

Subject: Bible Question for OPEN LINE LIVE (Gordon Watts)

*** Dr. Rydelnik, I got your message this past Feb. 28, 2026, regarding my Heb. 9:27 exegesis call-in question. Cheyenne, your call-screener, said to you wanted me ask my pastor for advice. I did, but he's not an expert on these issues, sorry, but I did do what you suggested. The last time we spoke, off-air back on 11-21-2021, long ago, you told me that you'd take my Bible question "when you were ready." I understand, but that was long ago, and continued filicide tragedies (like the Andrea Yates or Laney cases, or "Mildred" a caller to your 1-30-2106 program, remember?) continue unabated, with unnecessary bloodshed due to false theological shortcut promises. I appreciate your valient efforts to dissuade Mildred from killing her kids to "send them to heaven," Michael—I agree with you that were this a valid means to ensure salvation, we should do it, but you then never refuted her underlying premise, namely that killing her kids was, indeed, was a valid shortcut to 100% guarantee salvation, thus providing her false hope that she might act on. Therefore, I feel it's time for my question. Could you please try? You're smart, I have faith, so here goes:

*** **MAIN BIBLE QUESTION:** "Many preachers hold to the view 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's your view that deceased infants will automatically go to heaven. However, Kenneth Wuest—Moody's own legendary theologian—notes that the Greek in Hebrews 9:27 uses 'krisis', meaning a process or non-final trial, rather than a final verdict (Greek word: 'krima'). Our own human courts recognize 'mental capacity' and don't convict those who can't understand the law. Why is it so hard for Moody to affirm that God is at least as fair as a human judge to issue such a non-final judgment? By staying silent (or advocating guaranteed salvation for deceased infants), aren't you leaving 'Infant Universalism' intact—the very heresy that tempted Andrea Yates to kill her children to 'guarantee' their salvation? Ie, how can you hold to your prior view (that fate is sealed at death) in light of Wuest's exegesis here?

*** **BACKUP BIBLE QUESTION:** If it's alright (given the life/death gravity, here), I have a second, related question: If "once saved, always saved," is true theology, and if all babies are saved, as you often say, then all adults are saved. But we know that's not true (Matt. 7:13-14, many walk the wide road), thus one or both premises is false. 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't be true. Can you clarify apparent contradiction between OSAS and your infant universalism view? Thank you!"

Subject: A personal note of apology and stewardship (Gordon Watts)

*** Hey, Charlie, it's Gordon. I feel horrible about accidentally offending you by misrepresenting your view; that was never my intent. To that end, my pastor counseled me to email you an apology, which I sent on the 2nd, and wonder if you got it.

*** While I hadn't planned on mentioning this, I feel stewardship duty: right after your last response, I had a dream that you were in ill health. While we both know not all dreams are from God, I feel an obligation to "test the spirits." After much prayer, I feel God may be telling me that if—may God forbid—some parent cites Moody as inspiration for filicide (like the Andrea Yates or Laney cases), based on an bad theology ('infant universalism', as some call it), the fallout could affect your health negatively. Charlie, you're my friend, I love you, and I don't want to see you hurt. Regarding the research, I noticed Kenneth Wuest's exegesis of Hebrews 9:27 suggests a similar misunderstanding (you quote Jesus right in Heb. 9:27, but it seems to me that you misrepresent what He meant): The Greek word used is 'krisis' (investigation, non-final judgment), not 'krima' (final judgment/sentence), which changes the "sandy foundation" of the "guaranteed heaven" result. I was worried and prayed real hard for you after my dream. The filicide victims is important, but so are you. I hope you remember I value you as a friend and feel bad about our misunderstandings.

*** Charlie, I know you said you already answered many of my questions, and, yes, true: You don't owe me anything (in fact, I owe you a lot). That said, I know you genuinely want to help me & others, so I'm going to make it easier for you—if you'd like to try. Here you go:

*** **MAIN BIBLE QUESTION:** "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. However, Kenneth Wuest—Moody's own legendary theologian—notes that the Greek in Hebrews 9:27 uses 'krisis', meaning a process or non-final trial, rather than a final verdict (Greek word: 'krima'). Our own human courts recognize 'mental capacity' and don't convict those who can't understand the law. Why is it so hard for Moody to affirm that God is at least as fair as a human judge to issue such a non-final judgment? By staying silent (or advocating guaranteed salvation for deceased infants), aren't you leaving 'Infant Universalism' intact—the very heresy that tempted Andrea Yates to kill her children to 'guarantee' their salvation? Ie, how can you hold to your prior view (that fate is sealed at death) in light of Wuest's exegesis here?

*** **BACKUP BIBLE QUESTION:** If it's alright (given the life/death gravity, here), I have a second, related question I overlooked last time: If "once saved, always save," is true theology, and if all babies are saved, as you say in your response to me, then all adults are saved. But we know that's not true (Matt. 7:13-14, many walk the wide road), thus one or both bases is incorrect. Moody hold 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't be true. Can you clarify the apparent contradiction between OSAS and your infant universalism view? Thank you!"