

## Forensic Brief Altruistic Filicide Summary

**Author:** Gordon Wayne Watts

**Role:** Editor-in-Chief, The Register | National Director, CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: PART II®

**Education:** BS, Biological & Chemical Sciences (Florida State University, with honors); AS, United Electronics Institute (Valedictorian)

**Theological/Legal Background:** Author, "When Babies Die: Where do they go?," ASIN: B008J8RTOK, Publisher: Create Space (July 9, 2012) | Lead independent pro-life litigant in the state and federal appeals regarding the Theresa Marie Schiavo life-support cases (2004-2005).

\*\*\* **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.*

### 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***

**Published:** Monday, 4 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>

**“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?](http://EngagedScholarship.csuohio.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1174&context=clevstlrev)

[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>

**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>

**“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](mailto: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/>

## II. CAUSES as shown by Case Examples

The theological bridge. – 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](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](https://Web.Archive.org/web/20180629040727/http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/northamptonshire/6103118.stm)

### [[ #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>

### [[ #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>

### [[ #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/>

#### **[[ #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>

#### **[[ #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>

#### **[[ #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](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](https://Web.Archive.org/web/20090727035108/http://www.boston.com/news/local/breaking_news/2009/07/mansfield_fathe.html)

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/kri>

[stopher-griffin-charged-with.html](#)

**[[ #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>

**[[ #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>

**[[ #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/>

### **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.

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

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 krisis 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 'pisteun'),** 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.**

---