

---

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

1 message

---

**Dr. Charlie Dyer** <charles.dyer@moody.edu>  
To: "Gww1210@gmail.com" <Gww1210@gmail.com>

Sat, Oct 23, 2021 at 3:05 PM

Gordon,

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

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." 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.

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. 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.

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. And in cases where the Bible is silent, I believe we are left looking to the character of God for answers. 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. 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). 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. I can't point to a specific verse, 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.

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

Charlie



**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](http://thelandandthebook.org)

---

**From:** Moody Radio Program Comments <[no-reply@wufoo.com](mailto:no-reply@wufoo.com)>

**Reply-To:** "[Gww1210@gmail.com](mailto:Gww1210@gmail.com)" <[Gww1210@gmail.com](mailto:Gww1210@gmail.com)>

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

**To:** thelandandthebook <[thelandandthebook@moody.edu](mailto:thelandandthebook@moody.edu)>, Charles Dyer <[charles.dyer@moody.edu](mailto:charles.dyer@moody.edu)>, MR Programming Comments <[mrprogramcomments@moody.edu](mailto: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](mailto: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

