

Filicide Case Study: Medical / Legal background, Causes, and Proposed Solutions

*** **Author:** Gordon Wayne Watts, editor-in-chief, The Register (GordonWayneWatts.com / GordonWatts.com)

National Director, CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: PART II® <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com>

BS, The Florida State University, double major with honours: Biological & Chemical Sciences

AS, United Electronics Institute, VALEDICTORIAN

Author: "When Babies Die: Where do they go?," ASIN: B008J8RTOK, Publisher: Create Space (July 9, 2012)

***INTRO:** This brief seeks to dismantle the theological 'Shortcut Logic' that provides a rationalized motive for altruistic filicide through a precise forensic and linguistic re-examination of Hebrews 9:27.*

Prepared for scholarly theological research for my friends at Moody Bible Institute and for a broader public discussion.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

- I. **The Problem (The "What") -- LEGAL AND MEDICAL FOUNDATIONS for ALTRUISTIC FILICIDE**
- II. **The Catalyst (The "Why") -- CAUSES as shown by Case Examples**
- III. **Exegetical Solutions -- (The "How to Fix") THE LINGUISTIC SAFEGUARD OF HEBREWS 9:27 and more**
- IV. **Appendix: Proposed Clarification for Broadcast/Print Mailbags (Q/A Session)**

Published: Saturday, 2 May 2026

Updated: Friday, May 8, 2026 (Refined Lexical Attributions ; supplemented citations ; fixed typos)

Updated: Thursday, May 14, 2026 (Added arguments 14 {Trib. Flight} & 15 {Faith} ; fixed typos)

I. LEGAL AND MEDICAL FOUNDATIONS for ALTRUISTIC FILICIDE

** The Evidence: [Andrea Yates \(2001\)](#) explicitly told forensic psychiatrist Dr. Park Dietz that she killed her five children because she felt they were stumbling and, by killing them while they were innocent, she was ensuring they would go to heaven and be safe with God. [Deanna Laney \(2003\)](#) stoned her children believing God ordered it to save their souls. This is not theoretical; it is historical fact. **Please remember the case of Andrea Yates, who explicitly stated she killed her children to ensure their safety in heaven while they were still innocent.** This is a real, documented psychological phenomenon. These cases illustrate the 'Terminal Endpoint' of the logic I am highlighting."

“Murder and a Mother’s Love: Understanding Maternal Altruistic Filicide and Reshaping the Legal System’s Approach to Mentally Ill Mothers Who Kill Their Children,” Author: Morgan Woodbridge, *32 J. L. & Pol’y 251 (2024), Volume 32, Issue 2, Article 7*, DATE: 5-1-2024, Quote from page 251, *Law Journals at BrooklynWorks*,

** **QUOTE:** “Every year, thousands of children are killed by their parents. Some of these killings are committed by mentally ill mothers who believe that death is in their children's best interest. This category of killings is called maternal altruistic filicide.” (Page 251) *(Editor's Note: Altruistic filicide is a phenomenon that affects both mothers and fathers, as shown below.)*

Available at: <https://BrooklynWorks.BrookLaw.edu/jlp/vol32/iss2/7>

ARCHIVE-1:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20241005210442/https://brooklynworks.brooklaw.edu/jlp/vol32/iss2/7/>

Direct URL: <https://BrooklynWorks.brooklaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1658&context=jlp>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20240618015607/https://BrooklynWorks.brooklaw.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1658&context=jlp>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/MurderAMotheraLove_UnderstandingMaternalAltruisticFil.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://Web.Archive.org/web/20260424203941/https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/MurderAMotheraLove_UnderstandingMaternalAltruisticFil.pdf

“The Andrea Yates Case: Insanity on Trial,” Author: Phillip J. Resnick, *55 Clev. St. L. Rev. 147 (2007)*, DATE: 2007, Quotes from pages 150 and 152, *Cleveland State Law Review*,

**** QUOTE-1:** “1. Mrs. Yates believed it was right to drown her children because she held a delusional belief that her children were not being raised “righteously” and that they would “burn in hell” if she did not take their lives. She faced a psychotic dilemma. She thought that she was doing what was right for her children by arranging for them to go to heaven while they were still “innocent.” She stated, “They had to die to be saved.”” (Page 150)

**** QUOTE-2:** “6. Finally, I reminded the jury of the psychotic dilemma that Mrs. Yates faced at the time she drowned her children. She believed that if she did not act, her children would burn in hell for all eternity. If she did take their lives before the age of accountability, her children would be with God in heaven for all eternity. Mrs. Yates believed that taking her children’s lives was the right thing to do in the face of this dilemma.” (Page 152)

Available at: <https://EngagedScholarship.csuohio.edu/clevstlrev/vol55/iss2/4>

ARCHIVE-1:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20170219224034/https://EngagedScholarship.csuohio.edu/clevstlrev/vol55/iss2/4>

Direct

URL:

<http://EngagedScholarship.csuohio.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1174&context=clevstlrev>

<http://EngagedScholarship.csuohio.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1174&context=clevstlrev>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20150923211455/https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1174&context=clevstlrev>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/TheAndreaYatesCase_InsanityOnTrial.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://Web.Archive.org/web/20260425012610/https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/TheAndreaYatesCase_InsanityOnTrial.pdf

Other statistics relevant to this phenomenon: Roughly 1-in-4 (25%) of all births end in miscarriage

These scientific findings of fact are included to demonstrate just how prevalent the loss of children before birth (and thus before the “age of accountability”) is in modern society to underscore the need for clarity on a topic that affects practically **all**** families due to the very high incidence of child loss in this age-range.**

“Pregnancy Loss,” *Department of Public Health*, © 2026 Commonwealth of Massachusetts. FAIR USE

QUOTE: “Approximately 1 in 4 pregnancies end in a loss, including miscarriage, recurrent pregnancy loss, fetal death, or stillbirth. The loss of a pregnancy has a profound impact on parents, families, and health care providers.”

LINK: <https://www.Mass.gov/pregnancy-loss>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/0Ahvb>

ARCHIVE-2: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20250901042240/https://www.Mass.gov/pregnancy-loss>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/PregnancyLossMass.gov_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/PregnancyLossMass.gov_Wayback.pdf

“Men living through multiple miscarriages: protocol for a qualitative exploration of experiences and support requirements,” By Helen Marie Williams, Laura L Jones, Arri Coomarasamy, and Annie E Topping, Correspondence to Helen Marie Williams; h.m.williams.1@bham.ac.uk, *BMJ Open*, 2020 May 15;10(5):e035967. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035967. PMID: 32414830; PMCID: PMC7232625, **FAIR USE QUOTE:** “Up to 1 in 4 pregnancies and 1 in 20 subsequent pregnancies end in miscarriage. Despite such prevalence the psychosocial effects are often unrecognised and unsupported.”

LINK-1: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035967> LINK-2:

<https://bmjopen.bmj.com/content/10/5/e035967>

LINK-3: <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7232625/>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/whzeS>

ARCHIVE-2: <https://Archive.ph/V3nrR>

ARCHIVE-3:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20250202052813/https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7232625/>

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/MenLivingThroughMiscarriages_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-5:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/MenLivingThroughMiscarriages_Wayback.pdf

II. CAUSES as shown by Case Examples

The theological bridge. This is where Mildred's question and the responses from Moody staff demonstrate how the "Shortcut Logic" forms in the minds of listeners. – Full list of cases / studies numbered and in chronological order: These demonstrate some causes – which include psychological delusions amplified by assurances from trusted theologians and preachers that infant universalism (the belief that all deceased infants go to heaven, with no choice in the matter, no exceptions) is a correct theology.

[[#01. – 2006-10-31]]

“Girl killed after 'Romeo' moment: A father has described how he spent a moment "like Romeo and Juliet" with his three-year-old daughter before suffocating her, a court has heard.,” from News Front Page, *BBC NEWS*, Last Updated: Tuesday, 31 October 2006, 15:19 GMT, QUOTE: “Hospital radiographer Gavin Hall, 33, killed Amelia as her mother and sister slept upstairs in their Northants home. [] Mr Hall, of Irchester, denies murder but admits manslaughter on the grounds of diminished responsibility. [] "It seemed very Romeo and Juliet, we were distraught, we were distressed," Mr Hall told Northampton Crown Court..." At the time it must have been clear. We talked about heaven and we talked about no more crying, no more sadness," he said.”

LINK: https://News.BBC.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/northamptonshire/6103118.stm

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.ph/oM16j>

ARCHIVE-2:

https://Web.Archive.org/web/20180629040727/http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/northamptonshire/6103118.stm

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/TalkedAboutHeaven_BBC_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/TalkedAboutHeaven_BBC_Wayback.pdf

[[#02. – 2007-12-31]]

“Andrea Yates case: Yates found not guilty by reason of insanity,” (Court TV) content from CourtTVNews.com, *CNN*, First published in 2006 ; Updated 11:03 a.m. EST, Mon December 31, 2007, QUOTE: “Yates told Resnick and others who evaluated her in the weeks after her arrest that she believed that, if she killed her children while they were still innocent, they would be sent to heaven and she would have defeated Satan.”

LINK: <https://www.CNN.com/2007/US/law/12/11/court.archive.yates8/index.html>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.ph/wgYPh>

ARCHIVE-2: <https://Archive.ph/SvmBi>

ARCHIVE-3:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20080107135414/https://www.cnn.com/2007/US/law/12/11/court.archive.yates8/index.html>

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/AndreaYates_CNN_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-5: https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/AndreaYates_12-31-2007_Archive-of_Jan-7-2008_CNN_Wayback.pdf

[[#03. – 2008-01-31]]

“Mother says no deal made to kill baby,” by Bob Gibbins, *TAHLEQUAH DAILY PRESS*, January 31, 2008, QUOTE: “Hurta testified she never told anyone she and Guthrie had decided to "send the baby to heaven.””

LINK: <http://TahlequahDailyPress.com/local/x519338834/Mother-says-no-deal-made-to-kill-baby>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/wip/6GhWT>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20120719145326/http://TahlequahDailyPress.com/local/x519338834/Mother-says-no-deal-made-to-kill-baby>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/FatherKilledBaby_tahlequahdailypress_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/FatherKilledBaby_tahlequahdailypress_Wayback.pdf

[[#04. – 2008-09-13]]

“World exclusive: John Hogan breaks silence about night he killed his son and nearly ended life of young daughter after row with wife,” by *Mirror.co.uk*, 22:24, 13 Sept. 2008; Updated 12:52, 3 Feb. 2012, QUOTE: “It was a moment of unbelievable madness – a father throws his son from a fourth-floor balcony at their holiday hotel in Crete, then grabs his daughter in his arms and jumps...Hogan recalls that as the truth of his actions sunk in he spent six months in a suicidal state, in the belief that he would be reunited with Liam in heaven.”

LINK:

<http://Mirror.Co.uk/news/top-stories/2008/09/13/world-exclusive-john-hogan-breaks-silence-about-night-he-killed-his-son-and-nearly-ended-life-of-young-daughter-after-row-with-wife-115875-20735576>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/Q3MHJ>

ARCHIVE-2: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20101030121627/http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/top-stories/2008/09/13/world-exclusive-john-hogan-breaks-silence-about-night-he-killed-his-son-and-nearly-ended-life-of-young-daughter-after-row-with-wife-115875-20735576/>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/Hogan_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4: https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/Hogan_Wayback.pdf

[[#05. – 2009-03-25]]

“Casey Anthony Diary,” by *All The Latest News*, 03-25-2009, QUOTE: “A secret diary kept by Casey Anthony includes a confession that she killed her daughter Caylee Anthony...“Casey snapped,” a source told reporters. “In her sick mind, she became convinced that Caylee would be better off dead, in heaven, than in the hands of her mother.””

LINK: <https://A11News.com/1610/casey-anthony-diary> ARCHIVE-1: <https://archive.vn/LJLjJ>

ARCHIVE-2: <https://Web.Archive.org/web/20090327105444/http://a11news.com/1610/casey-anthony-diary/>

LINK: <https://www.TapaTalk.com/groups/watchingrobertpickton88015/viewtopic.php?f=63&t=2434>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/VZ79W>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20220221093834/https://www.tapatalk.com/groups/watchingrobertpickton88015/viewtopic.php?f=63&t=2434>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/CaseyAnthonyDiary_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/CaseyAnthonyDiary_Wayback.pdf

[[#06. – 2009-04-10]]

“Mother kills Son to send him to Heaven,” by “entrailsgalore,” Normal User, Join Date: Dec. 2008, *Darkfall Forums > Non-Darkfall Related > Off-Topic Discussions*, 04-10-2009, 07:15 AM, QUOTE: “If that is a guarantee to get your child into heaven (assuming that is how it works) then why not? Sacrificing your afterlife to insure your child's is set in stone.”

LINK: <http://Forums.DarkFallOnline.com/showthread.php?p=3214553>

Editor's Note: Some original URL's seem bad or broken links; thus, we depend on archives.

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/YIFM8>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20120305142113/http://Forums.DarkFallOnline.com/showthread.php?p=3214553>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/DarkfallForums_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/DarkfallForums_Wayback.pdf

[[#07. – 2009-07-24]]

“Mansfield father accused of killing daughter, 6,” by Eric Moskowitz, Globe Staff, *THE BOSTON GLOBE*, July 24, 2009, 06:51 PM, QUOTE: “Police charged a 35-year-old Mansfield man with murdering his 6-year-old daughter after being alerted to the crime by a note in which he allegedly asked forgiveness for sending her “to heaven.””

LINK: http://www.Boston.com/news/local/breaking_news/2009/07/mansfield_fathe.html (*Link may be broken*)

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/qyn6g>

ARCHIVE-2:

https://Web.Archive.org/web/20090727035108/http://www.boston.com/news/local/breaking_news/2009/07/mansfield_fathe.html

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/MansfieldFatherKillsDaughter_BostonGlobe_7-24-2009_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/MansfieldFatherKillsDaughter_BostonGlobe_7-24-2009_Wayback.pdf

LINK: <http://CrimesAgainstOurChildren.blogspot.com/2009/07/kristopher-griffin-charged-with.html>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/iMMGk>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20220221085802/http://crimesagainstourchildren.blogspot.com/2009/07/kristopher-griffin-charged-with.html>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/KristopherGriffinChargedMurder_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/KristopherGriffinChargedMurder_Wayback.pdf

// #08. – 2010-01-20 //

“Mother who killed brain-damaged son with heroin injection told Old Bailey she was 'releasing' him,” by Helen Pidd, *THE GUARDIAN*, Wednesday, 20 January 2010, 14.48 GMT, QUOTE: “I can remember saying I felt I would rather he go to heaven than to hell on earth.”

LINK: <http://www.Guardian.co.uk/uk/2010/jan/20/frances-inglis-tom-inglis-heroin>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.vn/2qG2G>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20100123170524/http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2010/jan/20/frances-inglis-tom-inglis-heroin>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/MotherKillsSon_TheGuardian_1-20-2010_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/MotherKillsSon_TheGuardian_1-20-2010_Wayback.pdf

// #09. – 2015-05-01 //

“When God Demands Blood: Unusual Minds and the Troubled Juridical Ties of Religion, Madness, and Culpability,” Author: Rabia Belt, *69 U. Mia. L. Rev. 755 (2015)*, DATE: 5-1-2015, quote from page 791, *Journals at University of Miami School of Law Institutional Repository*, QUOTE: “For example, Deanna Laney killed two of her children and tried to kill the third one in 2003...Laney also told investigators that God promised that she would be reunited with her children in heaven...”

Available at: <https://Repository.Law.Miami.edu/umlr/vol69/iss3/7>

ARCHIVE-1:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20200602152130/https://repository.law.miami.edu/umlr/vol69/iss3/7/>

Direct URL: <https://Repository.Law.Miami.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3057&context=umlr>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20210413065713/https://repository.law.miami.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3057&context=umlr>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/WhenGodDemandsBlood_UnusualMindsTroubledJuridical.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://Web.Archive.org/web/20260424202149/https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/WhenGodDemandsBlood_UnusualMindsTroubledJuridical.pdf

[[#10. – 2023-04-13]]

“Idaho mom Lori Vallow Daybell believed her kids were 'zombies,' ex-best friend testifies,” by Terry Collins, *USA TODAY*, Published 10:22 p.m. ET April 13, 2023 ; Updated 10:27 p.m. ET April 13, 2023, QUOTE: “Gibb said Vallow Daybell told her people who were light had signed contracts with "the Savior," and those who were dark signed contracts with "Satan" before coming to Earth...Gibb said she did see JJ, but Vallow Daybell said JJ’s behavior was changing and he would say things like "I love Satan.”,” yet another case of "altruistic filicide" involving a parent believing they are "sending the soul back to God" to prevent future spiritual corruption.

LINK: <https://www.UsaToday.com/story/news/nation/2023/04/03/lori-vallow-daybell-idaho-mom-murder-trial-jury-selection/11571727002/>

ARCHIVE-1: <https://Archive.ph/JUSnA>

ARCHIVE-2:

<https://Web.Archive.org/web/20230414050338/https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2023/04/03/lori-vallow-daybell-idaho-mom-murder-trial-jury-selection/11571727002/>

ARCHIVE-3:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/LoriVallowDaybell_ArchiveToday.pdf

ARCHIVE-4:

https://ContractWithAmerica2.com/DrCharlieDyer/FilicideCaseStudy/LoriVallowDaybell_Wayback.pdf

**A deeper dive into infant soteriology:
What does MBI (Moody Bible Institute) believe?**

The theological bridge. This is where Mildred's question and the responses from Moody staff demonstrate how the "Shortcut Logic" forms in the minds of listeners. These demonstrate some causes – which include psychological delusions *amplified by assurances from trusted theologians and preachers that infant universalism (the belief that all deceased infants go to heaven, with no choice in the matter, no exceptions) is a correct theology.*

DATE:	Sender / Recipient:	Topic:	Summary of Response:
Sat. 01-03-2015	Gordon Wayne Watts (To: Open Line Live / Dr. Rydelnik)	Open Lines Live not truly open	OpenLinesNotTrulyOpen_Sat03Jan2015_WATTS.pdf ** Watts has concerns about "Open Line Live" not keeping their word when call-screener refused to take caller's question on infant soteriology issue, diplomatically

			concludes question was too hard (blames question, instead of blaming Moody Radio staff).
Sat. 01-30-2016	Deb Solomon / Dr. Rydelnik (To: Listener "Mildred")	Infants going to heaven / Shortcut Logic	<p>** Mildred asks if all babies go to heaven, wouldn't it be better for them to all die so they can avoid possibility of hell? ** TRANSCRIPTION - Webpage: OLL_Transcription_Sat30Jan2016.html PDF: OLL_Transcription_Sat30Jan2016.pdf Mildred asks if dying in infancy is better to avoid Hell. Dr. Rydelnik admits the "logic" but he & Deb offer 5 counterpoints: Image of God, opportunity for faith, service, God's glory, and free will.</p> <p>** Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 1-30-2016 program in 5 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat30Jan2016_WAV.wav ** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat30Jan2016_MP3.mp3 ** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat30Jan2016_MP4.mp4 ** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat30Jan2016_MOV.mov ** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat30Jan2016_WMV.wmv</p> <p>** Watts has concerns about "Open Line Live" <i>*again*</i> not keeping their word in this 2016 call-in, like they did in 2015 (<i>see above</i>), when call-screener refused to take caller's question on infant soteriology issue, and <i>again</i>, diplomatically concludes question was too hard (blames question, instead of blaming Moody Radio staff). QUOTE from email: "Even if my question was too hard (and, I admit, it may have been too difficult), the call-screener should have kept his word to let me ask it: He did not...So twice in a row, the call-screener didn't keep his word to take my question."</p> <p>E-mail: ScaryConsequencesOfBabyUniversalism_Sat30Jan2016.pdf</p> <p>Web-page copy/paste: open-line-live-Moody-radio-question-too-hard.html</p>
Sat. 8-28-2021	From: Unnamed listener To: Jon Gauger (who reads question) and Dr. Charlie Dyer (who answers it).	QUESTION: "At the time of the rapture, will children, who have not reached the age of accountability, be	<p>** DR. CHARLIE DYER responds: He admits that no Scripture directly answers this, but sees 2 passages that indirectly may help: FIRST, in 1 Cor. 7:14, Paul tells believing spouses married to unbelievers that if non-believing spouse is willing to remain married, the children would be holy, and not unclean, implying these children are somehow set apart due to believing spouse. SECONDLY, in Matt. 24:19, Jesus tells of pregnant women & nursing mothers in the middle of the Tribulation, begging the question: If God takes some</p>

		raptured?"	<p>unborn children at rapture, but leaves others unborn immediately afterward, implying an inconsistency that God wouldn't do. Charlie says ultimately we must remember God's word to Abraham in Gen. 18, asking will not the Judge of all earth do right? <i>(Editor's Note: This seems to me, Gordon, to imply unborn children are neither saved nor lost, otherwise they'd be raptured, from which I infer that deceased babies will get a chance to exercise faith at some point and have free will – like angels and adult humans – God being a fair Judge.)</i></p> <p>** Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 8-28-2021 program in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** TLTB-20210828_UnbornInfantsRapturedOrNot_MP3.mp3 ** TLTB-20210828_UnbornInfantsRapturedOrNot_MP4.mp4 ** TLTB-20210828_UnbornInfantsRapturedOrNot_MOV.mov ** TLTB-20210828_UnbornInfantsRapturedOrNot_WMV.wmv</p>
Sat. 10-23-2021	From: Dr. Dyer (To: Gordon Watts -- 2-part exchange)	Millennial Theory	<p>BibleQuestion_MillennialTheory.pdf ** Dyer rejected Millennial but alluded to Rev. 20:5. Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 1-22-2022 program read from Watts' 10-23-2021 email in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** 00:00 Intro ** 00:58 Gene's question about Dan. 10:13 (Angelic battle) ** 03:50 Millennial Theory and infant universalism ; Heb. 9:27 <i>**correctly**</i> quoted correctly but Charlie <i>**incorrectly**</i> adds “final” to meaning when original Greek <u>doesn't</u> say that: A technical analysis of the original Greek reveals a critical distinction. The text uses the word κρίσις (krisis), which denotes a process, a trial, or an investigative "turning point." This is distinct from κρίμα (krima), which refers to the result of a judgment—the final decree or final sentence. (Jesus could have said "krima" in Heb. 9:27 had He wanted to, but He didn't, so for Charlie to say that death seals the baby's fate in incorrect. Charlie quotes Jesus correctly in Heb. 9:27 but misrepresents what Jesus meant. <i>However -- to be fair -- same mistake I made when I **correctly** quoted Charlie's email in followup but **incorrectly** misunderstood him.</i> In both cases (Charlie misunderstanding Jesus and me misunderstanding Charlie) were unintentional – but</p>

			<p>wrong – mistakes. We're both human / subject to mistakes: We must be willing to forgive others for such human mistakes (for we're forgiven if we forgive others: Mark 12:25), and such is the Christian experience.</p> <p>** 06:43 Alan was disappointed that Charlie equated anti-Zionism with Antisemitism and that the blessings of God for Israel weren't meant to last forever.</p> <p>** TLTB-20220122_MillennialReignQuestion_MP3.mp3</p> <p>** TLTB-20220122_MillennialReignQuestion_MP4.mp4</p> <p>** TLTB-20220122_MillennialReignQuestion_MOV.mov</p> <p>** TLTB-20220122_MillennialReignQuestion_WMV.wmv</p>
Sat. 11-13-2021	Gordon calls in Open Line Live	Infant soteriology question re Millennium possibility	<p>** Dr. Rydelnik refuses to take question on-air but tells Gordon off-air that he agrees "100%" with Dr. Charlie Dyer.</p> <p>** Audio / Notes of this brief, off-air (commercial break) conversation on Sat. 11-13-2021 program in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips:</p> <p>** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat13Nov2021_MP3.mp3</p> <p>** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat13Nov2021_MP4.mp4</p> <p>** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat13Nov2021_MOV.mov</p> <p>** OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat13Nov2021_WMV.wmv</p>
Sat. 01-22-2022	Gordon emails question	Infant soteriology	<p>BibleQuestion_MillennialTheory.pdf *** Dr. Dyer gives similar response on-air (Sat. 01-22-2022) as his Sat. 10-23-2021 emailed response.</p> <p>** TLTB-20220122_MillennialReignQuestion_MP3.mp3</p> <p>** TLTB-20220122_MillennialReignQuestion_MP4.mp4</p> <p>** TLTB-20220122_MillennialReignQuestion_MOV.mov</p> <p>** TLTB-20220122_MillennialReignQuestion_WMV.wmv</p>
Sat. 02-26-2022	Question from: Bob, audience member ; To: Dr. Michael Rydelnik	Crossbridge Church, Boca Raton, FL hosts live audience Q/A	<p>** OPEN LINE LIVE didn't take phone calls or "mail-bag" (e-mailed) questions, but rather, live from Boca Raton, FL, Dr. Rydelnik took questions from a live audience about God's faithfulness to Israel. Bob, a Boca Raton, FL resident, and member of Crossbridge Church, asks what happens to unborn babies & infants who die before the age of accountability. Dr. Rydelnik</p>

			<p>(#1) admits that Bible doesn't directly address it, but says that God will always be fair, (#2) says we have sin nature, but can not knowingly sin if under the age of accountability, citing Romans chapter 5 (but admits he's totally in "Conjecturville"), implying they go to heaven upon death, and (#3) That King David's comment about going to his dead son might've meant that David thought he'd go to the grave, instead of going to heaven, to see the child, or perhaps that David would see the baby again, i.e., "infant universalism," but offers no Scriptural support otherwise.</p> <p>** Audio / Notes of this brief, off-air (commercial break) conversation on Sat. 02-26-2022 program read from in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** MoodyRadio_Sat26Feb2022_640x480_x264_MP3.mp3 ** MoodyRadio_Sat26Feb2022_640x480_x264_MP4.mp4 ** MoodyRadio_Sat26Feb2022_640x480_x264_MOV.mov ** MoodyRadio_Sat26Feb2022_640x480_x264_WMV.wmv</p>
Sat. 10-22-2022	From: Dr. Charlie Dyer ; To: Kirby (listener)	Infant soteriology question / fate of people God orders killed	<p>** Kirby asks about God ordering death of large group of people: What's the eternal fate of the faithful followers and children in that group?</p> <p>Charlie admits uncertainty, but mentions God can take physical life without impacting eternal destiny (cites 1 Cor. 5, handing over immoral church member to kill body, but save soul). Secondly, Heb. 11:6 shows God rewards those who diligently seek Him, but only God knows a person's heart. Third, Romans 1 shows God gives revelation to all people of His existence. Concludes we don't know, but leans towards infant universalism (all babies go to Heaven period, without any need for faith in The Lord).</p> <p>** Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 10-22-2022 program in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** TLTB-20221022_CharlieExpressesUncertainty_MP3.mp3 ** TLTB-20221022_CharlieExpressesUncertainty_MP4.mp4 ** TLTB-20221022_CharlieExpressesUncertainty_MOV.mov ** TLTB-20221022_CharlieExpressesUncertainty_WMV.wmv</p>
Sat. 07-13-2024	From: Dr. Charlie Dyer ; To: a listener	Salvation question	<p>** Charlie says, 'no', we *can't* lose our salvation: John 10:26-30 gives 'eternal' life, protection from being</p>

			<p>snatched out of Jesus' & The Father's hand. Also, 1 John 5:11-13 says God gives us 'eternal' life. Charlie adds: If we can lose it, it's not eternal, but Charlie adds a word of caution: It's possible for a person to make a false profession of faith: Matt. 7 tells of Jesus telling people to depart from Him as Jesus never knew them. This question is added to offer context on infant salvation: Charlie (& other Moody Radio hosts) have said deceased infants are saved & automatically go to heaven. However, this contradicts OSAS, what Charlie said: If all infants are saved (Charlie's theory), and once saved, always saved, then all adults are saved. Since we know that's not true (many walk the wide path, Matt. 7:13-14), then the one or both premises are false. It's not OSAS, so it must be infant universalism. Infants CAN get saved, but need faith, meaning a fair God will give them an opportunity at some point, even if we don't know when: We mustn't cling to false beliefs (infant universalism) just because we lack God's secret knowledge.</p> <p>** Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 07-13-2024 program in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** TLTB-20240713_OnceSavedAlwaysSavedTRUE_MP3.mp3 ** TLTB-20240713_OnceSavedAlwaysSavedTRUE_MP4.mp4 ** TLTB-20240713_OnceSavedAlwaysSavedTRUE_MOV.mov ** TLTB-20240713_OnceSavedAlwaysSavedTRUE_WMV.wmv <u>v</u></p>
Sat. 09-13-2025	From: Dr. Gerald Peterman ; To: a listener	Infant soteriology question	<p>** Listener ask what happens to babies lost in miscarriage, stillbirth, or abortion? Do they go to heaven? If so, will they be grown up adults? Dr. Gerald Peterman admits that he doesn't know, but thinks so and cites Ps. 139 (God knew David when he was in the womb), 2 Samuel (David says he will go to his deceased son), and rejects the idea that David means he'll go to the grave, but instead references heaven. But does not grapple with the harder question of how a baby will exercise faith, or of they'll have a shortcut to 'eternal' salvation without faith in Jesus. <i>Editor's Note: Just as many see no prohibition against animals being in heaven or Millennium, I see no prohibition against babies being in Millennium to have a chance to exercise faith – not prohibited, but not guaranteed.</i></p>

			<p>** Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 09-13-2025 program in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** TLTB-20250913_InfantUniversalism_MP3.mp3 ** TLTB-20250913_InfantUniversalism_MP4.mp4 ** TLTB-20250913_InfantUniversalism_MOV.mov ** TLTB-20250913_InfantUniversalism_WMV.wmv</p>
Sat. 11-08-2025	From: Dr. Gerald Peterman ; To: Anna, a listener	Infant soteriology question	<p>** Anna asks what happens to babies who die in miscarriage, and will I meet them in heaven, & will they grow up into adults? Dr. Gerald Peterman says he thinks we'll see them but doesn't know if they'll be adults. He cites Ps. 139 where God says He knew David before he was born. He also mentions David lost his son with Bathsheba, and mentions that David says he'll go to his son, not to the grave, and thus does not mourn. However, like before, doesn't grapple with the harder question of how a baby will exercise faith, or of they'll have a shortcut to 'eternal' salvation without faith in Jesus. <i>Editor's Note: Just as many see no prohibition against animals being in heaven or Millennium, I see no prohibition against babies being in Millennium to have a chance to exercise faith – not prohibited, but not guaranteed.</i></p> <p>** Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 09-13-2025 program in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** TLTB-20251108_MoreInfantUniversalism_MP3.mp3 ** TLTB-20251108_MoreInfantUniversalism_MP4.mp4 ** TLTB-20251108_MoreInfantUniversalism_MOV.mov ** TLTB-20251108_MoreInfantUniversalism_WMV.wmv</p>
Tue., Dec. 23, 2025 at 2:52 AM (EST)	From: Gordon Watts (To: Dr. Peterman ; Cc: Dr. Dyer ; Bcc: Dr. Jobe, Dr. Rydelnik)	Anna's infant soteriology Question / Universalist Leanings	<p>BibleQuestion_AnnasQuestion.pdf ** Peterman admitted "don't know" on prior program, but had Universalist leanings in his response to Anna; Watts had questions about Peterman's response, warns this creates a "100% vs. 50%" math delusion for at-risk parents to commit "altruistic filicide" (i.e., killing children for supposedly altruistic motives).</p>
Tue., Dec. 23, 2025 at 12:31 PM (EST)	From: Dr. Dyer (To: Gordon Watts ; Cc: Dr. Peterman, Jon Gauger, MR Programming Comments)	The "Misquote"	<p>BibleQuestion_TheMisquote.pdf ** High-tension exchange; Dyer claimed that Watts both "misunderstood—and then subsequently misquoted—me in your response below to Dr. Peterman," requested no more emails.</p>
Tue., Dec. 23, 2025 at 8:58	From: Gordon Watts (To: Dr. Dyer ; Cc: Dr. Peterman, Jon	Diplomatic response	<p>BibleQuestion_DiplomaticResponse.pdf ** Watts disclaims misquoting Dyer, challenged him to compare his original email with what was quoted, but apologised</p>

PM (EST)	Gauger, Dr. Jobe. Dr. Rydelnik, Dan Anderson, and "Tricia.McMillan@moody.edu," a misspelled email address; correct spelling is "Trish.McMillan@moody.edu," no 'a' in name, and two o's in Moody.edu)		for misunderstanding his intent; offered some closing thoughts on the dangers of infant regarding how it has been documented to tempt parents into altruistic filicide (so-called justifiable infanticide), but Watts failed to do proper Exegesis by looking at original Greek text of Heb. 9:27 to support his claims that KJV was correct in its rendering of "judgment" as not necessarily necessitating "final judgment," as Dyer had claimed. <u>** I note that the KJV uses "the judgment" (including the definite article) and specify that the Greek uses the article (ἡκρισις), which reinforces it as a specific, appointed event/process rather than a generic concept.</u>
Sat. 02-28-2026	From: Gordon, who calls in to Open Line Live (Moody Radio) ; To: host, Dr. Michael Rydelnik	Heb. 9:27 exegesis question re infant soteriology	** Gordon calls in to Open Line Live with host, Dr. Michael Rydelnik, and asks whether his technical exegesis of Heb. 9:27 is correct regarding the Greek word used for 'judgment' to reveal a critical distinction: The text uses the word κρίσις (krisis), which denotes a process, a trial, or an investigative "turning point." This is distinct from κρίμα (krima), which refers to the result of a judgment—the final decree or final sentence. POINT: Since Jesus could have said "krima" in Heb. 9:27 had He wanted to, but He didn't, so for theologians to say that death seals the baby's fate in incorrect -- and a huge theological motive for altruistic filicide -- parents killing babies to send them to heaven when a trusted theologian tells them that this shortcut 100% guarantees the baby will have 'eternal heaven' as a judgment [κρίμα (krima)] without an exercise of faith [κρίσις (krisis), which denotes a process, a trial, or an investigative "turning point."] ** Gordon recalls Dr. Rydelnik refused to take his similar question on air back in 2021, but with a better understanding of the issue, calls back to clarify theology -- and to save lives -- figuring Dr. Rydelnik has had time to think this through & not be caught off guard with too hard of a question. ** Call-screener, Cheyenne, tells Gordon that Dr. Rydelnik refuses to take that question on-air, and to ask his pastor for help with this. ** Editor's Note: Dr. Rydelnik doesn't keep his word to take any legitimate question ("Open" Line Live), and misses a chance to clarify correct theology to save lives by refuting the incorrect theological motive of a "guaranteed salvation" theology by infant universalism. (Note: Clip is short, but there's a break: I was "on hold" for about an hour.)

			<p>** Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 02-28-2026 program in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** OPEN-20260228-H1_Heb9-27_Exegesis_WhyWasQuestionTooHard_MP3.mp3 ** OPEN-20260228-H1_Heb9-27_Exegesis_WhyWasQuestionTooHard_MP4.mp4 ** OPEN-20260228-H1_Heb9-27_Exegesis_WhyWasQuestionTooHard_MOV.mov ** OPEN-20260228-H1_Heb9-27_Exegesis_WhyWasQuestionTooHard_WMV.wmv</p>
<p>Sat. 03-21-2026</p>	<p>From: Fran in GA, question ; To: Dr. Michael Rydelnik (host)</p>	<p>Dead in Christ / Infant soteriology question</p>	<p>** Dr. Rydelnik takes this caller's question (but not Gordon's), and says he's uncertain, but leans towards "all babies go to heaven."</p> <p>Fran, in Georgia, listening to WPLE, calls in to ask Dr. Michael Rydelnik about where the Bible says that the dead in Christ will rise first: Fran asks what happens to those who are still in the womb, or who've been aborted, or who die before the age of accountability. How will they be raised? Dr. Rydelnik admits that Scripture isn't clear on this issue, but he leans towards the belief that all babies go to heaven and alludes to King David's infant who died, and David said he would go to his child. Dr. Rydelnik admits that some people "get mad" about his belief that all babies go to heaven because of the implicit altruistic filicide (murder of children to "send them to heaven" or for other altruistic motives). Rydelnik says the infants haven't sinned.</p> <p><i>Editor's Note: If he doesn't want these pro-life folk mad, perhaps he should abandon an unscriptural infant universalism view that provides a Scriptural warrant for Altruistic Filicide.</i></p> <p>He cites Deut. 29:29 about the hidden things of The Lord, and assures listeners that The Lord will be just. But, like before, doesn't grapple with the harder question of how a baby will exercise faith, or if they'll have a shortcut to 'eternal' salvation without faith in Jesus. <i>Editor's Note: Just as many see no prohibition against animals being in heaven or Millennium, I see no prohibition against babies being in Millennium to have a chance to exercise faith – not prohibited, but not guaranteed.</i></p> <p>** Audio / Notes of this question on Sat. 03-21-2026 program in 4 formats -- short "Fair Use" clips: ** OPEN-20260321-H1_RydelnikBabyUniversalism_MP3.mp3</p>

			<p>** OPEN-20260321-H1_RydelnikBabyUniversalism_MP4.mp4</p> <p>** OPEN-20260321-H1_RydelnikBabyUniversalism_MOV.mov</p> <p>** OPEN-20260321-H1_RydelnikBabyUniversalism_WMV.wmv</p>
<p>Sun., March 22, 2026 at 3:39 PM (EDT)</p>	<p>From: Gordon Watts (To: Gordon Watts)</p>	<p>File copy of research on several aspects of the previous infant soteriology Bible question submitted to Dr. Dyer</p>	<p>BibleQuestion_GeminisTakeOnCharlieDyerAndMoody.pdf ** Gemini's Technical Exegesis of Heb. 9:27 & Filicide Warning for Dr. Charlie Dyer & MOODY RADIO. <i>Excerpt:</i></p> <p>"You asked me to "refine the Legal/Medical warning" and were unclear on what that meant. Let me clarify:</p> <p>By "Legal/Medical Warning," I mean a specific section of your argument that moves away from Bible verses and speaks the language of Forensics (Law) and Psychiatry (Medicine). This is crucial because if you want to warn an institution like Moody, you must speak to their <i>liability</i> and <i>risk management</i>, not just their theology.</p> <p>Here is the Refined "Clarion Cry" / Legal-Medical Warning Section for your Statement of Record. This is designed to be the "Cold Water" that wakes them up to the real-world danger.</p> <hr/> <p>SECTION 3: THE "CLARION CRY" — MEDICAL & LEGAL RISK ANALYSIS To: Dr. Dyer, The Land and the Book, and Moody Radio Leadership</p> <p>Re: The Foreseeable Danger of "Altruistic Filicide" Motivated by Soteriology</p> <p>1. The Medical Diagnosis: "Altruistic Filicide"</p> <p>In forensic psychiatry, "Altruistic Filicide" is a documented classification where a parent kills their child <i>out of love</i>, believing death to be in the child's best interest. Unlike localized abuse, this is often driven by a delusion that the parent is "saving" the child from a fate worse than death.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ** The Theological Trigger:** If a parent suffers from a distortion of reality (postpartum

			<p>psychosis, severe depression, or schizophrenia) and they hear a respected theologian teach that "Death before the Age of Accountability guarantees 100% entry into Heaven," while "Growth into adulthood carries a risk of rejecting Christ (Hell)," the theologian has inadvertently provided the motive for the crime.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The "Shortcut" Logic: To a distorted mind, the math is absolute: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • * Option A (Life): 50% chance of Heaven / 50% chance of Hell. • * Option B (Death now): 100% chance of Heaven. • * Conclusion: Murder becomes an act of mercy."
Date TBA	From: Gordon Watts (To: TBA)	Potential response if warranted	BibleQuestion_APOLOGY.pdf ** If any response is submitted: Gemini notes that altruistic filicide and proper Greek Technical Exegesis of Heb. 9:27 were both overlooked in Watts' reply -- a huge oversight and glaring omission on key, foundational facts on an important and life-threatening subject. Watts notes that he feels that he owes Dyer/MOODY an apology on several fronts: (i) failing to more-fully acknowledge his past work at answering Bible questions; (ii) failure to provide a proper Technical Greek Exegesis of Hebrews 9:27 to get a clear understanding; (iii) failure to grasp/share the magnitude of the altruistic filicide moral/legal dangers poses by infant universalism; and, (iv) failure to more-quickly share a 2nd dream Watts had about his friend, Dr. Charlie Dyer that greatly concerned/worried Watts.
Date TBA	From: TBA (To: Gordon Watts)	Potential response if applicable	BibleQuestion_MoodyResponse.pdf ** If any reply is given.
Date TBA	To: / From: recipients TBA	Placeholder table entry for any potential reply.	BibleQuestion_Reply.pdf ** In case new developments or replies ensue.
Sat. 04-25-2026	Gordon Watts (To: Dr. Dyer / Moody)	Forensic Brief: Altruistic Filicide	BibleQuestion_Reply2.pdf ** FilicideCaseStudy.pdf: Watts submits a 3-section forensic brief documenting 10+ cases (e.g., Andrea Yates , Gavin Hall) where "Shortcut Logic" provided the motive for murder.

III. Exegetical Solutions -- (The "How to Fix")
THE LINGUISTIC SAFEGUARD OF HEBREWS 9:27 and more

[[1.]] THE LINGUISTIC SAFEGUARD OF HEBREWS 9:27

The foundational theological "trigger" for altruistic filicide often rests on a misinterpretation of **Hebrews 9:27**: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." Contemporary teaching frequently inserts the qualifier "final" before "judgment," treating the event as an immediate sentencing to a fixed destination. However, a technical analysis of the original Greek reveals a critical distinction. The text uses the word **κρίσις (krisis)**, which denotes a *process*, a trial, or an investigative "turning point." This is distinct from **κρίμα (krima)**, which refers to the *result* of a judgment—the final decree or sentence.

By applying *krisis* here, the Writer of Hebrews establishes that death is not the moment of automatic "entry," but the commencement of an individual's accountability before God. When theologians replace *krisis* (process/turning point) with the functional equivalent of *krima* (final sentencing) for infants, they inadvertently create a "100% certainty" of salvation that does not exist in the text. Restoring the proper meaning of *krisis* ensures that death is viewed as an appointment with a Just Judge, rather than a mechanical "shortcut" to a guaranteed outcome.

*** While venerable commentators like Matthew Henry, John Calvin, or perhaps A.T. Robertson traditionally interpreted this as the 'final sentence' (*krima*), they did so without the benefit of today's forensic psychological data regarding how that specific interpretation acts as a catalyst for altruistic filicide.

Dr. Kenneth Wuest, however, a respected professor of New Testament Greek at the Moody Bible Institute, is an absolute titan in MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTES theological circles, and he provides documented lexical definitions to help clarify the meaning of Hebrews 9:27.

Greek Term	Strong's #	Meaning	Application in Heb. 9:27
<i>Krisis</i>	G2920	The Act of Judging / Investigation	An appointment for a process.
<i>Krima</i>	G2917	The Sentence / Final Decree	The eventual result of the <i>krisis</i> .

In Wuest's Word Studies in the Greek New Testament, he is famous for rigidly enforcing the morphological rules of Greek suffixes. Wuest repeatedly notes that Greek nouns ending in -sis (like *krisis*) denote the action or process of the verb, while nouns ending in -ma (like *krima*) denote the result of the action. This linguistic correction is a vital forensic safeguard; by removing the "certainty" of the result, we dismantle the rational motive for a mentally fragile parent to "ensure" salvation through the crime of filicide. See *also*: W.E. Vine (Vine's Expository Dictionary), BDAG (A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature by Bauer, Danker, Arndt, and Gingrich), the undisputed heavy-hitter of modern translation, which categorizes '***krisis***' as "the legal process of judging, judging, judgment" and reserves '***krima***' for "the decision of a judge, verdict." Cf: Richard Trench (Synonyms of the New Testament).

The *Krisis* vs. *Krima* Distinction

Matthew 12:41: "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment (*krisis*) with this generation, and shall condemn it..."

The Logic: This implies an interactive, comparative process occurring within the judgment period. If judgment were a final, immediate sentence at death, this comparison wouldn't be logically possible.

1 Peter 4:17: "For the time is come that judgment (*krisis*) must begin at the house of God..."

The Logic: This proves that crisis has a start date and a duration. It is a "season" or an "event" with a chronological flow.

Revelation 20:4: "...and judgment (*krima*) was given unto them..."

The Logic: This describes the authority to pass final sentences. It is a verdict – the end-state of the judicial process.

Hebrews 6:2: "...and of eternal judgment (*krima*)."

The Logic: This is the most powerful citation for this distinction. Just three chapters before Hebrews 9:27, the author uses *krima* to refer to the **eternal, final verdict**.

The Forensic Argument: If the author of Hebrews meant that death brings an immediate final sentence, he would have used *krima* (as he did in 6:2). By switching to *krisis* in 9:27, he is explicitly pointing to an appointment for an investigative process. I don't imply that **all judgment is delayed, but rather that Hebrews 9:27 establishes the appointment for the process, not the finality of the sentence**.

EXTRA CREDIT – The Septuagint (LXX) Connection

The Septuagint is the Koine Greek translation of the Old Testament, completed roughly 200–300 years before Christ.

Why it matters for Section III: The New Testament writers (including the author of **Hebrews**) primarily quoted from the **Septuagint**, not the Hebrew Masoretic text.

The Linguistic Bridge: When Daniel 7:10 says "the judgment was set," the Septuagint uses the exact same word as Hebrews 9:27—*krisis*.

The Proof: By showing that the Greek translation of Daniel uses *krisis* for a courtroom scene where "books are opened," we clearly see that the "investigative process" is the intended meaning of the word in a biblical context in Heb. 9:27, not a final verdict / sentence: This leaves the door open for The Judge to enter ANY appropriate sentence, i.e., it avoids "putting God in a box," by a misunderstanding – and subsequent misrepresentation – of Heb. 9:27 – by "adding to the Word of God" a "final" judgment/sentence which is NOT in the text, thereby creating a "sandy foundation" upon which prohibited universalism is created.

Applying Kenneth Wuest's documented lexical definitions of κρίσις (krisis, the act of judging) vs. κρίμα (krima, the sentence rendered) to the text of Hebrews 9:27, we find that – while modern translations often imply a singular "final judgment" – the presence of the definite article in the Greek **κρίσις (krisis)** supports the KJV's specific focus. As noted in various lexicons, krisis refers to the act of investigating or deciding (the trial), whereas **κρίμα (krima)** refers to the sentence rendered (the verdict). If death leads to a krisis (process), the "Immediate Finality" used to justify altruistic filicide is Scripturally undermined. *** This specific linguistic data, *alone*, renders the interpretation of 'final sentencing' in Hebrews 9:27 structurally untenable." ***

[[2.]] OSAS is irrefutable proof that all babies aren't saved

If "once saved, always save," and if all babies are saved, then all adults are saved, but as we know that's not true (Matt. 7:13-14, many walk the wide road), then one or both bases is incorrect. Moody holds OSAS, so infant universalism is false. *** **This point – all by itself – proves that all babies are NOT automatically saved, as some allege.** ***

[[3.]] LAZARUS testifies as a counterpoint to "final judgment" interpretation of Heb. 9:27

If some interpret Heb. 9:27 to mean that physical death closes the door for any further free will and "locks in" salvation, then this theory is shown false by the case of Lazarus (John 11:1-46). Jesus made sure to not heal Lazarus til he had been dead four (4) days (John 11:17), well-past the "3-day" standard Jewish scholars set **[[**]]**, to show that Lazarus wasn't just "sleeping" or "kind of" dead, but rather, Lazarus was totally dead, graveyard dead, so if death closes opportunity for free will and "locks in" salvation, then Lazarus would've lost all free will, here. We have no records of such an event, so obviously physical death does not close the door to free will exercise re salvation. **[[**]]** *Editor's Note: According to some midrashic tradition, the soul hovers over the body for either three days: see e.g., Genesis Rabbah 100:7, Leviticus Rabbah 18:1, and Ecclesiastes Rabbah 12:6.* *** **This counterpoint ALONE shows that physical death doesn't close the door to free will and its use for salvation.** ***

[[4.]] Another example disproving a link between physical death and "final" judgment

The opposite is also true: Above (#3) we see free will CAN happen after physical death (proving the two events are not strictly linked). There is also Scriptural warrant for the opposite: the capacity for "free will" regarding salvation being lost BEFORE physical death occurs.

If physical death is the sole mechanism (*'Biological determinism', so to speak*) that "locks in" one's eternal state, then a living person would always have the free-will capacity to repent right up until their final breath. Scripture thoroughly refutes this: Christ explicitly warned of the "Unpardonable Sin" (Matthew 12:31-32), a state where a living person is barred from forgiveness "in this age." Furthermore, Paul describes living individuals whom God "gave over to a debased mind" (Romans 1:28) or whose consciences were "seared with a hot iron" (1 Timothy 4:2), rendering them incapable of repentance. The author of Hebrews confirms it is "impossible... to renew them again to repentance" (Hebrews 6:4-6) if certain conditions are met, even while the physical body remains alive. Therefore, the moment of physical death cannot logically be the sole boundary line for spiritual culpability or the cessation of free will. This proves that those who interpret Heb. 9:27 to link "physical death" with "the closed door" to free

will are wrong—two counter examples (3 and 4, here) exist to disprove that interpretation of Heb. 9:27.

Yes, for some, physical death ****will**** be the time of final judgment, but that is not a guaranteed link.

[[5.]] The Davidic argument disproven by David's own words elsewhere

Some cite 2 Samuel 12:23 as proof that David's son would go to heaven forever: [""But now that he is dead, why should I go on fasting? Can I bring him back again? I will go to him, but he will not return to me." 2 Sam 12:23, NIV]]. However, this is an unclear verse: First, David might've referred to sheol the grave. Secondly (more likely) David shares his opinion, but his opinion is NOT theological fact, as shown by counter-examples: 1 Samuel 27:1 ("And David said in his heart, I shall now perish one day by the hand of Saul...", KJV: This was a flat-out false statement of faith. God had already promised him the throne. Or: Psalm 22:1 "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?...", KJV: FALSE – These are the opinion of David (in emotional distress over his son's death), not theological fact, which show that citation of 2 Sam 12:23 as theological fact is using an "unclear" verse to interpret a "clear" verse on the requirements of faith: HERMENEUTIC PRINCIPLE: unclear passages (like 2 Sam 12:23) are understood in light of clearer ones, like John 14:6, Acts 2:38, Acts 16:31, John 3:16, Heb. 11:6, and Eph. 2:8-9, which all show that faith is a *Sine Qua Non* required element, and "David's opinion" does not trump theological fact.

[[6.]] Is God really less capable or less just/fair?

A concept in MATTHEW 7:9-11 [[9 Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? 10 Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? 11 If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?]] and in LUKE 18:1-8 [[Parable of The Unjust Judge]] cf: Jesus as ULTIMATE Judge in JOHN 5:22 [["22 For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:"]] shows God will NOT be less just than mere mortals. Cf: *Psalm 89:14 — "Righteousness and justice are the foundation of Your throne."*

**** 6a:** If a mere "mortal" judge, being evil, knows how to issue both "FINAL" and "interlocutory" or "NONFINAL" judgments (as the situation call for), how much more shall JUDGE JESUS give "fair and just" judgments to those who die (meaning Jesus is NOT precluded by the language of Heb. 9:27 from giving a post-mortem judgment to deceased infants who never got a "first chance" to hear gospel, thus this wouldn't be a "second chance."

**** 6b:** If a hurricane lights down on a University Campus and shuts down final exams for ALL classes, what college professor is just going to "Give A's to all students" who never had a chance to take final exams? If mere mortal college professors are fair, how much MORE fair is GOD ALMIGHTY to deceased infants in giving them an opportunity of Free Will? (You really don't aspire to call God Almighty less capable or less just than human judges or human college professors, do you?)

**** 6c:** If angels had free will (one-third fell), as do adults on earth, and those in Millennium (cf: Rebellion in Rev. 20:9), and The Millennium features free will (Rev. 20:9), people in physical bodies (Isaiah 65:20), and infants (Isaiah 11:6-8), and if we have successfully shown respected Moody scholars accept Heb. 9:27 to NOT necessarily mean "final judgment/sentence), then why would a fair/just God **not** give more fairness to deceased infants than humans in 6a and 6b, above?

[[7.]] Commonly cited passages that are *NOT* on-topic, thus DON'T apply

** 7a: Passages where Jesus describes little children (Except ye be converted, and become as little children, Mt 18:3) are general descriptions of children's differences with adults, not guarantees for all children (Example: Children obeying their parents and God's Law are promised length of days in general, NOT in all cases: Deut. 11:18-21, Prov 3:1-2)

** 7b: Passages describing children's angels seeing the face of God don't address children's character –or eternal salvation.

** 7c: Likewise, passages like Mark 9:37 (“Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me:...”) address standards of treatment –not character of the children in question here.

** 7d: Jer 1:5, which states “Before I formed you in the womb I knew you” doesn't address or state whether the person is saved or lost.

** 7e: Gen. 18:25b "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" **-- TRUE: *That being the case, this proves that God would not approve of adding a new meaning to Jesus' quote in Heb. 9:27 not actually in the Scripture – or creating another Gospel (2 Cor. 11:4 ; Gal. 1:6) that lacks the Sine Qua Non element of faith. (John 14:6, Acts 2:38, Acts 16:31, John 3:16, Heb. 11:6, and Eph. 2:8-9)***

** 7f: Deut. 29:29 "The secret *things belong* unto the LORD our God: but those *things which* are revealed *belong* unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law." **-- TRUE: *But this is not a license to add to God's Word, by adding a new meaning to Jesus' quote in Heb. 9:27 not actually in the Scripture. (Quoting Jesus correctly, but misunderstanding, and subsequently misrepresenting Jesus' words, in Heb. 9:27, is adding to The Word of God.)***

** 7g: Ps. 89:14 — “Righteousness and justice are the foundation of Your throne.” **-- TRUE: *But see above.***

** 7h: Is. 55:8-9 -- 8 For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. 9 For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts. **-- TRUE: *But see above.***

** 7i: 1 Cor. 13:12 -- “For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.” **-- TRUE: *But see above.***

** 7j: Lastly, passages like Deut. 1:39 address little ones (children & babies) during the Moses/Joshua era entering the promised land --NOT heaven!

[[8.]] IMAGE OF GOD implies FREE WILL

Man is created in the image of God (Gen. 1:27) – with Free Will (Ez. 18:20); thus, denying some deceased infants free will is an insult to the image of God. (All dogs go to heaven -or so the saying goes, but humans aren't dogs -and babies aren't robots stripped of free will; to do so would be offensive to the nature of God, as we are created in His image!)

Cf: Ezekiel 18:20 — Very strong for individual responsibility (“The soul who sins shall die.

The son shall not bear the guilt of the father...”), i.e., free will / personal accountability.

[[9.]] REVEALED WORD

God does nothing without first revealing it to His prophets (Amos 3:7); thus, if killing her unborn child or toddler would "lock in" a "100% 'Guarantee' of Salvation" for the child, God would put this "shortcut" in Scripture – *That he did **not** do.*

[[10.]] TWISTING GOD'S ARM TO FORCE ACCEPTANCE OF ONE'S CHILD by ALTRUISTIC FILICIDE?

Some people think that they can 'cast a spell' on God and "make" Him grant eternal salvation to their child. **You can't "make" The Maker do *anything*** --and to even consider this is offensive to God! God Almighty does **what** He wants **when** He wants -and does not consult with mere mortals to get permission. GOD ALMIGHTY is both capable and just (see, e.g., point 6., above, and Gen. 18:25b).

[[11.]] CONSIDER JESUS vs. SODOM

Matthew 11:20-25 quotes Jesus saying that it'd be better off for Sodom (a REAL wicked place whose citizens were KILLED by God and died in their sins without repenting) than for some contemporary cities; however, there is no WAY that Sodom could be 'better off' if they didn't have a 'postmortem chance' to hear the Gospel, repent, & get saved AFTER they died. **So, since we know Jesus is NOT a liar,** this proves the existence of some sort of chance for them to get saved AFTER they died –not a 2nd chance, since they never got their 1st chance, and, God being fair & impartial, would likewise grant such a chance to hear the Gospel, repent, & get saved to babies who died without having first heard the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

[[12.]] THE FIRST RESURRECTION ADDRESSED – (Revelation 20:4-6)

Some point out that those who are resurrected in the first resurrection (those killed for their faith) cannot go to hell (Revelation 20:4-6), since they had already passed the test of loyalty to Jesus. **** RESPONSE:** If these people refused the mark, how then can this include babies who die as infants? They did not refuse because they COULD not refuse: Isaiah 7:16 (KJV) “For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good...” [He was under the age of accountability, as discussed above.] God, being just, would not hold them accountable for not doing that for which they were incapable, thus would not render final judgment one way or another.

Point: While I see no Scripture that mandates or requires deceased infants to be included in the 1,000-year Millennium Reign of Jesus, neither do I see any Scripture that precludes or forbids it. Thus, while we don't know the precise timing and location of their opportunity to exercise Free Will – nonetheless, neither do we know the “day of the rapture,” either. Yet, lack of knowledge of the “rapture timing” is **NOT** a license to deny the rapture's existence. Likewise, lack of knowledge of the “Free Will timing” for deceased infants is **NOT** a license to deny the existence of this opportunity to hear the Gospel – as all others have had a chance to hear.

This is not to say that those living elsewhere in the world who might not have heard the gospel will get such treatment: Romans 1 and 2 say that creation and conscience will be evidence to heathen & gentiles:

**** GOD revealed in CREATION:** “19 Because that which may be known of God is

manifest in them; for God hath shewed *it* unto them. 20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:” [Rom. 1:19-20] Cf: “THE heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.” [Psalm 19:1]

**** GOD revealed in CONSCIENCE:** “14 For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: 15 Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and *their* thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;).” [Rom. 2:14-15] Cf: “6 But without faith *it is* impossible to please *him*: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and *that* he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” [Heb. 11:6]

[[13.]] LINGUISTIC SAFEGUARDS in Heb. 11:6 ; John 3:16 ; John 14:6 (Believing and Faith)

** Hebrews 11:6: “But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” – **The Greek word for 'faith,' is 'pivstiß' (Strong's number 4102, transliterated: 'pistis' or 'pisteos'),** and means, in this context, relating to God: “the conviction that God exists and is the creator and ruler of all things, the provider and bestower of eternal salvation through Christ.”

** John 3:16: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” – **The Greek word for 'believeth,' is 'pisteuvw' (Strong's number 4100, transliterated: 'pisteuo' or 'pisteuon'),** and means, in this context, relating to God: “to think to be true, to be persuaded of, to credit, place confidence in.

** John 14:6b: “...no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” **The Greek word in John 14:6 is “oujdeivß,” Strong's Number 3,762, which literally means “no one, nothing.”** Thus, infants, too, **must** have faith to be saved –and my claim that faith involves free will –for EVERYBODY (not just some) is backed by scriptures. (Cf: John 14:6, Acts 2:38, Acts 16:31, John 3:16, Heb. 11:6, and Eph. 2:8-9) If infants can't exercise free will now, then God – being just – will NOT call them to faith without first equipping them to so do. (*Is God both capable and just – or not?*)

** *There is no free pass – No Free Lunch: **Denying some infants a chance to exercise free will to accept Christ would violate Heb. 11:6, John 3:16, and John 14:6, the 'bright line' standard for salvation.** Scripture cannot be satisfied unless the person exercises free will, and if someone tells you any differently, they're just blowing smoke. God, being fair, wouldn't deny any person a chance to accept Christ: NO man comes to the Father BUT by the Son. Period.*

[[14.]] Matt. 24:19 / Mark 13:17 pregnant / nursing women flight disprove infant universalism

Jesus gives a specific “woe” in Matthew 24:19 and Mark 13:17: “Woe to those who are pregnant and to those who are nursing infants in those days!”

(A) CONCEPTION RATES: Under standard Pre-Tribulation rapture timing (which places this flight ~3.5 years after the Rapture), this statement creates real problems for any theory of automatic infant salvation / rapture: If all unborn and infant children are guaranteed salvation (and therefore raptured), we should not see pregnant & nursing women as a continuing demographic group several years later during the Tribulation flight: Historical data from wars & disasters confirm that birth rates drop sharply — often by 20–50% or more — during times of extreme danger, displacement, and societal collapse. **The idea of normal conception rates continuing at the height of God's wrath is demographically strained.**

(B) The Covenant/Parental Trap: Critics often argue these Tribulation infants remain

because their parents are unsaved. However, appealing to parental status proves that infancy itself was never the trigger. If parental faith determines an infant's presence in the Tribulation, then infancy alone never guaranteed salvation pre-Tribulation. This would imply an inconsistency that God wouldn't do: 1 Peter 1:17; Colossians 3:25; Acts 10:34; and, Romans 2:11 all show that God is impartial, unbiased.

(C) In Context with OSAS: When this passage is combined with the OSAS argument above (Argument #2), the case becomes even stronger. Automatic infant salvation, paired with Once Saved Always Saved, leads to universalism — a conclusion that contradicts the Narrow Gate (Matthew 7:13-14, see also John 3:36, Matt. 25:46, Rev. 20:15.). Even attempts to explain this away by saying “these infants remain because their parents were unsaved” backfire: it proves that infancy alone was never the saving mechanism. Parental status ends up mattering, which destroys the “guaranteed shortcut” claim.

Note: While this argument is secondary to the OSAS reductio in #2, it adds important narrative and practical weight against any form of infant universalism – and does, however, strongly challenge any teaching that offers a guaranteed “shortcut” to heaven based solely on dying young — a shortcut that has, in many documented cases, contributed to tragic “altruistic filicide,” as shown by well-documented facts: “Every year, thousands of children are killed by their parents. Some of these killings are committed by mentally ill mothers who believe that death is in their children's best interest. This category of killings is called maternal altruistic filicide.” “Murder and a Mother’s Love: Understanding Maternal Altruistic Filicide and Reshaping the Legal System’s Approach to Mentally Ill Mothers Who Kill Their Children,” Author: Morgan Woodbridge, 32 J. L. & Pol’y 251 (2024), Volume 32, Issue 2, Article 7, DATE: 5-1-2024, Quote from page 251, Law Journals at BrooklynWorks, and cited in the introduction.

[[15.]] The Requirement of Personal Faith and Response

Salvation in the New Testament is consistently tied to personal faith and response where moral accountability exists. This is not optional — it is the *Sine Qua Non* (essential element) of salvation:

- John 3:16 – “whosoever believes” is saved
- John 3:36 – “He who does not believe... the wrath of God abides on him”
- John 14:6 – “No one comes to the Father except through Me”
- Acts 2:38 – “Repent...”
- Acts 16:31 – “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you will be saved”
- Ephesians 2:8-9 – Saved by grace through faith
- Hebrews 11:6 – “Without faith it is impossible to please Him”

Infants lack the capacity for conscious faith, belief, and repentance. Therefore, placing them in a completely separate “automatic salvation” category creates a second pathway to heaven that bypasses the clear New Testament requirement of personal faith.

If God calls infants to salvation, He will also equip them to respond — because God does not call anyone to do what He will not enable (a principle consistent with His character). Since infants cannot exercise conscious faith in this life, a just and truthful God must provide them an opportunity in another time, such as during the Millennial Kingdom (Revelation 20:4) or in the resurrection of “the rest of the dead” (Revelation 20:5).

Note: While Scripture does not guarantee this opportunity for every deceased infant, neither does it prohibit or preclude it. **The absence of explicit details is *not* license to invent a “guaranteed shortcut” that contradicts the consistent biblical requirements of faith.**

[[16.]] EDITOR'S NOTE (regarding "where are deceased infants right now," distinct from 'eternal' fate)

** In prior theological discussions and communications, the question was posed as to "where are deceased infants right now" (distinct from their eternal fate). In prior communications, I supported the 2—3 witnesses standard (Deut. 17:6, Deut. 19:15, Matt. 18:16, II Cor. 13:1, I Tim. 5:19, Heb.10:28), and, relying upon dreams, visions, NDE's, and OBE's, there was much testimony that people saw deceased infants in heaven. Dr. Charlie Dyer responded to me with scepticism, citing Paul's testimony in Acts 14:19–20, in which he tells readers that he "heard inexpressible things, things that man is not permitted to tell." While I don't see this as on-topic or necessarily precluding the testimony of others (it addressed **PAUL'S** experience), nonetheless, I concede that even with 2-3 witnesses, it's possible that people lie – or make mistakes – and that the "2-3" witnesses standard is a **general principle**, *not* a brightline standard. Also, the "current" state of these infants is nowhere near as important as the "eternal" fate – **so, for that reason, I will agree with Dr. Charlie Dyer that this matter is sufficiently uncertain** – and refrain from addressing it in this Executive Summary – because I want to avoid unnecessary distractions, and keep "the main thing" the main thing.

Note to self: In my email to Dr. Gerald Peterman and Dr. Charlie Dyer, dated Tuesday, December 23, 2025 at 12:58 AM, I brought up this point: "...if all little children are saved, and "once saved, always saved" is true – as many believe – then ALL people are saved because they once were as children," but in his response, later that day, dated Date: Tue, Dec 23, 2025 at 12:31 PM, Charlie does not address this salient point. In all fairness, the email exchanges were lengthy, and Charlie has a busy schedule, but – strictly-speaking – he didn't answer all of my question's point in his reply (that was a human error on his part), and neither of us brought up the Greek language of Heb. 9:27, both of us were at fault, here – me, moreso than him for 2 reasons: First, it was my question, and secondly, while he's smarter than me overall, I'm a specialist on infant soteriology, and thus, LUKE 12:48 places more blame on me than on him. This is a reminder that we're all human and should be patient and forgiving on one another. This executive summary aims to address those areas that were overlooked first pass because of (a) the life/death nature of altruistic filicide – something I overlooked first pass, and secondly: (b) fidelity to Scriptures is key: We must trust God to be right even on 'hard' topics that catch us off guard. Try to briefly incorporate this in any potential followup and apology. Perhaps, if I do email Charlie and offer an apology for misunderstanding his position, followup with a brief note online to the effect: *Dr. Dyer, I have just submitted a formal Forensic Brief to your email regarding the exegesis of Hebrews 9:27 and its clinical impact on altruistic filicide. I am sending this via the portal to ensure it reached you safely through institutional filters. My deep apologies for not thinking to do a linguistic exegesis of the nuances in the original Greek of Heb. 9:27, which offer better clarity to address the confusion we initially had on this important topic: Both fidelity to Scripture as well as Scriptural ways to dissuade the ever-growing altruistic filicide phenomenon are of great importance to us "pro-life" and "sola scriptura" believers. I look forward to your scholarly perspective. -- Gordon///*

IV. Appendix: Proposed Clarification for Broadcast/Print Mailbags (Q/A Session)

Proposed Q/A format for live program --- Note to self: Hold myself to same standards as I ask Dr. Charlie Dyer & other MOODY RADIO shows to do: Publish my own Q/A segment.

JON GAUGER (*proposed dialogue, not actual transcript, here & below*) says: **Charlie, today**

we have several questions on the same topic, so why don't we go ahead and take them all together?

DR. CHARLIE DYER: That sounds great, Jon! Today, we have a guest host in the studio, with us, a listener named Gordon, from Florida. He will be "pinch hitting" and helping us in an area of his research on a hard topic. Dr. Gerald Peterman is taking the week off for some much deserved rest, so let's get to it.

JON GAUGER: Our first question comes to use from Anna, who asks: "what happens to babies who die in miscarriage, and will I meet them in heaven, & will they grow up into adults?" We took this question before, but with an expert in studio, we'll revisit this because we missed key nuances. Gordon will help us here.

Our second question is from Mildred, who wrote in, and she said: "I've heard the teaching that all babies go to heaven. If this is so, would it [not] be better for all people to just die in infancy – and [thus] avoid the possibility of hell? If all babies go to heaven?" Wow, tough take. OPEN LINE LIVE took that question from Mildred back in 2016, with out colleague, Dr. Michael Rydelnik and Deb Solomon hosting the program, but it's a common question—so, we're revisiting it afresh.

Our third and Final question comes to us from Gordon, listening in on WKES in Plant City, Florida. Gordon writes: "You are one of my favourite Bible Answer hosts because you always try to respond to genuine questions, and I can testify that you've always responded to my occasional Bible question down through the years. Thank you for responding to my email back in 2021, where you write that Hebrews 9:27 supports the general principle that "unless someone is born again, physical death closes the door to any further opportunity to respond spiritually. One's eternal destiny is fixed at that point," to support your view that deceased infants have no opportunity to exercise Free Will and hear/accept the gospel, and thus, it is your view that deceased infants will automatically go to heaven. My question, then, is this: How can you hold to that view, when the Greek word 'krisis' is used in Hebrews 9:27, to denote Judgment as a process or non-final investigation, instead othe Greek word 'krima', which means a final judgment or sentence. If it's alright, I have a second, related question that I overlooked last time: If "once saved, always save," is a true theology, and if all babies are saved, as you say in your response to me, then all adults are saved. But as we know that's not true (Matt. 7:13-14, many walk the wide road), thus one or both bases is incorrect. Moody holds OSAS (once saved, always saved), as do you, so the other premise – that all babies are automatically saved, must be false. This point – all by itself – proves that "infant universalism," as some call it – the view that all babies are NOT automatically saved, as some allege – can not be true. Can you clarify the apparent contradiction between OSAS and your infant universalism view? Thank you!" Gordon asks 2 good questions, so this segment, we have 4 questions in total from listeners.

DR. CHARLIE DYER: Wow, that's a lot! And, in an ironic case of "man bites dog," we have Gordon here in studio with us to help us tackle these 4 questions – 2 of which are his own questions! Gordon, it's your turn!

GORDON WAYNE WATTS: Thank you for having me on, Charlie! It's a pleasure! This is a sensitive subject, so we must be respectful in approaching this hard topic, as many women lose children, and in fact, about 1-in-4 pregnancies – yes, 25% -- end in

miscarriage, so almost all families are affected by this tragic loss. Let's address the last one first:

As the listener noted, the original Greek uses the word 'krisis', which refers to a process or a 'trial' rather than a final verdict ('krima'). This suggests that while everyone faces the 'Day of the Lord' process, the final sentence is not a foregone conclusion based solely on the timing of death. This prevents the dangerous 'Shortcut Logic' that some have used to justify tragedy of altruistic filicide (killings one's children for altruistic motives) under the guise of 'guaranteed' salvation. Thus, to answer Gordon's question, we know that infants aren't capable of faith, and we know that faith is a requirement to be saved, as required by John 14:6, Acts 2:38, Acts 16:31, John 3:16, Heb. 11:6, and Eph. 2:8-9. First, we must be clear and admit that Scripture is silent on the precise time and place for these deceased infants to have a "fair" chance to accept/reject the gospel with their Free Will, so the view that these infants will reappear in the 1,000-year Millennium Reign (Rev. 20:4) or be among the "Rest of the Dead" (Rev. 20:5) is NOT guaranteed. Where Scripture is silent, we must trust God.

However, Scripture is not silent on God's character of being just, fair, and more-than-capable, like human judges who often enter "non-final" judgments, so while – like the "rapture timing" debate, we don't know the timing of the rapture, that's not a licence to deny the rapture. How much more fair/capable is God than mere mortal judges! Thus, we believe, based on Scripture, that, God, being fair, will give those babies a chance to hear the gospel and respond. Some feel that the rebellion in Rev. 20:9 includes some adults who perished as infants, and were in the millennium, which is not prohibited by any Scripture. But it's also not guaranteed-- and, like the "pre-trib" theory, Scripturally-possible, but not guaranteed, and we must trust God, here.

*Gordon's second question of OSAS (once saved, always saved) is a 'clincher' to defeat infant universalism. As he says, in his email, if all infants were saved, and once saved, always saved, than all adults would be saved. This is simply not true, so one of the bases, at the least, must not be true. Thus, we must avoid this commonly-held belief that many on the wide road believe. Deceased infants CAN go to heaven, but only through approved means: By Grace and through Faith – not of works, lest any man should boast. Again, if you didn't catch Gordon's point: If all babies are saved, and OSAS, than all ****people**** are saved, but this isn't true, so we must dig deeper.*

Thirdly, to address Anna's 2-part question, "what happens to babies who die in miscarriage, and will I meet them in heaven, & will they grow up into adults?," I'll take the last part first. Many people claim to have visited with children lost in miscarriages, abortions, etc., in NDE's (near death experiences), OBE's (out of body experiences), dreams, or visions. With that many witnesses, it seems likely that is true. But the "2-3 witnesses" Scriptural standard is a general principle, not a brightline standard, so, while, yes, I lean in that direction, I must admit that we don't know, and frankly, the eternal fate is the "main" question. As to what happens to them, and whether we'll meet them, again, Scripture is silent, so we must trust. But this much we can say: God is more-than capable of giving them a "fair shake" like both angels and most humans have: God's character is to not be unfair to ANY person—they'll get an opportunity to exercise faith / Free Will: Whom God calls, He equips – including these babies!

Lastly, Mildred asks an age-old toughie, which many have asked: If killing the baby

bumps salvation odds from less than 50% narrow road (current situation) to a 100% guarantee, then, yes, I agree with Dr. Rydelnik here: Eternal life is superior to temporary life because it is imperishable, offering an everlasting, unseen reality (2 Cor 4:18) "While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." (2 Cor. 4:18, KJV). But that assumes that we can force the hand of God, "make the Maker" accept our kids into heaven by killing them. But, based on our prior responses to the other questions, that assumption is false: Killing your child under the age of accountability to "send them to heaven," and assure aa 100% chance of eternal life is a false assumption: Parents, please don't kill your kids – it'll neither help nor hurt their "eternal salvation" odds – and, instead, only shed blood unnecessarily. Dr. Rydelnik really struggled with that question, and – no disrespect meant to him – he seemed to miss that the underlying assumption was false. But I know my dear colleague, Professor Michael Rydelnik, to be pro-life, as am I. He and Deb Solomon do, however, offer additional reasons to opt for life, and not kill your child if times get tough: 1. Image of God, 2. opportunity for faith, 3. service, 4. God's glory, and 5. free will.

JON GAUGER: Wow, good attention to detail. Thank you for sitting in with us this segment, Gordon. We'll offer a download of notes for this segment along with our MP3 audio. Dr. Rydelnik's Q/A section is in a recent news update on Gordon's blog, and MOODY RADIO producers will work to make that available to you, soon, too, because – while Michael missed the mark on the main point, he still works very hard and has a lot to offer listeners – and he, and Dr. Peterman, are especially helpful in fielding questions, so Charlie and I don't have as many. Thank you for listening. Segment 3, the questions and answers with The Land and The Book is over, and next, a devotional with Dr. Charlie Dyer.

