

# A Day with Charles Wheeling

**PART ONE OF TWO**

Every so often friends phone, saying that they have heard Charles Wheeling give a lecture in their area; and, from what he says, it is clear that he is opposed to Ellen White and our historic teachings. Unfortunately, I have had other friends who have abandoned confidence in the Spirit of Prophecy after attending his meetings or listening to his sermon tapes.

One cannot help but wonder how Charles can be so successful in capturing the minds of faithful believers at his meetings. So, briefly, I am going to explain how he does it. If this is not a topic that interests you, then do not read it. But I write to protect other friends in advance.

In three meetings in Ringgold, Georgia, during Sabbath, June 30, 2001, and in a fourth meeting that night, Charles Wheeling presented a series of four lectures. One historic believer who attended them laboriously took thirty-two pages of very careful notes. The following quotations are reconstructed from them.

Charles began the 10:00 a.m. morning meeting (which was entitled “*Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*”) by continually mixing allegorical and symbolical applications as he related the Biblical story of those three families. By the time the meeting was done, the audience had good reason to be confused. You may recall that telling confusing and/or boring stories was one of the methods devised by Erickson, the founder of Ericksonian hypnosis, which captures peoples’ minds while they remain awake. He said it was the simplest way to hypnotize people. Although they remained awake, they had become susceptible to whatever he might tell them thereafter. Erickson’s theories were expanded by Bandler and Grinder (with their “neuro-linguistic programming”) and popularized by Savage in his LAB courses (who, among others, taught them to over a thousand of our pastors and leaders).

(For more on Ericksonian hypnosis, Neuro-linguistic programming, LAB, and hypnosis, we refer you to our book, *Hypnotism Tractbook* [134 pp., 8½ x 11, \$10.50 + \$2.50], which contains a collection of several of our tracts on these topics).

Here is a brief sample to show you the confusing nature of Wheeling’s initial 10:00 a.m. presentation:

“Today, I will present an interpretation of history

as I see it through my eyes, so you can see where I am coming from and where I am going.

“The male is independent; the female needs a provider. There is a design in this. Why? Women feel if they bear no children, they are unfulfilled. Why? Why did God create everything before He made Adam and Eve? Why did God not create Eve at the same time He made Adam?”

By this time, many in the audience are beginning to feel they must be ignorant because they cannot figure out what is being said. This gives them the impression that Wheeling is more intelligent than they are—and, in turn, opens their minds to be willing to consider new concepts which do not agree with their beliefs.

A fundamental lesson we should take to heart is that it can be dangerous to listen to speakers whose belief systems are strange or unknown. You are venturing on unstable ground when you do this. In contrast, you know you can trust the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy when, bowing in prayer for guidance, you thoughtfully study those precious books for yourself. I urge you to stay in the rich pastures of God’s Word; stay away from the cliff.

“Now to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Visitors told Abraham he would have his own son. But he and Sarah were very old and past childbearing age.”

The audience is now trying to follow Charles closely, and he launches into a detailed list of names and what he considers to be their meaning. It is a hodgepodge of unrelated points, which only adds to the confusion. Here are a few samples:

“Sarai means the wife of the governor or lord. Canaan means the land of humiliation, a place where one will wallow in the dust. Eliezer, Abraham’s chief servant, could be a representative of Satan. Elieser also means the great idol of Damascus. Damascus means a holy place. Lot is the veil man, needing to be saved. Rebekah means she will fetter you. Esau is a red man or rough handler, like a cowboy. Leah will make you disgusted, ugly. Rachel is best of the flock, a good traveler, like us. Leah was covered up. Jacob could not see her. We are covered up by Jesus, so others cannot see our nakedness.”

Charles then explains the mandrake transaction in this way:



“Leah’s son finds mandrakes. He takes them to Leah, his mother. Rachel sees him. She is peeking out the window. She wants the mandrakes. Leah says, ‘What will you give me?’ A typical Jew. Mandrakes were plants that can cause conception in women, an aphrodisiac. The barren becomes pregnant. Rachael wanted a child. So this is how Jacob and Rachael have a son of the promise. The three women—Sarah, Rebekah, and Rachel—all have something to do with the Holy Spirit. We will talk about this later.”

The meeting ends.

The 2:00 p.m. Sabbath meeting begins. It carries the intriguing title, *“Changing Times/Changing Minds.”* The time has come for Charles to begin changing those in his audience. Eventually, Charles arrives at his main topic for the day: The Adventist Church and its flawed prophet and teachings.

“The early Christian church was disowned, cast out. Friends had mock funerals for those disowned. Early Adventists were also outcasts. Most of them were young people. God made us out of dirt. Early Adventists said they would never have a creed. James White said this, and others did also. —But today we have a creed, the 27 Fundamentals. We have a set of doctrines, a creed! People are rotten and behave as human beings. Adventists have canned answers. Yet that is the spirit of Catholicism! We need to learn from the past. We do not need canned answers.”

By this time, many in the audience are favorable to Charles’ idea, that we should not have “canned answers”; for we do not want “the spirit of Catholicism.” What they do not realize is that he is about to lead their impressionable minds toward a rejection of another type of “canned answers”: the Spirit of Prophecy writings and our historical prophetic beliefs.

Similar techniques are used by other itinerant preachers. You will be told that you need to go by “the Bible only,” that “truth is progressive,” that “there is new light for our time,” and that Ellen White wrote “for her time in history.” Then, freed from the constraints of the Spirit of Prophecy, the preacher presents his errors as the “new light needed just now.” If you object, he tells you that you should accept “new light.” If you quote Spirit of Prophecy disproving his “new light” theory, he will say “we must go by the Bible only.” What he is saying is, “Accept my interpretation of the Bible, not the Spirit of Prophecy’s.” —As soon as the preacher belittles the Spirit of Prophecy, get out of there quick and take your loved ones with you!

Charles continues:

“Every movement goes through a process of change. In the process of being born and living, they

settle down after crossing the Jordan and the next generation arises. Over and over again, the cycles of change come.

“We think we are the people of God. Seventh-day Adventists. We inflate ourselves, thinking we already know everything. We develop myths and legends. We make heroes of ourselves and tell the world how important we are. We think we are the remnant! We have placed a cloud over Scripture. It is only what we say Scripture says. We cling to these decades-old man-made ideas. But we must read the Bible as it reads in order to know the truth.

“Now, when the SDA movement was born, we brought certain baggage along. We used the proof-text method of proving things. Not good. All Christians did that back in 1844. What we are doing is go to the Bible, take a verse here and there, and say, ‘This is what the Bible says.’ We prove the Sabbath this way. Doing this works occasionally; teaching the Sabbath by proof-texting is alright, but it can be misused to prove wrong ideas.”

You should be aware of the fact that Charles’ beliefs run parallel to many of those espoused by our liberals. Ridicule of the so-called “proof-text method” is one of their techniques. Such ridicule was prominently used in the two liberal sermons at the 1995 Utrecht Session, preached in an attempt to prove that women’s ordination was Scriptural. The Bible obviously does not support their position, so the liberals have to weaken our confidence in what the good Book teaches. (The liberals maintain that, instead of relying on the clear words of Scripture, we should let our Ph.D. “scholars” analyze the original languages, the historical context, and ancient “cultic symbols” in order to arrive at the correct meaning. We must trust our souls to the “Bible scholars.”)

A similar approach is used by Adventist gays, to prove that Scripture supports homosexuality! They attempt to talk away the eight or so passages which directly condemn homosexual practices.

The truth is that the Bible is full of specific rules, commands, and promises. By declaring that we will no longer consider or obey “proof texts,”—we destroy the ability of the Scripture to teach and guide us. We have decided that we will no longer believe what we read!

Having destroyed the Scriptural safeguard in the minds of some at the meeting, Charles is now prepared to lead them into deeper levels of Wheeling theology:

“Here’s an example of the faulty use of the proof-text method: ‘Judas went out and hanged himself; go and do thou likewise.’ See, you can prove anything with proof texts! Seventh-day Adventists fell into this fallacy. That’s why some of our doctrines are not true.

One is the investigative judgment.

“Now, the Sabbath is true; but some of our cardinal doctrines have no basis in Scripture. Fortunately, as they have matured, some Adventists have challenged Adventist ideas. But then, when they do, they are ostracized. What should be done? Adventists should sit down and study with them, so they can learn the truth. I believe you want to know the truth, don't you?”

“In the past, Adventists who have questioned the doctrines have been smeared instead of being listened to. Dr. J.H. Kellogg was smeared. His character was smeared.

“Then there is the role of Ellen G. White. The legends and myths about her have gotten out of hand. People have made her larger than life. Years ago, I was not permitted to know this. It was covered up because it would make waves and rock the boat. We need to correct some problems about the teachings of Ellen G. White.”

Charles then makes much of essentially nothing. He speaks mysteriously about how, in earlier decades, church leaders tried two or three times to correct some of these “problems” about Sister White; but they were not able to do so, fearful that they would be branded “heretics” if they exposed these mysterious “problems” which Charles does not identify.

Then he mentions the 1919 Bible Conference and how church leaders attending it identified the problems—but were so horrified at their discovery, they determined to bury the truth so it would never be known.

The real truth is that a small group of men were at this meeting; and, during it, a little discussion about some quibbling, which originated with slanted hints by one member (W.W. Prescott), was made for a short time before they passed on to other matters. I have a copy of that 1919 Conference incident. (See my *Analysis of the 1919 Bible Conference—Part 1-3 [WM-537-539]*, in which I carefully go over the entire conversation).

Charles has now warmed up to his subject, and he next passes to a direct attack on a well-known historical incident. He charges that Ellen White never held that Bible out at arm's length. The truth is she did hold heavy Bibles, not once but twice. Read again Chapter Four of my book, *Prophet of the End*. It will thrill your heart. (Pages 42-43 discusses the two Bible incidents.) The large Harmon family Bible weighed 18½ pounds. In the E.G. White Estate vault, in Takoma Park, I held that Bible in my hands in the mid-1950s.

Charles then “exposes” another “terrible” thing about Ellen White:

“The last two chapters of *Prophets and Kings* were not written by Ellen White. They used other of her writings on the subject.”

Of course they did! Ellen White died before the book was completed, and her helpers had to piece together the closing two chapters from her earlier writings. What is wrong with that! That fact is well-known. So, yes, she *did write* the closing two chapters; it was all *her* writings!

But Charles does not stop with that. He next turns his guns on our historic teachings.

“R.R. Figuhr, General Conference president in the late 1950s and 1960s, was an impatient person. Some facts were brought to Figuhr. So he appointed a committee, called the Daniel Committee. Important scholars in Adventism were put on that committee. It met eight to ten years secretly. Scholarly papers were presented on Daniel, like the Investigative Judgment, etc. But it was locked up. After the committee studied it; it was locked up. ‘Don't publish this,’ they were told. They locked up the findings and never told us about it.”

Here we are told of more ominous, terrible secrets that Charles only hints at. Why? Because if he said much more, the audience would quickly see his insinuations do not amount to anything. The truth is that, prior to the middle of the 1950s, we had godly men in our college Bible departments. They were seasoned pastors and evangelists who had been hired because they were tried and proven as solid laborers in the Advent cause. Back then, the same held true for our editors.

But a change came. Some of our men started going to Protestant, Catholic, and secular universities for doctorates in religious subjects. While there, they imbibed non-Adventist teachings about the law, grace, salvation, the Sanctuary, and Daniel and Revelation.

When the on-again, off-again meetings of the Daniel Committee began about 1960, the solid Bible teachers clashed with the newly arrived liberal Bible teachers. The result of several years of meetings was a miserable collection of discordant views, hardly worth publishing. As more and more university-brainwashed men were hired in the 1960s as Bible teachers, the situation became so bad, the meetings of the Daniel Committee were eventually terminated. Some of our leaders had learned a terrible truth: The new, university-trained Bible teachers were going to hol-

Continued on the next tract

# A Day with Charles Wheeling

**PART TWO OF TWO**

W  
M  
1  
0  
7  
1

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

low out the faith of our college students, if their hiring continued! But degrees were in demand, so we started the practice of hiring men on the basis of degrees rather than beliefs and years of reliable service in the church.

So what are these mysterious insights the liberals arrived at in those meetings? Just the apostate Protestant, Catholic, and atheist gibberish our liberal Ph.D.s had been spoon-fed in the universities! Here are some of them: We were saved at the cross. The atonement was finished then. We now need do nothing more than accept it. Behavior has nothing to do with salvation. Efforts to obey God are legalism. There is no Sanctuary in heaven. Daniel 8:9-14 was fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes, who lived prior to the time of Christ. Instead of humbling obeying God's law, we should celebrate our already certain salvation.

Charles continues:

“Decades later, some of those men were tarred and feathered because of what they knew to be truth; and they were run out of the church for defending what they believed.”

Charles is here referring to the crisis in 1980 and shortly afterward, when Desmond Ford, and a few of the Bible teachers and pastors who adhered to his teachings, left Adventist denominational employment. The truth is that very few left! Most of them went undercover for awhile in order to keep their jobs,—and they are now happily teaching Fordism to their students, your present and future pastors. We wish they had all cleared out! They have been doing this for twenty years in America, nearly as long in Europe and thirty-five years in Australia.

“I'm just trashing the trash. I love Adventism. I would never give up the truth. But don't give me fluff, but truth. Fortunately, a change is coming in the SDA Church. We don't have it all; we don't have all the light. We have something yet to learn. We need to be more tolerant of people and different ideas. We need to study together. It is important that we keep open minds. We need a tolerant spirit.”

It bears repeating that, when the itinerant preachers come to your area, they will tell you that not all the light was given to Ellen White, and there is new light for us today. They will tell you that she had light

for her day, but there is additional light now. —And the preacher standing before you is the font of wisdom who has it! Be “tolerant” and accept what he has to say.

When you hear that kind of talk, get out of there fast! Take your loved ones and go. Warn your friends; get them out before they become mesmerized. Any time a speaker starts downgrading the Spirit of Prophecy writings, even in the slightest,—get out of there! He is an instrument of the devil.

“A wonderful spirit of tolerance is developing. The *Association of Adventist Forums* is one such place. Their lectures are outstanding. They publish *Spectrum* magazine. You need to read it. It will change you. You need to attend their meetings. Then you will begin to see things more clearly.”

For nearly thirty years, the pages of *Spectrum* was the channel of quibbling about Ellen White. Various issues have advocated a variety of lowered standards and variant beliefs,—including evolution. It advocates women's ordination and is not unfavorable to homosexuality.

“The church in Jesus' time crucified Him. They thought they were doing the right thing. We should be careful today not to throw the baby out with the bathwater. There are truths, hidden for years, which our people still have not learned.

“Prescott died, kicked out. A letter from Willie gave false impressions of his mother. Kellogg was not a pantheist! He was a good man. They cooked up that scheme to take the Tabernacle in Battle Creek.”

Some facts: William W. Prescott (1855-1944) was a continual gripper. He complained about Ellen White and a lot of other things. He had good reason to, for he believed he was smarter than she was! In 1909, he wrote the leaders a letter (a copy of which I have) in which he listed about ten things which he thought should be changed in her book, *Great Controversy!* Talk about pride of opinion! He was the primary complainer at the 1919 Bible Conference. (Read my tract, *The Prescott Letter [WM-534]*, in which he writes a negative letter about her. In that tract, I review the sorry spectacle of his life.)

William C. White, Ellen White's godly son, was hated because he faithfully stood with his mother and defended her writings. If you defend her writings, you will be strongly disliked too.

As for Dr. John Harvey Kellogg (1852-1943), he hatched a scheme to steal the immense Battle Creek Sanitarium—built with denominational funds. And through the use of legal tricks, he did it about the year 1907. Kellogg was indeed a pantheist! I have a copy of his large book, *The Living Temple*. Pantheism is in that book. The Dime Tabernacle was our large Adventist church building in Battle Creek. Kellogg never owned it, so how could our leaders steal it from him? The Adventists in Battle Creek paid to build it. A little girl gave the first dime for the project; hence its name. (Read my in-depth study on the apostasy which occurred in the first decade of the twentieth century, *The Alpha of Apostasy—Part 1-6 [DH-251-266]*.)

“Walter Rea was another persecuted Adventist. Ninety percent of what he wrote in the *White Lie* was true.”

For months, Rea collected a thousand dollars every weekend as he lectured close to our college campuses and Adventist centers. I call it blood money. For much more on this, read my book, *Ellen White Did Not Plagiarize*. You will there learn, among other things, that the six-year *Desire of Ages Project* report revealed that Ellen White had not plagiarized after all!

Charles next moves to a favorite topic: Adventist historical positions on Daniel and Revelation are incorrect. One might ask how he can be so sure. The answer is because he thinks so.

“The Old Testament is not divorced from the New Testament. Christianity was built on Judaism. Millerites were the forerunners of Adventism. They preached that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and people got excited. But there are theological problems about 1844.”

With that intriguing statement, Charles concludes the 2:00 p.m. meeting. Charles is an excellent public speaker, and he knows how to keep the people coming back.

The 3:30 p.m. meeting (originally scheduled for 4:00 p.m.) begins. It is entitled “*Seven Miserable Years*.”

“When October 22, 1844, passed without the second advent taking place, Miller was confused. By October 22, there had been a variety of dates and times set,—and then Hiram Edson came up with the fifth version! He says he had been praying all night, and he sees Jesus in the heavenly Sanctuary. Christ had gone into the Most Holy Place to begin something there. After this, Ellen wrote about it also.

“But they were both wrong! The day of atonement was not on October 22 that year; it was no later than

October 15! They had made a mistake, both historically and Biblically.”

It is better that I explain Wheeling’s errors to you, so you and your loved ones will not feel defenseless when he or his associates spring them on you at a meeting in your locality.

On what day in 1844 did the day of atonement fall? Actually, it would not matter on what day it fell, as long as it was in 1844! The 2300-year prophecy ended in that year, and that is what counts.

But we have these facts: (1) The believers that year selected October 22, and Ellen White later endorsed it in her writings. Her endorsement establishes it. Why? Because she is a prophet, and Charles and his opinions are not. (2) The day was selected on the basis of the day on which learned Jews that year said it would fall. Modernist Jews had one view, based on a lax analysis. Another group, the Karaite Jews, were extremely dedicated and tried to be as accurate as possible. It is their conclusion that the Millerite brethren adopted as the terminal date. (As you may know, Jewish dates were determined by when the moon first appeared at a certain time in the spring. So this caused dates to vary from year to year. That is why *yom kippur* (the day of atonement) falls on a different day each year.)

Keep in mind that it was Charles who, about a decade ago, said the date 1798 was also incorrect! He stated that the pope was taken captive in 1799. At the time, I produced several quotations from prominent historians and historical books establishing 1798 as being the correct date. Just because Charles says something, does not make it true. (See *Charles Wheeling Leaves Historic Adventism—Part 1-5 [WM-315-319]* and his 46-page *Wheeling Tape Transcript*; both are now in our *Wheeling Documentary Tractbook*, \$3.50 + \$2.50. Also see *Wheeling’s Latest Attack on the Spirit of Prophecy [WM-532-533]*, not in our *Wheeling Tractbook*. Also of interest is Luis Munilla’s *Open Letter to Wheeling [WM-547-550]* (not in our tractbook), in which Munilla, Wheeling’s chief treasurer for years, charges that Wheeling siphoned donations from *Great Controversy* distribution to pay for distribution of his tapes and papers attacking Ellen White. I spoke personally with Munilla at the time, and he maintained that it was true.)

“A day does not equal a year in Bible prophecy. Our SDA ministers knew it was not correct. SDA scholars today know it is not correct.”

If Wheeling’s theory of day-for-a-day instead of year-for-a-day was accepted, it would destroy our 2300-, 1260-, 1290-, and 1335-year prophecies!

In reality, dedicated Christian Bible students have recognized the year/day principle for centuries.

Joachim of Floris (c.1130-1202) and other students applied it to the “three and a half times” (the 1260 days), the 1290 and 1335 days, and the 2300 evenings and mornings. A century later, Arnold of Villanova interpreted the 2300 days as 2300 years. Numerous writers later taught this view.

The 70 weeks of Daniel 9:24-25, leading to “Messiah the Prince,” were understood, from the early centuries, as 490 years, pointing to the ministry and death of Christ.

In the sixteenth century, Johann Funck, in Germany, dated the period from 457 B.C. to A.D. 34—from Artaxerxes to the crucifixion. This dating was so sound that it became popular among interpreters.

Then Johann Petri (d. 1792) combined the 70 weeks with the 2300 days. By beginning the 2300 days jointly with the 70 weeks (the shorter period of 490 years being cut off from the 2300 years), he reckoned the 2300 years from Artaxerxes to 1847.

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was a widespread recognition of the ending of the 1260 years in 1798. Rather quickly, a sizeable number of prophetic writers uniformly fixed on 1843, 1844, or 1847 as the terminal date of the 2300-year period. Between 1810 and 1844, about 35 writers ended the period in 1843 or 1844. Most of them were in England; but some were in Scotland, Ireland, Germany, and America.

“We need to give people breathing room. It is cultic to place our minds in a straight jacket. Don McAdams, at Southwestern Adventist College, said that the historical chapters of *Great Controversy* were wrong because the historians wrote something different.”

Donald McAdams authored an article in *Spectrum* years ago, complaining that Ellen White was not historically accurate in the earlier half of *Great Controversy*. Later, Bill May, at the time president of the Texas Conference, went to McAdams and asked him to explain his thinking on this.

McAdams told Bill May that Ellen White had a few details about historical events which were different than what historians wrote about them. May pressed him closer. “Do all the historians describe those incidents that way?” McAdams admitted that some historians thought it occurred one way, and others thought it occurred another way. Ellen White was supported by some historians, but not by some which McAdams preferred. “Well, how do you decide which historical accounts are the most accurate?” McAdams admitted that no one could really know for sure.

Here is one example: A bell tolled at midnight as the signal for an event. Was it the bell on one building or the bell on a different building? McAdams said

Ellen White (although supported by certain historians) placed the bell on the wrong building. How picky can these people get! It is desperation. Either they get rid of the Spirit of Prophecy or they have to acknowledge it as from God—and they must put away their secret sins which it condemns.

“It was not a 2300-year prophecy; it was only a 3½-year period of prophetic time!”

You need to understand that Charles is an expert in Bible prophecy. How does one become an expert in Bible prophecy? Easy, just tear down all the other possible interpretations—and yours is the only one left!

Our liberal Bible teachers were taught at the universities that Daniel 8:9-14 is fulfilled in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. Charles agrees with the liberals. But he has a second, very important reason for wanting the day-for-a-day interpretation: Charles has been time setting for years now. When one of his predicted dates passes without fulfillment, he sets another. In the mid-1980s, the Iraq war with Iran was, in his presentations, a major event predicted in Daniel 8, signaling the nearness of the end. Then Daniel 8 was switched to the U.S.-Iraq Gulf War. Soon we should find Osama bin Laden in it.

As for Charles’ 3½-year time period, he is in questionable company. It was Ribera (d. 1656), a faithful Catholic wanting to twist Bible prophecy as part of the Counter Reformation, who devised the concept of 3½ literal years at the end of time. Charles does the same thing. Another faithful Catholic, Alcazar (d. 1613), pushed the dating into the distant past. Ribera started the “futurist” school of thought; and Alcazar, the “preterist” view.

But, just now, what about Antiochus? There are several reasons why Antiochus Epiphanes could not be the little horn power of Daniel 8: (1) He was only one king of the Seleucid empire, hence was a part of one horn. He could not therefore be another complete horn. (2) He did not grow great toward the south, the east, and the pleasant land of Palestine. The Romans stopped him in Egypt, and his push to the east was stopped by his death. His policy of enforced Hellenism failed, and his craft did not bring him outstanding prosperity. (3) He came in the middle of the divided Grecian kingdoms, and not at the latter end of them. (4) He did not stand up against the “Prince of Princes.” (5) His casting truth to the ground was only temporary and unsuccessful, for it drove the Jews to powerfully defend their faith.

At this juncture, Charles launches into a presentation about “seven years” in the Bible. It is all supposed to prove something. Charles is fascinated by timed events in Scripture.

“In the time of Joseph, there were seven years of madness. [He goes into detail on the story of Joseph.]

“Babylon was a type. God’s people were captive to the state when the seven years of madness came. [Details on Babylonian captivity.]

“The Catholic Church changed the calendar. Matthew 24 and Mark 13 said there would be wars and rumors of wars. Luke 21:11. Luke was a thoroughly proficient person, and said there would be famine, pestilence, and earthquakes. In the middle of the seven years of madness in these last days in which we live, God will set the clock again. I am convinced of this. Haggai 2. God said, ‘I will fill this house with glory.’ His Word shakes the heavens and the earth.

“Jacob worked seven years for Rachel. The Biblical type of Hebrew marriage is long and drawn out. After 6,000 years of sin, there will be 1,000 years when the bride is taken to the house of the bridegroom.

“But the mind can absorb only that which the seat can endure. No numbered days in Daniel and Revelation that go beyond the 1335. I should explain this, but the mind can comprehend only that which the seat can endure. We need to examine historical documentation. We will do that tonight.”

End of the 3:30 meeting.

The 6:00 p.m. meeting begins. It is entitled “*The Voice of God: When the Sun is Darkened and the Moon Becomes Blood.*” Charles is going to explain the exciting ways those two celestial events may occur.

“The book, *Early Writings*, mentions about the sun being darkened. The sun will be darkened and give no light. Science must support the Bible. The sun will be ‘black as sackcloth’ and the moon ashamed, ‘red as blood.’

“Now there are several ways this could come about. First, there could be a total solar eclipse. Second, there could be a total lunar eclipse. Third, the earth must literally flip or the sun and moon must flip. Fourth, a cloud must come between the sun and the earth, a galactic cloud. Fifth, the approach of a black hole could do it!

“Revelation 6:12-14 in the KJV. There are seals, trumpets, and plagues. Something is approaching the earth! For a third part of a day, the sun is smitten! Revelation 9: the fifth angel’s trumpet! Could it be another planet coming between the sun and the earth! Could it be a neutron star! This would be a small dot only 20 miles across! It would be enough to blot out the sun’s light!

“Then it could be a black hole—which devours

neighbors! The Bible says the sun is darkened by something. Acts 2:20-21, Joel 2:31: The sun is turned dark and the moon to blood!”

Modern astronomy abounds with theories which, if true, would mean that the universe about us is menacing and utterly chaotic. So-called *neutron stars* and *black holes* are part of this imaginative lore. Both have been dreamed up by astrophysicists in order to explain the cause of X-rays originating from certain locations in the sky.

In 1934, Fritz Zwicky theorized that neutrons (uncharged particles) might exist in such great numbers within a star—that it would become a *neutron star*. If, somehow all the atoms could become neutrons, he theorized, the star would be no more than 10 miles across—while retaining the mass of a full-size star. In addition, it would emit more X-rays than those produced by the corona of a normal star.

In 1939, J. Robert Oppenheimer theorized that a super-massive star, if such large ones could exist, might be able to collapse into a point called a *singularity*. In the 1960s, John A. Wheeler nicknamed them *black holes*. These would be star-eating objects, gulping down all the stars about them. But I do not believe God would permit such gigantic stars to exist or black holes to form from them. God’s universe is not an evil place of terrible horrors. It is only evil down here on earth.

It is known that there are special X-ray locations in the universe, including a very large one in the center of each galaxy. Since, in God’s plan, everything has a purpose, it is very possible that these are special recharging or signaling stations of some kind. We do not know. But astronomers say the smaller X-ray locations are neutron stars and the larger ones are black holes.

Charles theorizes that a passing neutron star or black hole could come between Planet Earth and our sun, temporarily blotting out its light. Yet, if they really existed, such terrible objects would cause great havoc before they ever got closer than several light years distant from us! They would not merely “pass between us and the sun.”

“When Christ returns, it will be the jubilee. The jubilee is not the spring of the year. The 50th year, 10th day of the 7th month falls at even.”

By this time, it was getting late, so Charles drew his exciting evening meeting to a close.

Some folk attempt to date the Second Coming by the Jubilee cycle. But our heavenly Father is careful not to disclose the date for the advent or any other future event, including the jubilee.