

# A Few Thoughts on Apostasy

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

<https://njjat.com/apologetics.html>

I have a series of lectures on the subject of Apostasy that I hope to put into book form one day. I have the advantage of over forty years of theological experience in the evangelical community and have seen *many, many, many* so-called evangelical philosophers, theologians, and pastors fall away into heresy or immorality.

The question of whether we should question the salvation experience of those who teach false doctrine is an important question that is increasingly an issue today. The moment you question the salvation of anyone, you are attacked on every hand as being mean. Yet, those who condemn me for doing so have never dealt with the following questions.

1. Did Jesus question the salvation of the religious leaders and teachers of his day?
2. Did he call them names and heap ridicule on them?
3. Was He right or wrong to do so?
4. Was He mean and unloving?
5. Should we follow his example and walk as he walked?
6. Did Jesus tell us to judge some people to be false prophets, dogs, and pigs?
7. Did Paul follow the example of Jesus and cast doubt on the salvation of some people in the church who claimed to be "brothers?"
8. Did he call them names and heap ridicule on them?
9. Did Paul call some professing Christians "false brethren?"
10. Did he tell us to follow him as he followed Christ?
11. Did John, the Apostle of Love, tell us to question the profession of salvation people made?
12. Did Peter cast doubt on the conversion of people in his day?
13. What did he say to Simon in Acts 8?

These questions help us to frame the issue of whether we should, at this time, in the light of their recent teachings, question the salvation of J. P. Moreland, William Lane Craig, and their disciples. Given what they are now teaching, we must put a question mark over their head.

Frank Beckwith is a good example. He was not thrilled when I cast doubt on his salvation. But now that I have been 100% vindicated by his apostasy to popery, my doubts and warnings were right on target.

When I was Chairman of the membership committee of the ETS, I often doubted the salvation of such men as Gundry, Pinnock, etc. who denied the inerrancy of Scripture. They were offended when I told them that I do not accept them as fellow Christians.

I am open and honest about such things. I told Frankie Schaeffer on a radio program several years ago that he was apostate and on his way to hell. He got all offended that I refused to accept him as a Christian. But now that he openly rejects the gospel and has joined the Orthodox cult, I have been vindicated 100%.

The main problem is that many religious leaders today say one thing and teach another. If you ask Boyd or the other "Open View of God" heretics if they believe in the omniscience of God, they will say, "Yes." Dumb Christians are satisfied at this point and go their merry way deceived and hoodwinked.

When I force them to define the term "omniscience," they end up denying that God knows all things! They claim that God does not and cannot know the future.

Just because someone says, "I believe in sola scriptura" does not mean they actually believe in it. If they elsewhere say that it is wrong to teach that the Bible is the final authority in matters of truth and morals, they have denied in substance what they supposedly affirmed as a slogan.

Heretics have always done this. What they affirm with the right hand is what they deny with the left hand. It does not matter what doctrine is at stake.

1. In the early 1980s, those who denied the inerrancy of Scripture did begin by openly denying it. They redefined it until the term "inerrancy" meant errors!
2. Those who deny the ontological deity of Christ try to deceive people at first by pretending they do believe in the deity of Christ. It is only upon careful questioning that the truth comes out. They only accept a *functional* meaning of the deity of Christ in that he functioned as a revelation of God, just as the heavens do. But they deny that Jesus was ontologically GOD as well as man.

Apostasy in Scripture is of two kinds: doctrinal and moral.

A heretic can be a good person who is very moral. Yet, he can also be an anti-Christ. The monk Pelagius was according to all a good man, morally speaking. Thus when I point out some teacher as a heretic, evanjellyfish usually respond, "But he is so nice! He is a good man, How dare you attack him!" They assume that heretics are always mean and vile. A nice heretic who uses right phrases and theological clichés cannot be a heretic in their mind.

The problem with heretics who are "nice" is that we tend to let them get away with the most outrageous teaching because they seem to be so nice.

I was at 700 Club, sitting in the Green Room, waiting to go on the program about my book on war, when I met a famous black actor. I discovered he was a fanatical SDA and did not believe that we went to heaven or hell at death.

When the producer later told me that he was being considered to host the show while Pat was running for president, I warned her that he was a cultist and heretic who denied many fundamental truths such as heaven and hell. She was taken aback by what I said and replied, "I can't accept what you are saying because he is too nice to deny heaven."

Given Moreland's teaching about Natural theology/Law, rationalism, meditation, miracles, and sola scriptura, I am forced to place a huge question mark over his head just as I had to do with Beckwith. If he, Craig and their clones all joined popery or Orthodoxy, it would not surprise me. I have seen things like this happen in over forty years of theological experience.

I hope these words are not twisted to mean I think I can judge their hearts. That is something only God can do. But I am bound by the Word of God to judge their theology. I can do no other, so help me God.