as he effects on American religious life,' said the Reverend Vinson Synan, dean of the School of Divinity at Regent University and author of 'The Century of the Holy Spirit: 100 Years of Pentecostal and Charismatic Renewal.'

Wesley's theological DNA is still deeply imprinted on American religion, from Billy Graham revivals and the 41 percent of Americans who claim to be 'born-again,' to the hospitals, universities and social movements that were founded to usher in Wesley's era of social holiness.

We all in a way stand in the shadow of Wesley's movement, even if we're not Protestant or not Wesleyan, said Brother Jeff Gros, who oversees ecumenical dialogue for the US Conference of Catholic Bishops.

### A Frontier Church

By the mid-1800s, fueled by frontier conversions, the Methodists were the largest Christian group in the United States. Methodists pioneered circuit riders and a sophisticated 'class meeting' system that relied on lay leaders rather than ordained professionals. Wesley's gospel found particular appeal among the poor, illiterate and uneducated.

The fact that Wesley didn't assume that what you were born into was what you had to be is really a new patent on religion that people take for granted today, said Martin Marty, a leading church historian and professor emeritus at the University of Chicago.

Methodists established a wide swath of territory from Baltimore to Kansas, where they became the typical Protestant church. Along the way they started such educational institutions as Emory, Duke, Northwestern and Boston universities while championing abolition, prohibition and civil rights.

Toward the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, some of Wesley's followers left to form Holiness churches in an effort to recover the old-time religion of emotional conversion. That split gave birth to the Nazarenes and the Salvation Army, who shed some of Wesley's cherished sacramental worship.

Then between 1900 and 1920, another split gave birth to the Pentecostals, who wanted still more emotional and spirit-filled worship.

### Second Largest Christian Movement

RNS said that, 'The various churches founded by John Wesley account for the world's second largest Christian movement.'

Wesley's anti-scriptural relation with women should have been enough to disqualify him from being a pastor in any denomination.

'Salvation on Horseback,' an article in the June 13, 2003 Wall Street Journal, noted that orthodox Methodist biographies have chosen to overlook Wesley's 'desperately unhappy marriage and troubling relationship with women.' The Wall Street Journal said, 'Wesley's diaries written in code and later published in expurgated form as publicity for the Methodist Connection, record incidents that, in modern society, might result in prosecution for sexual harassment and assault.'

The late Dr. John Drickamer, the revision editor of the Fourth Edition of An American Translation of the Bible, in an article titled, 'Wesley The Heretic,' in the May 7, 2007 issue of Christian News wrote, 'Wesley's

nonsense about entire sanctification led to the Holiness Movement, which led to Pentecostalism, not emotionalism. In short, a whole host of doctrinal falsehoods and spiritual problems can be traced back to him. Most of the problems Lutheranism faces in America today can be discussed in terms of dealing with Wesley's legacy.

So let us have no more of regarding Wesley as any sort of evangelist, much less a great one. His works righteousness, known as entire sanctification, is worse than any Romanist doctrine. I can think of only two so-called theologians who might sink lower than he, Pelagius and C. G. Finney. Every time a faithful Lutheran preacher opens his mouth, he is opposing the falsehoods of Wesley.'

What about the followers of John Wesley? Some of the many articles Christian News has published about the anything goes United Methodist Church are in the Christian News Encyclopedia. The November 29, 1965 Christian News reprinted from the November 15, 1965 National Observer, a report of the Charles Y Glock and Rodney Stark survey which first appeared in Trans-action magazine of Washington University. It showed that the majority of Methodist clergyman shared at least some of the skepticism of founder John Wesley. Only 60% had no doubts about God's existence. Only 45% said that it is absolutely necessary to believe in Jesus as Savior. A special 64 page issue of Christian News, March 3, 1969, reprinted Jeffrey K. Hadden's "A Protestant Paradox Divided They Merge." A scientifically conducted survey showed that only 40% of Methods clergymen accepted the virgin birth of Christ and that only 49% accepted the resurrection of Jesus Christ as an actual historical event.

Since 1969 the Methodists and most Protestants have only become more liberal. It should be noted, of course, that there are Methodists who deplore the liberalism of the United Methodist Church.

The skepticism of John Wesley set the pattern for many of his followers."

In conclusion, by understanding the elements in Wesley's life that influenced him such as Roman Catholic mysticism and Wesley's own admission to be an honest heathen, it can be easily discerned why his doctrine goes against plain biblical teaching and has spawned so many false Christians within the so-called Christian church. Wesley, like Finney, is responsible for the large numbers of tares in the wheat field of God.

In this day and age, the evangelical church so greatly influenced by Wesley and Finney, there is little wonder why false and nominal so-called Christians seem to outnumber the true believers in Christ throughout the world. Wesley, a tare himself by his own admission, has left his legacy.

Matthew 13:24-30, this is the famous parable of the wheat and tares. "Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn."

Announcer. Check out our websites: [biblequery.org](http://biblequery.org), this site answers 7,700 Bible questions; [historycart.com](http://historycart.com), this site reveals early church history and doctrine, proving Roman Catholicism is not historically or doctrinally viable; [muslimhope.com](http://muslimhope.com), this site is a classic refutation of Islam, a counterfeit religion created by Mohammad. Free newsletters are also available.