
Re: Program Contact Us! [#15048]

gww1210@aol.com <gww1210@aol.com>

Sat, Oct 23, 2021 at 6:56 PM

To: "Jon.Gauger@Moody.edu" <Jon.Gauger@moody.edu>, "eva.rydelnik@moody.edu" <eva.rydelnik@moody.edu>, "michael.rydelnik@moody.edu" <michael.rydelnik@moody.edu>, "rydelnik@messianicjourneys.org" <rydelnik@messianicjourneys.org>, "eva@messianicjourneys.org" <eva@messianicjourneys.org>
Cc: "charles.dyer@moody.edu" <charles.dyer@moody.edu>, "Thelandandthebook@moody.edu" <Thelandandthebook@moody.edu>, Gordon Watts <gww1210@aol.com>, Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>, "mark.job@moody.edu" <mark.job@moody.edu>

oops-- I overlooked a few recipients. My apologies.

Gordon

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

To: "charles.dyer@moody.edu" <charles.dyer@moody.edu>; "thelandandthebook@moody.edu" <thelandandthebook@moody.edu>; "mike.fabarez@moody.edu" <mike.fabarez@moody.edu>; "michael.fabarez@moody.edu" <michael.fabarez@moody.edu>; Dan Craig <dan.craig@moody.edu>

Cc: "openline@moody.edu" <openline@moody.edu>; "michael.rydelnik@moody.edu" <michael.rydelnik@moody.edu>; Gww1210@aol.com <gww1210@aol.com>; Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>; "mark.job@moody.edu" <mark.job@moody.edu>; "tricia.mcmillan@moody.edu" <tricia.mcmillan@moody.edu>; "michaelqwelch@gmail.com" <michaelqwelch@gmail.com>; Kuranda Robertson <office@calvaryonline.com>; "wgrudem@phoenixseminary.edu" <wgrudem@phoenixseminary.edu>

Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2021, 06:38:11 PM EDT

Subject: Re: Program Contact Us! [#15048]

Thanks for replying, Dr. Dyer. For the record, while profit is not my main motive, nonetheless, a workman is worthy of his wages, and I did do my due diligence to study to show myself approved: First, before emailing you: I wrote a book on this subject, which was given *top marks in reviews by many*-- ****including**** an old Baptist preacher, Rev. Jack Wellman, who actually changed his views on this and, thus, gave me 5 of 5 stars on my book (linked below -- **and attached in my email as a FREE GIFT to you**).

- <https://www.Amazon.com/When-Babies-Die-Where-Full-color-ebook/dp/B008J8RTOK>
- <https://www.BooksAMillion.com/p/Babies-Die/MR-Gordon-Wayne-Watts/9781478208839?id=5448103442036>
- <https://www.bol.com/nl/p/when-babies-die/9200000015559950/>

There should be five (5) attachments in my reply here: First, my book, 2nd, it's book cover (Kindle required separate PDFs), 3rd, a small "FairUse" audio sample of Dr. Rydelnik's Sat30Jan2016 OpenLineLive program where he attempted to answer Mildred as to why killing a baby to send it to heaven was not preferred to letting the child grow up and maybe reject Jesus; 4th, my show notes, 5th, Amazon's product description, with book reviews by Rev. Wellman & others. Oh, my bad: One other key thing: 6th & 7th are a PDF print of my call-in to another national show and the screenshot of <https://www.CoastToCoastAM.com/show/2020-11-13-show/> because my smartphone PDF printer didn't load images.

Tank you, once again, for responding, Charlie. See below, for my interlaced replies.

On Sat, Oct 23, 2021, 3:05 PM Dr. Charlie Dyer <charles.dyer@moody.edu> wrote:

Gordon,

Thanks for your email. I appreciate your writing, but I think you probably know that I can't accept your theory.

** you're welcome-- and thank *you* once again: Frankly, through, Dr. Dyer, while I know that not all accept my arguments, I am indeed surprised-- Since, frankly almost all theologians and pastors, with whom I have spoken, consider my exegesis to be at least Biblically possible -- including Rev. Wellman (who also wrote my forward) and Pastor Shane Skelton (Calvary Baptist, LAKELAND FLA lead pastor and distant cousin to actor Red Skelton-- see cc line above) who actually preached a sermon advancing the millennial theory (and without having read my book first as it was years before!).

I'm mildly surprised now days when ANYONE says my theory is biblically precluded! (But I'll be the 1st to admit that my theory is not proven as actually true -- only Biblically possible -- something no true theologians can say of ANY variant of Universalism -- including of course infant universalism.)

Here's why. You refer to the "biblically-solid millennial theory," but in reality there are no passages that say all babies who have died physically will be raised physically at the beginning of the Millennial kingdom and given a second chance.

** True! But neither are any passages existant to preclude such... and trust me, Dr. Dyer, after having mulled this over since the 10 or so years ago I 1st wrote this book (and plan to update it with input -- pro or con to be fair -- from other theologians), I still haven't found the "silver bullet" to Biblically preclude my 2 theories given in my book, the millennium theory being one, and the "rest of the dead" Rev.20 theory being the other, advocated by Buddy Cocherel and others.

In fact, your theory seems to contradict Hebrews 9:27. "Just as man is destined to die once, and after that to face judgment." In other words, the general principle is 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.

** Ok, excellent point, but who are we, mere mortals, to "put God in a box" and say that the "judgment" Sovereign King Jesus choses as judge is not to throw them into the millennium!?.

Remember, Charlie, the 1st principal of Exegesis in Hermeneutics: When confronted with 2 passages that appear to conflict, always pick the clear passage to interpret the ambiguous one -- not the other way around: Here, it is clear that faith is Sine Qua Non, and babies can't have faith, so, this is the standard against all else must be judged-- including your dubious application of Heb. 9:27 to say things that contradict known Scripture -- and can be read differently to harmonize the various Scriptures. When we can read 9:27 two ways, and one is impossible, we must accept the other as either true or at least possible.

I see a similar principle presented in Revelation 20:4-5. "I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded because of their testimony for Jesus and because of the word of God. They had not worshiped the beast or his image and had not received his mark on their foreheads or their hands. They came to life and reigned with Christ a thousand years. (The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended.) This is the first resurrection."

** Thank you for paying attention to passages that apply to the Millennium: You reference 2 groups-- the millennial group in Rev.20:4, and the "rest of the dead" in v.5, which I cover in my book and assess at the only 2 Biblically possible outcomes (unless we accept reincarnation, but while still possible as a form of "judgement," nonetheless, not a view accepted by most theologians, the undersigned Gordon Watts, included).

The ones being raised to life are believers who were martyred during the Tribulation period. But John then says "the rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended." It seems to me that "the rest of the dead" would

include the babies in your theory.

** As Mr. Spock from Star Trek might say, Fascinating! You take the minority view alluded to above, and I admit that while my gut feeling likes my theory better, nonetheless you and Rev. Buddy Cochran and others may be right here, as I address in my book.

So where do children come from in the millennium? They are the product of the men and women who come to faith in the Tribulation period, who are not martyred, and who then enter the Millennium in their natural bodies.

** True-- but this truth doesn't preclude either the "walk ins" (those at the end of the 7-year tribulation who "walk in" to the millennium-- or those babies who ARE in heaven-- right now -- for the time being -- but are thrust into the millennium! The COAST To Coast AM website appears to slightly misquote me as to the present whereabouts of the unborn babies-- but it appears an honest mistake-- and COAST -- Like 99.999% of all call-in shows -- let me call in -- agree or disagree-- so long as I was short, sweet, & polite. I am told, however, by numerous trusted sources that Dr. Michael Rydelnik instructed his call-screener to never take this question which both you, COAST, and many others have taken, calling it a whacky question -- my paraphrase-- and spreading such rumour behind my back that I ask whacky questions and do not take them even by E-mail where we can edit them for length -- While I am VERY VERY VERY upset and believe these several reports to be True, nonetheless, instead of embarrassing Michael publicly, I will ask him here via cc copy -- if any or all of these rumours are true before judging him here. Moreover, Charlie, I'm a Christian and am NOT trying to "stump the preacher" or ask hard questions or argue/insult anyone for their views -- you, for example-- seem to somewhat disagree-- but if/when I update my book, I will aspire to be respectful to ALL whom I quote-- whether their views agree with me or not-- and, no matter Dr. Rydelnik's view, I hope to include a respectful chapter on his view -- whatever it may be -- alongside my quotes from numerous other theologians-- most whom seem to agree with me.

As a token of my goodwill, I am including both his old Jan 30 2016 stumble (where he made many good points but froze in the clutch on the key point), as well as show notes and my book -- and your e-mail.

My point, Charlie, is that when Dr. Rydelnick considers that my question is one his program has NEVER addressed (tho it addressed similar questions), I don't want to catch him off guard: I KNOW by The Spirit that others will pressures him to finally stop running and address this theory -- as have many other call in programs -- and when he inevitably does address this, Dr. Dyer, I want Drs. Michael and Eva Rydelnik, Dr. Mike VanLaningham, and Dr. Mike Fabarez (fill in &/or co hosts) to all have enough tools to be able to research it.

I.e., while I firmly believe there is some truth to the rumours that Mr. Rydelnick purposely kept me on hold for >2 hrs and complained about my question being whacky (something NO other call-in program-- local or national has ever done), I am a Christisn- and not only appreciate that probably he's trying to do some good-- but also, to the extent he may sin, I wish to forgive and to return good to him in response to him: Hopefully all my research attached and linked and discussed in this thread will be of both practical help AND ENCOURAGEMENT that I'm trying to be a blessing to all -- him included.

Ok -- sorry about that, but I needed you as a Matt 18:16 witness as past attempts for resolution here failed.

Anyhow-- to continue my reply... see below...

They are pictured in Matthew 25:31–46 where they are referred to as the “sheep” who are invited to “take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you.” They will be the ones who will procreate and repopulate the earth.

** While I hadn't considered that connection, yes, it is certainly Biblically possible.

Now, back to the main issue. The reality is that the Bible doesn't specifically speak to the issue of what happens to young children who die, or to those who are stillborn or aborted before birth.

** Correct -- except to outlaw or preclude certain things -- which include any form of Universalist soteriology. Salvation = faith + grace (but works-- while a result of salvation-- are not a cause). Age, location, youth, or our opinions matter not: ONLY what

the Bible says matters. ☺ □□□□

And in cases where the Bible is silent, I believe we are left looking to the character of God for answers.

** and precedent-- which subsume His character: angels WERE in heaven and did NOT lose free will! Proof of that is that 1/3rd fell. Free Will does not require sin... but sin DOES Require free Will -- and both the heavenly Luciferian rebellion and the Rev.20 rebellion require free will to exist.

God is righteous, just, and loving. Jesus' death on the cross was sufficient to pay for the sins (and sinful nature) of all, and I believe God's love will extend to those who had absolutely no opportunity to exercise faith in any capacity before dying.

If all babies are saved-- and if once saved, always saved, then all people are saved. Your logic has many Biblical preclusions, if you infer eternal salvation outside the required standards. Besides, as we're created in the image of God, He didn't make us automaton robots or puppets. ☺ ...infants included.

This isn't the same as saying someone living elsewhere in the world who might not have heard the gospel will go to heaven. We know "the heavens declare the glory of God," and we also know that "without faith it is impossible to please God, because anyone who comes to him must believe that he exists and that he rewards those who earnestly seek him" (Heb. 11:6).

Good point, Dr. Dyer-- but remember, if God didn't strip those in remote parts of the world of free will, and God is impartial and fair, don't you see that stripping infants of free will would violate that known standard? Just because we don't know the time/place/method of salvation (or any other gift of God), we should not at all "put God in a box" and say "Stop", Mr. God: You didn't get our permission. One other Southern Baptist preacher who spoke privately (thus I shant reveal his name) told me privately (but not in a pulpit sermon!!) that while he didn't know the details, he believed that God would afford some volitional Free Will opportunity to said infants who perish before the age of accountability-- and, Dr. Dyer-- that's saying a lot: We Southern Baptists, while mostly pure in theology, are some of the worst in both obesity (Look this up if you didn't get the note) and the incorrect Universalist infant soteriology: Babies are probably in heaven for the moment, but so were Lucifer's angels-- and yet both will end up having gotten free will: God isn't a respecter of persons = he's not partial or unfair or biased.

But I believe God will extend His grace to those who die before every having an opportunity to recognize the reality of God through nature or to understand and respond to the that He does exist.

** Correct-- Romans 1 speaks of Conscience and Creation-- to which you allude.

I can't point to a specific verse,

** And that's the problem!... Ah hah! You are an honest theologian and admit it! And the defense rests it's case. ☺

but this seems to align with what I see the Bible teaching about God. However, I really can't find any biblical support for believing that God will bring babies back to life for a second chance.

** Dr. Dyer -- with all due respect, this would ****not**** be a "second chance" as said babies NEVER got a 1st chance. Please read my book, if you are able, as I think I addressed this point in it.

I know you will disagree, but I wanted to share why I hold what I do. I hope this is helpful.

The other guy I quote in my book, who dissented (and emailed me back) was in 1st place-- but you just bumped him from the top spot. Actually, you seem to agree at times, so I can't say for sure I'd classify your reply as disagreement-- but-- yes, you've been helpful in clarifying issues. I hope that I've been as helpful.

Charlie

*** In closing, I feel absolutely HORRIBLY BAD about the "bad blood" between me and Open Line Live (whose staff otherwise seems to try to treat me well -- when I'm not blocked on Facebook or the phone for simply asking a good, but difficult, question)... But anyhow, in closing, I have this to say about Mr. Rydelnik: While I admit that I don't know the full nature and magnitude of the details, it is common knowledge that some of my claims mistreatment are true-- meaning he's done this to others and must stop.

But given his heavy workload and many personal life difficulties, I have no choice but to forgive him -- and whomever else may have piled on -- and remind ALL RECIPIENTS HERE that while I'm not perfect, I almost ALWAYS get along with call-in show staff/hosts, implying that I'm NOT a troublemaker-- and -- given this truth, I am not inclined to embarrass Mr. Rydelnik either via any updates to my book or otherwise-- and trust that my Paul v Peter rebuke today will suffice.

Beyond that, I hope that your show, Dr. Rydelnik's show, and the various other "Bible answer" shows (guests on Janet Parshall's show for example), will attempt to address both my theory and that which you and Buddy Cochral advance-- and which both seem Biblically permissible-- and that you all enjoy yourselves as well in your research.

[See how big is my handwriting as I sign my name with my own hand:](#)

[GORDON WAYNE WATTS in Plant City FLORIDA --](#)

id:image001.png@C

Dr. Charlie Dyer

Professor-at-Large of Bible | Host: *The Land and the Book* radio program

[820 N. LaSalle Blvd., Chicago, IL 60610](#)

thelandandthebook.org

From: Moody Radio Program Comments <no-reply@wufoo.com>

Reply-To: "Gww1210@gmail.com" <Gww1210@gmail.com>

Date: Saturday, October 23, 2021 at 11:34 AM

To: thelandandthebook@moody.edu, Charles Dyer <charles.dyer@moody.edu>, MR Programming Comments <mrprogramcomments@moody.edu>

Subject: Program Contact Us! [#15048]

Moody ITS Alert: This email is from an external source. Please exercise caution when opening attachments, clicking on links, or replying to the sender.

Program * The Land and the Book

Name * GordonWayne Watts

Email * Gww1210@gmail.com

Zip or Postal Code 33566

Message *

Question for "The Land and the Book" about the Book aka Bible: Why, everytime the "infant salvation" question comes up, do most Bible scholars cling to the universalist view that they must go to heaven, in favour of the much-more Biblically-solid Millennial theory? While "similar" questions have been asked on your program, this question (e.g., comparing millennial vs baby universalism) has NEVER been asked on your program (or, to my knowledge, addressed by anyone at Moody Radio call-in programs, EVER), and it baffles me why? While, yes, in the past, various "Bible Answer" scholars have tried to defend baby universalism (that babies go to heaven, and they probably DO for the time being, but I'm talking "eternal" salvation), using emotional arguments, the fact remains that salvation must come through grace AND FAITH, something a baby can't possess (because faith requires intellect). The possibility of the babies being presented the gospel in the millennium, however, has much more solid Biblical support than misinterpretation of King David's baby's death, which would violate the doctrines of faith & be a form of universalism, thus not biblically-warranted interpretation. Therefore, to build any kind of theology on it (especially one which causes so many difficulties for established and very strongly warranted soteriology) is thoroughly dubious. To any Bible scholar who might disagree, I ask: Where is your scriptural warrant to support ANY

type of universalism at all, much less in favor of biblically-solid millennial theory. The millennium features free will (viz Rev20:9 rebellion), babies (Isaiah 11:6-8), and people in human bodies who live & die (Is 65:20), which makes millennial theory at least possible (& not whacky theory). I know Moody to be firm Christians who love solid biblical exegesis, so why support unbiblical baby universalism (impossible) over a theory which, while not guaranteed, is certainly Biblical permitted?

P.S.: There's one additional reason to address this theological issue: Parents are documented often to kill children (handicapped for example) to "send them to heaven," ie increase eternal odds. Thus, if my claims that the millennial theory is more Biblically supported than baby universalism, it can be used to dissuade parents from killing kids to "make The Maker" accept them: If the millennial theory is correct, then killing said children would neither increase nor decrease the eternal odds, and thus is more easily opposed. Lastly, the precedent of angels in heaven who had free will to accept/reject is Biblical truth against the "salvation by location (heaven)", or "salvation by youth alone," no faith required Universalist heresy.

So, do you find my exegesis comparing Millennium as more Biblically possible correct hermeneutics?

Thank you. "Gordon in Plant City, FL," listening via WKES, Moody Radio.

- I give Moody permission to contact

me about my story and understand that it may be used on-air or on Moody's websites.

I have read and agree to Moody's Terms of Use and Privacy Policy.*

- I Agree

--Sent from my mobile:

Gordon Wayne Watts, editor-in-chief, The Register

Director, CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: PART II(TM)

* GordonWatts.com

* GordonWayneWatts.com

* ContractWithAmerica2.com

ALWAYS FAITHFUL - To God

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

AS, United Electronics Institute, VALEDICTORIAN

* <https://GordonWatts.com/education>

* <https://GordonWayneWatts.com/education>

* <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com>

SOCIAL MEDIA:

* <https://Facebook.com/GordonWayneWatts>

* <https://YouTube.com/GordonWayneWatts>

* https://Twitter.com/Gordon_W_Watts

2046 Pleasant Acre Drive, Plant City, FL 33801-2113

Home: (863) 687-6141 ; Cell: (863) 688-9880

See also: http://Gordon_Watts.Tripod.com/consumer.html

Gww1210@aol.com ; Gww1210@Gmail.com

Truth is the strongest, most stable force in the Universe

Truth doesn't change because you disbelieve it

TRUTH doesn't bend to the will of tyrants

www.ContractWithAmerica2.com

www.GordonWayneWatts.com / www.GordonWatts.com

Get Truth.

"First, they [Nazis] came for the Jews. I was silent. I was not a Jew. Then they came for the Communists. I was silent. I was not a Communist. Then they came for the trade unionists. I was silent. I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for me.

There was no one left to speak for me." (Martin Niemöller, given credit for a quotation in The Harper Religious and Inspirational Quotation Companion, ed. Margaret Pepper (New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 429 -as cited on page 44, note 17, of Religious Cleansing in the American Republic, by Keith A. Fomier, Copyright 1993, by Liberty, Life, and Family Publications. Some versions have Mr. Niemöller saying: "Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up, because I was a Protestant"; other versions have him saying that they came for Socialists, Industrialists, schools, the press, and/or the Church; however, it's certain he DID say SOMETHING like this. Actually, they may not have come for the Jews first, as it's more likely they came for the prisoners, mentally handicapped, & other so-called "inferiors" first -as historians tell us -so they could get "practiced up"; however, they did come for them -due to the silence of their neighbors -and due in part to their own silence. So: "Speak up now or forever hold your peace!"-GWW
--Sent from my mobile:

Gordon Wayne Watts, editor-in-chief, The Register

Director, CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: PART II(TM)

* GordonWatts.com

* GordonWayneWatts.com

* ContractWithAmerica2.com

ALWAYS FAITHFUL - To God

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

AS, United Electronics Institute, VALEDICTORIAN

* <https://GordonWatts.com/education>

* <https://GordonWayneWatts.com/education>

* <https://ContractWithAmerica2.com>

SOCIAL MEDIA:

* <https://Facebook.com/GordonWayneWatts>

* <https://YouTube.com/GordonWayneWatts>

* https://Twitter.com/Gordon_W_Watts

[2046 Pleasant Acre Drive, Plant City, FL 33801-2113](http://2046PleasantAcreDrive.com)

Home: (863) 687-6141 ; Cell: (863) 688-9880

See also: http://Gordon_Watts.Tripod.com/consumer.html

Gww1210@aol.com ; Gww1210@gmail.com

Truth is the strongest, most stable force in the Universe

Truth doesn't change because you disbelieve it

TRUTH doesn't bend to the will of tyrants

www.ContractWithAmerica2.com

www.GordonWayneWatts.com / www.GordonWatts.com


Get Truth.

"First, they [Nazis] came for the Jews. I was silent. I was not a Jew. Then they came for the Communists. I was silent. I was not a Communist. Then they came for the trade unionists. I was silent. I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for me. There was no one left to speak for me." (Martin Niemöller, given credit for a quotation in The Harper Religious and Inspirational Quotation Companion, ed. Margaret Pepper (New York: Harper & Row, 1989), 429 -as cited on page 44, note 17, of Religious Cleansing in the American Republic, by Keith A. Fomier, Copyright 1993, by Liberty, Life, and Family Publications. Some versions have Mr. Niemöller saying: "Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up, because I was a Protestant"; other versions have him saying that they came for Socialists, Industrialists, schools, the press, and/or the Church; however, it's certain he DID say SOMETHING like this. Actually, they may not have come for the Jews first, as it's more likely they came for the prisoners, mentally handicapped, & other so-called "inferiors" first -as historians tell us -so they could get "practiced up"; however, they did come for them -due to the silence of their neighbors -and due in part to their own silence. So: "Speak up now or forever hold your peace!"-G



Screenshot_20211023-165318.png
575K

 **7th-printing-Full-Color-WhenBabiesDie-6x9-Book.pdf**
1364K

 **21-Feb2013-cover.pdf**
376K

 **https___archive.vn_fN445.pdf**
78K

 **OLL-FairUse-audio-clip-Sat30Jan2016_MP3.mp3**
3276K

 **WhenBabiesDie-byWATTS_Amazon.pdf**
336K

 **FiresignTheatre_Open Lines_CoastToCoastAM.pdf**
467K