



Gordon Watts <gww1210@gmail.com>

The scary consequences of Baby Universalism: Justifiable Abortion!

1 message

Gww1210@aol.com <Gww1210@aol.com>

Sat, Jan 30, 2016 at 5:47 PM

To: openline@moody.edu, Rydelnik@messianicjourneys.org, Gww1210@aol.com

Cc: gww1210@gmail.com, Gww12102002@yahoo.com, GordonWayneWatts@aol.com, gordonwaynewatts@hotmail.com

Dr. Rydelnik c/o Messianic Journeys Office

PO Box 59122

Chicago, IL 60659

773-761-1956

Rydelnik@MessianicJourneys.org ; openline@moody.edu

Re: The scary consequences of Baby Universalism...Justifiable Infanticide, Justifiable Abortion <https://www.google.com/search?q=%22baby+universalism%22+infanticide>

* <https://www.quora.com/Why-dont-Christian-parents-kill-their-children>

* <https://bramboniusinenglish.wordpress.com/2012/07/09/the-scary-consequences-of-baby-universalism/>

* <http://reknew.org/2011/02/baby-universalism-and-reasonable-infanticide/>

Although I practically never listen to this program, for some reason, this morning, I felt a very strong leading of the Spirit of God to listen to the 10AM-12PM, EST (9am-11am, CST) Saturday, January 30, 2016 program of 'Open Line Live,' hosted by Dr. Michael Rydelnik, <http://www.MoodyRadio.org/Open-Line/> and I even felt the question coming at me in advance, but I said to myself "no, this is not God."

But, as commanded by The Bible, I decided to 'Test the Spirits,' and I listened to the balance of the 1st hour, and still no question that I had "felt." (So, I thought that it was just my imagination.) But, I discovered there was a 2nd hour, and so I listened to it, and I was shocked out of my wits! The very thing which I had felt coming down the pike happened!

In the 2nd hour of OLL, the announcer (Deb Solomon, apparently) told us the following:

Question: Mildred wrote in and she said (and I quote verbatim) that: "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 avoid the possibility of hell? --if [indeed] all babies go to heaven?" (Words in [bracket] added for clarification: not in verbal quote.)

I hesitate (and am very fearful, afraid, and reluctant) to write you because what I am about to write you will (if you apply it) save lives – and, since it will (**if** you apply it) save lives, demonic powers and principalities will (very, very strongly) oppose me (and you all). – But, since I'm one of those "right wing, pro-life" nuts who believes in the Holy Bible and Jesus, I have no choice but to obey my Sovereign King Jesus, and (per 2 Cor 5:20) be His ambassador to you in order to address where you all royally screwed up in no less than four (4) areas – with my intent being to help you get back "on track" and avoid missing yet another opportunity to save lives. (That statement above, regarding demonic opposition, can be taken as a prophecy in the name of The Lord, and if it doesn't happen, then I'm a false prophet: I am sure on this point, and thus not afraid to speak in the Name of the Lord on this one key point. I clearly heard from The Holy Spirit of God, who still speaks today.)

Before I tell you where you all "went wrong," I will start out with diplomacy and show you where you "went right." Below is the (true, but incomplete and rather confusing & self-contradictory) reply of Dr. Rydelnik. (I do not mean offense here: Dr. Rydelnik is very smart, and I think he has a pure heart, human as we all are, but all of you sequentially and concertedly botched this & "dropped the ball," Big Time – Major League.)

Here was his reply:

- 1)GOOD: We must think of life as God thinks of it. (That is, life have infinite value!!) This, to me, implies the woman must NOT kill her infant children (for example, handicapped kids or children in high crime areas come to my mind.)
- 2)BAD: Here's where he contradicts himself: He admit that, since the best thing in the world is to have "eternal life," then, yes, logically, it would be best to kill the kids in infancy.
- 3)GOOD: He contradicts the above statement by (correctly) admitting that if this method of salvation were true and legit, then that ("that," who? God?) would be encouraging people to "let's abort our children."
- 4)BAD: The part in parents in not clear who the 'that' of 'who' might be, and so I note that this is "confusing" to the listener.
- 5)BAD: Deb said that "we're going to assume that this is a philosophical question for Mildred, and that she is not really

trying to do that [e.g., kill her children]." Deb's assumption is bad because it is not always a correct assumption, and, in my recent book, available on Amazon (but I'm giving you a FREE copy!), I prove that my claim here is true: I show no less than SEVEN (7) families who did NOT see this as 'philosophical,' and, instead, saw it as a way to increase eternal salvation odds, and the rivers of blood from the many dead children was chest deep – as I document in 'Appendix-A' of "When Babies Die: Where do they go?," ISBN-13: 978-1478210146, by Gordon Wayne Watts, Copyright © 2012, Pub. Create Space, Kindle, Amazon, et al. <http://www.amazon.com/When-Babies-Die-Full-color-Edition-ebook/dp/B008J8RTOK> And: <http://www.amazon.com/When-Babies-Die-Heavenanswer/dp/147820883X> [Note: The forward is by a senior pastor who changed his views due to my Biblical arguments, and my book has no less than five perfect 5-star ratings.]

6)GOOD /and/ BAD: Dr. Rydelnik says that we must support life (correct conclusion), but does not offer very strong support. (He says that God says that "every human life is precious" (implying 'Thou Shalt Not Murder), but fails to address how it would be a "worse" alternative to save the soul, which is (as we all know) more important than the body (or our experiences to boot).

7)He mentions that we're created in the image of God (GOOD) and cites the Biblical law for murder demands capitol punishment. (GOOD POINT).

8)He invokes Free Will by stating that the "greatest opportunity people have is to believe in Jesus, and so we don't want to short-circuit that." (CORRECT)

9)He says that "God wants us here on earth to serve Him." ** CORRECT, but why, exactly, would heaven not be a better place, if it increased 'eternal' salvation odds?? (Hint: It doesn't, but I'll get to that later.) He doesn't say!!

10)He says: "There are too many reasons for us to protect human life." (CORRECT, but he fails to mention a whole lot of these 'many reasons' – which are actually stronger arguments than his, and not based on false assumptions, such as ((A)) the assumption that all 'Baby Universalism,' is correct theology: It is not – or ((B)) the false assumption that Deb made about people's motives in #5, above.)

11)Deb mentions that 'God's Glory' is our purpose. (CORRECT: But this is too vague to persuade, and does not rebut the other false premises and assumptions.)

12)Michael mentions that: "it's so important that people love God and respond to Him with their [Free] Will. We're not robots..." (CORRECT: This makes me wonder if Michael read my book which I had emailed him a little over a year ago, on Sat, Jan 3, 2015, to openline@moody.edu and Rydelnik@messianicjourneys.org, for example, on pages 8—10, where I have drawings of puppets, robots, and arguments on that head.)

So, Deb and Michael made many (technically) true arguments, but the addition of several false assumptions as well as a clear failure to make Biblically solid arguments to refute Baby Universalism, allows the dangerous temptation to lure many a soul to a fatal attraction of Justifiable Infanticide, Justifiable Abortion, or worse (worse in the sense that the child's salvation odds are NOT increased by killing him/her, and the murderer DECREASES eternal odds by being blood-guilty, here).

OK, Michael is VERY smart, and all parties surely are pro-life and wish to get Bible-truth, and not fairy tails (as we have so far), so I will not make any intentional insult of character, here – but rather, merely state the facts: OLL's answers missed the mark Big Time. That's the PROBLEM, but I have no right to complain unless I offer a proposed SOLUTION... OK, I do:

SOLUTION: To properly "revere Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have" (1 Pet 3:15), I shall offer solid answers as to why I believe 'Baby Universalism' is bad theology.

SOLID BIBLE ARGUMENTS AGAINST BABY UNIVERSALISM:

1)BIBLE THEOLOGY: Universalism is a Doctrine of Demons, and therefore ANY variant of it is also false theology. Salvation must have both grace AND faith, and Baby Universalism (the false doctrine that all babies have automatic eternal salvation) violates the doctrines of faith. (This is not to say aborted babies go to hell: They don't, as I explain in my book, only to say they are not puppets or robots deprived of Free Will.)

2)As an example of #1, above, ANGELS already WERE in heaven, so "Salvation by Location," is known to be false: One-Third of all angels fell and rebelled.

3)While we don't know for sure what **does** happen, we know that the Millennium **can** be such a place for free will of said babies, as it is not ever Biblically prohibited: Scriptures show children in the Millennium (Is. 11:6b,8), in physical bodies that live and die (Is. 65:20b), as well as a Rebellion that proves Free Will still exists (Rev.20:9). This is but one of many Biblically possible alternatives.

4)Dr. Michael Rydelnik alluded to the fact that this would be God tempting a person to murder, and this is a correct conclusion, but he did not back it with Scriptures. See my book for said Scriptural underpinning.

SAVE LIVES – review my book – MY EXPENSIVE – but Free to you – book. #ImProLifeWhatAboutYou

Let me summarise the four (4) unique and distinct problems I've found, so far: (#1) OLL gave an incomplete, confusing, and self-contradictory answer based on several incorrect premises and assumption – missing better answers, as I show above. (#2) OLL implied that it would be OK to call in with on-topic questions, when, in fact, my question was too hard for

the host, and not allowed. You gave your word here that such questions were welcome, but you did not keep your word! :((#3) 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. I called in and proposed several Biblical solutions, and he said that I had to have a 'question' to be allowed to ask publicly: A statement would not do. So, I then asked a question: "How could Baby Universalism be true in light of the various arguments (above)?" He did not keep his word to allow me to ask my question, claiming that he would "pass along" my comments, but I don't see how any human could take notes that fast, and wonder if he was brushing me off?? Not only did the call-screener not keep his word this time, I just remembered: When I called last time, a little over a year ago, he said 'open line' wasn't really 'open line,' because you "weren't going in that direction," whatever that means. So twice in a row, the call-screener didn't keep his word to take my question. Not that you broke any laws – you all did not – but there is a Higher Law. (God's Law of telling the truth, treating others as you'd want to be treated, etc.) (#4) The failures of 1—3, above endangered the lives of many a baby, as I show in no less than seven (7) families who went south and killed unnecessarily due to bad theology.

In spite of the huge 'Comedy of Errors,' above, I will not hold it against you to run from my question: Sometimes running is the best thing to do (Paul ran for his life in Acts 9:25; Joseph & Mary flee to Egypt to protect their Son, King David flees into exile for a period, etc.). But, if we are among the quick, and not the dead, and have our mental and spiritual faculties about us, God expects more of us this next time: See e.g., LUKE 12:48:

Luke 12:48 (NIV) Holy Bible:

48 But the one who does not know and does things deserving punishment will be beaten with few blows. From everyone who has been given much, much will be demanded; and from the one who has been entrusted with much, much more will be asked.

Last time, you all collectively made huge, and sequential, errors, and dropped the ball, but you did not know these deep areas of theology, so God will not beat you with many strong and painful stripes. But this time, you are well-rested, charged, and ready to go. Worth repeating, so I shall: SAVE LIVES – review my book – MY EXPENSIVE – but Free to you – book. #ImProLifeWhatAboutYou:

1 Thessalonians 4:13 (AMP) – “Now also we would not have you ignorant, brethren, about those who fall asleep [in death], that you may not grieve [for them] as the rest do who have no hope [beyond the grave].”

1 Peter 3:15 (NIV)

15 But in your hearts revere Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect,

And, with kind regards, I Am,

Sincerely,

Gordon Wayne Watts

PS: You might print out a copy of my free book in the PDF attachment, and you're welcome to discuss it or make brief 'Fair Use' quotes, but please do not post it online, as KINDLE has a copyright agreement with me, and I am a man of my Word. ~~GWW//

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

www.GordonWayneWatts.com / www.GordonWatts.com

BS, The Florida State University, Biological & Chemical Sciences;

Class of 2000, double major with honours

AS, United Electronics Institute, Class of 1988, Valedictorian

821 Alicia Road, Lakeland, FL 33801-2113

Home:(863)688-9880 Work: (863)686-3411 Voice&FAX:(863)687-6141 Cell:(863)409-2109

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

Gww1210@aol.com ; Gww12102002@Yahoo.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<http://GordonWayneWatts.com> / <http://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. Fournier, 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

6 attachments

-  **21-Feb2013-cover.pdf**
372K
-  **7-Bible-Tests-for-Spirits-and-Prophets.pdf**
213K
-  **7th-printing-Full-Color-WhenBabiesDie-6x9-Book.pdf**
1382K
-  **SundaySchoo-Lesson.pdf**
122K
-  **old-email-to-Dr-Rydelnik.pdf**
159K
-  **open-line-live-Moody-radio-question-too-hard.pdf**
101K