

WHEELING'S ATTACK ON DANIEL 8:14

PART ONE OF TWO

W
M
1
0
8
4

Over the years, Charles Wheeling has collected a large mailing list of historic believers. In a mailing dated April 29, 2002, he recently sent out a letter complaining that he is actually a conservative that is misunderstood. In most, but not all, of those letters, he included an audiotape on which he seeks to explain his position. This tract set is an analysis of that shocking tape.

Wheeling's objective is to flood his large mailing list of historic believers with shattering doubts in regard to historic Adventism. Our objective is to counter his attack by flooding our large mailing list with a strong affirmation of the truth of our precious God-given beliefs.

Entitled "*Prophecy Update: 'Turning the Page,' February 2002 by Charles Wheeling,*" his tape begins with a typical Wheeling application of Daniel Eight. In the early 1980s, he applied it specifically to the Iran-Iraq War; in 1990, he said it was fulfilled in the Gulf War. Now he is saying it will have its fulfillment in the approaching U.S. attack on Iraq. He predicts that the U.S. will also attack Iran at that time. When that occurs, he says, still more startling developments will occur:

"Get ready for UFOs and space ships from alien worlds."

WHEELING'S INTRODUCTION TO THE COTTRELL PRESENTATION

We would not comment on Wheeling's latest prophetic theories, except that, on this tape, Wheeling next tries to undermine the faith of historic Adventists in a bedrock doctrine: Daniel 8:14. For most of side one of the tape, he plays part of a presentation made on behalf of Raymond Cottrell at the San Diego Forum.

Wheeling introduces the Forum presentation by repeated, strong affirmations that he fully endorses what the listener is about to hear on the Forum talk segment. (The Adventist Forum consists of meetings by ultra-liberal Adventists in various locations throughout the nation. A number of our colleges, including Southern Adventist University, welcome them and they are held on campus. The San Diego, La Sierra, and Loma Linda Forums are especially notorious for the severity of their attacks against our beliefs.)

Lest there be any doubt as to Wheelings accep-

tance of the message of the Cottrell presentation or his hope that it will eradicate Daniel 8:14 and the Sanctuary Message from the minds of the faithful, I will here transcribe Wheeling's introductory words. As with the transcribed portions of the Forum talk, I will interject from time to time my comments and clarifications, either in separate paragraphs or within brackets. Charles Wheeling expresses extremely high hopes for how wonderfully the Adventist Church will be improved if Cottrell's attack on Daniel 8:14 is accepted:

"I have been waiting for this moment of truth in Adventism. Quite frankly, I doubted it would ever come. Brief excerpts of this lecture by Raymond Cottrell are included in this cassette. If his disclosures are ever comprehended, by even a reasonable minority of SDAs [He says "SDAs" at times instead of "Seventh-day Adventists."], I believe these revelations will change the whole course of Adventist history.

"In 1991, I was personally disfellowshipped by the Adventist Church over some of the very issues so clearly voiced in this forum by Dr. Cottrell."

On September 3, 1990, Charles Wheeling presented a refutation of our historic beliefs in regard to the prophecies of Daniel and the nature of Biblical and Spirit of Prophecy inspiration. The nearby Jamison, Alabama, Seventh-day Adventist Church members had enough. They decided to disfellowship him, not for his independent ministry activities (for they themselves were conservative, independent-minded), but for his flagrant and ongoing attacks against basic Adventist beliefs.

In an effort to avoid the disfellowshippment, Wheeling printed a booklet in defense of his position. It included article reprints from *Spectrum* and other liberal publications, attacking the veracity of Ellen White, the accuracy of historical portions of *Great Controversy*, and the correctness of our historic interpretations of prophecy. At the time, we published an analysis of his defense (*Charles Wheeling Leaves Historic Adventism—Part 1-5 [WM-315-319]*). The next month (March 1991), we published a transcript of one of his complete lectures (*The Charles Wheeling 46-page Tape Transcript [WM-315x 1-6]*).

We will continue now with Charles' current tape remarks, introducing the Cottrell presentation. Keep in mind that Wheeling is referring directly to belief in our historic Daniel 8:14 and Sanctuary teaching

DATE OF PUBLICATION: JUNE 2002

as the cause of the “heartbreak and damage” to Adventists.

“As a widely traveled Adventist pastor and evangelist for more than 35 years, I have witnessed the heartbreak and damage that can be wrought by an unsound doctrine of so-called fundamentalist behavior within Adventism. At this very moment, I know of families being broken to the point of divorce, and I know of local churches, not a few, literally dividing over a cardinal SDA doctrine that has no sound basis in Scripture. Less than honest revision of Adventist history and legend-building, by over-zealous church members, have cost SDAs dearly in the past. One can only wonder when this terrible carnage will end.”

Charles declares that Cottrell’s message, if accepted, will be the solution to the problem.

“As I listened to this frank and open forum discussion, I was amazed to hear an overt appeal to share these tapes and Dr. Cottrell’s research with every SDA pastor and lay member possible. Quite honestly, I thought this day of truth would never come to the Adventist Church at large!”

Wheeling exalts at the anticipated shakeup in the church, which his hoped-for annihilation of our Sanctuary doctrine will bring.

“The consequence of a showdown between traditional, fundamental Adventists and the cold, hard truth will likely alter SDA history as dramatically as the coming confrontation between the ram and the goat. [Charles is referring to the forthcoming U.S. attack on Iraq and Iran, which, at the beginning of the tape, he said would bring ruin to America and dramatically affect the entire world. He explains this in detail later in the tape.] It will turn the world upside down.

“I want to offer portions of this rather monotone reading on behalf of Dr. Cottrell. You’ll be wise to listen carefully. A great explosion is coming in Adventism.”

Wheeling is determined to spread copies of this skepticism everywhere, so the “great explosion” can occur. This ends Charles’ introduction to the lengthy forum segment that fills the rest of side one of this Wheeling tape.

THE COTTRELL PRESENTATION

Who is Cottrell? Raymond F. Cottrell was an Adventist educator in Asia, then a teacher at Pacific Union College, followed by an associate editorship at the Review. He retired to Calimesa, California, close to Loma Linda and La Sierra. Since the early 1980s, he has been a leader in the liberal movement in southern California. At the present time he is 90 and becoming more frail. Because of a recent bout with pneumonia, his February 9, 2002 presentation at the San Diego Forum was read by R. Larry Christoffel, associate pastor of the Campus Hill Church in Loma Linda (serving under Hyveth Williams). So when we say “Cottrell says,” etc., it is Christoffel who is reading what Cottrell says. It is remarkable what a poor

reader Christoffel is! But he is thoroughly liberal, and that is why the Southeastern California Conference hired him.

“‘How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the Sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the Sanctuary be cleansed.’”

Throughout this lecture, Cottrell equates Daniel 8:14 as the Sanctuary message. In reality, it is the prophecy that drew the attention of William Miller and other early Bible students to the subject. But, especially after October 22, early Adventists found additional light in Exodus, Leviticus, Daniel, and Revelation which, in expanded form, is our present “Sanctuary message.” Unfortunately, many of our people do not know that message. You will find it most clearly (and accurately) stated in Ellen White’s writings, especially in *Patriarchs and Prophets* and *Great Controversy*.

I am fairly well-acquainted with most of the liberal theories, but Cottrell’s equation of Daniel 8:14, as being all there is to the Sanctuary message, surprised me. It reveals how little he and his associates really know of that message which is so broad and full. Its truths are beautiful. You can study them for yourself in *Great Controversy*, 409-432, 479-491, and *Patriarchs and Prophets*, 343-358. Further insights will be found in many other passages in the Spirit of Prophecy.

After charging that Daniel 8:14 has been a major part of all the problems in the Seventh-day Adventist Church, Cottrell briefly lists the primary aspects of our historical interpretation of that passage which he believes to be wrong:

“They accepted the King James Version interpretation of *ereb boqer*, literally, ‘evening-morning,’ as ‘days.’ They adopted the year-for-a-day principle in Bible prophecy, and thus construed the 2300 days as prophetic years. They took the 70 weeks of Daniel 9:24-27 as the first segment of this 2300 years.

“They identified the cessation of sacrifice and offerings from the last half of the 70th of the 70 weeks (Daniel 9:27) as referring to Jesus’ crucifixion.

“And then, figuring back from the crucifixion, they identified the decree of the Persian king, Artaxerxes Longimanus ([Artaxerxes I; the term means ‘the Artaxerxes with the large hands’] in his 7th year, Ezra 7) as that alluded to in Daniel 9:25, thus locating the commencement of the 2300 years in 457 B.C.”

I am going to prepare an in-depth study in defense of our historic belief on these topics. Watch for the announcement.

The third decree, given by Artaxerxes, was the one “to restore and build Jerusalem.” 457 B.C. is obviously the correct starting date. Compare Ezra 7:11-28 with Ezra 6:14 and Daniel 9:25. The first

decree, issued by Cyrus (Ezra 1), was confirmed by Darius, who specifically stated that all that was included in the first two decrees was the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem (Ezra 6:3). It was the third decree that fulfilled the "going forth" specifications of Daniel 9:25.

Liberals in the church do not like this interpretation! Why? Because when they obtained their doctorates at outside universities; they were taught that Daniel 8:14 was fulfilled in the brief 7-year attack by Antiochus IV (called Antiochus Epiphanes) a third-rate king of Syria who briefly persecuted the Jews between December 14, 167 B.C., and December 14, 164 B.C.

"And they did this, with 457 B.C. as their starting point, terminating them [the 2300 years] about the year 1843."

The Millerites, and Bible students preceding them, generally identified 1843 as the terminal year because they did not understand that 1 B.C. was followed by A.D. 1. The lack of a "zero year" threw their calculations off by one year.

"They adopted the King James Version interpretation of *nisdaq*, literally, 'set right or restored,' as 'cleansed.'

"And they concluded that the cleansing of the Sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 meant the cleansing of the church on earth, and thus the earth itself by fire at the second coming of Christ." [For the early Adventist position, see *Great Controversy*, 409:1b.]

"When the great disappointment of October 22, 1844, proved conclusively that Miller's interpretation of Daniel 8:14 as the church on earth, and the nature of its cleansing as by fire at the second coming of Christ, were in error, pioneer Adventists reidentified the Sanctuary in verse 14 as that of the book of Hebrews, in heaven, and its cleansing as the heavenly counterpart of the ancient sanctuary on the day of atonement."

That reidentification was not an error, as Cottrell and Wheeling would have us believe. The believers had been focusing their attention on Daniel 8:14, with their interpretation: about 1843, the earth will be cleansed by fire at the immediate second advent of Christ.

Samuel Snow expanded the Millerite concept by showing that Leviticus 16 was also applicable. It was the type of an antitypical "cleansing of the Sanctuary"! But Snow erred in only seeing in it the date for the terminal event: October 22, 1844, according to the accurate calculations of the Karaite Jews for that year.

After praying much of the night, on the morning of October 23, Hiram Edson suddenly realized that Paul's statement in Hebrews 9:1-5, commenting on Exodus 25:40, was also applicable! The antitypical Sanctuary was in heaven and Christ was in it, medi-

ating as our High Priest! This was a solid Biblical application.

In 1888, the truth of righteousness by faith (which, according to the Spirit of Prophecy, is Christ-empowered forgiveness and obedience by faith; see my *Message of Minneapolis [FF-22-25]*) came to light. Her book, *Steps to Christ*, written just afterward, detailed the experience.

In more recent years, God's people realized that the cleansing of the Sanctuary has an even wider application: God not only wants to cleanse the Sanctuary in heaven during the investigative judgment, but He also wants to cleanse our hearts of sin (Leviticus 16:29-30, 33-34). In the enabling strength of Christ, we must cooperate by putting sin away and fully obeying the law of God.

That is why we were called into existence: to live a life of obedience by faith (Revelation 14:12) and call the world to that experience (14:6). We are to give a call to judgment (14:7) and call people out of the fallen churches which reject the three angels' messages (14:8 and 18:1-5). Not only are we to fully keep the Ten Commandments by enabling faith in Jesus Christ (Revelation 14:12), but we are to solemnly warn mankind that rejecters will receive the mark of the beast (14:9-11).

"Retaining the presumed validity of October 22, 1844 as the fulfillment of Daniel 8:14 and the concept it implied of the soon return of the Lord, the disappointed Adventists assumed that human probation had indeed closed on that fateful day. And for some years, they referred to 'the shut door' as their interpretation of what had occurred in 1844. But, by the early 1850s, they abandoned the shut door aspect of the heavenly Sanctuary interpretation."

What is this about "presumed validity of October 22, 1844"? If it is not October 22 of that year, what date is it? Cottrell offers us nothing. None of the liberals do. They want us all to go back to the second century B.C. to find the fulfillment of Daniel 8:14. Read again Daniel 7 through 9. Daniel 8:14, with its companion 70-week prophecy in 9:24-27, obviously refers to events of the greatest importance in the history of the world—not to the struggles of a weak Syrian warlord for less than a decade!

Regarding the shut door: When October 22 passed, a very large number of people in the areas evangelized by the Millerites had rejected the message and had become bitter scoffers. To the faithful, it appeared obvious that probation had closed for those hardened souls. We can fully understand why the faithful believed in a shut door theory for several years (*Shut Door and Other Questions [PG-23-24]*).

"The Investigative Judgment, which thereafter was commonly referred to as the Sanctuary doctrine set forth in every statement of beliefs, is most recently rep-

resented as Article 23 of the 27 Fundamental Beliefs, adopted at the 1980 Session at New Orleans.”

The Investigative Judgment is only part of our Sanctuary message. You will find it explained in chapter 28 of *Great Controversy*. It deals with the investigative work of Christ in the Most Holy Place from 1844 till the final close of human probation.

The full Sanctuary message is broader and explains both the typical and antitypical structures and services, as well as the meaning of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary. The full message includes His first apartment ministry in heaven for eighteen centuries before the Investigative Judgment began and His intercessory work on our behalf in the Most Holy Place, which He does in addition to His examination of the Judgment records. Checking Article 23, I find that it mentions a broader Sanctuary ministry prior to 1844, but only an investigative judgment afterward. Yet Christ's intercession continues after 1844.

“In 1857, they began using the term, ‘Investigative judgment,’ to explain the doctrine.”

The concept was well-understood before the term, “investigative judgment,” first began to be used.

You might wonder why liberals are so anxious to eliminate such a thorough Biblical teaching as our Sanctuary message. There are three important reasons: (1) The modernist view eliminates the papacy from Scripture. (2) The heart of the true message is a call for us to put away sin through the enabling grace of Christ. Obeying the law of God and living a clean life is not appreciated. (3) Ellen White defends and explains in detail the Sanctuary message. If it is wrong, then she is shown to be an uninspired writer.

“The ultimate argument in defense of the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, every time questions have been raised concerning it, has been Ellen White's explicit affirmation of it.

“In 1888, she wrote: ‘The Scripture which above all others had been both the foundation and the central pillar of the advent faith was the declaration: “Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the Sanctuary be cleansed” ’ [*Great Controversy*, 409:1; *Cottrell does not supply sources. Perhaps they are in footnotes*]. Eighteen years later, in 1906, she wrote again: ‘The correct understanding of the ministration in the heavenly Sanctuary is the foundation of our faith’ [*Letter 208, 1906; Evangelism*, 221:2]. Now in both of these statements, Ellen White is simply stating historical fact; she is not exegeting Scripture.”

That is a clever phrase: “Ellen White is simply stating historical fact; she is not exegeting Scripture.” (“Exegete” comes from “exegesis,” which means careful analysis or interpretation of a word, sentence, or

passage, especially of the Bible.) This is the kind of statement that new theology teachers use to destroy confidence in the Spirit of Prophecy. Our liberals want you to believe that Ellen White is forbidden from explaining, defining, and expanding on Scripture passages; they alone, by virtue of their possession of Ph.D. degrees, are permitted to do that. And they surely are busily doing it. Every forum meeting is full of it.

If Ellen White is not supposed to be explaining about the Sanctuary in the first two sentences in *Great Controversy*, chapter 23 (quoted above), what are we to make of the fact that she then continues her explanation, in great detail, for the subsequent 24 pages!

Cottrell next mentions the names of several outstanding rebels against our Sanctuary doctrine: Dudley Marvin Canright (1840-1919) from 1887 onward, Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921) from 1905 onward, William Warde Fletcher (1879-1947) from 1930 onward, Louis Richard Conradi (1856-1939) from 1931 onward.

In his October 27, 1979, forum lecture at Pacific Union College, Ford also listed most of those men and spoke of them as honorable men of highest integrity. The heretics are praised while the faithful are ridiculed.

“Think of the time, the attention, and cost of disciplining these Bible scholars that have diverted the attention of the church from its mission to the world.”

Cottrell expresses such concern for men who rejected the Spirit of Prophecy and our key beliefs, and spent their time denouncing us before the world. In reality, “they went out from us, but they were not of us” (1 John 1:19).

“In 1945, Dr. Desmond Ford began to encounter exegetical problems in the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14, the Sanctuary, and the Investigative Judgment.”

He did not obtain a doctoral degree until the 1960s. The problems he encountered was that he did not believe it. So he should have left the church back then.

“In his definitive 991-page *Glacier View document, Daniel 8:14, the Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment*, he named 12 Adventist leaders with whom he had discussed the problem.”

I have a copy of Ford's document. Back in 1980, the liberals lauded, what they termed, Ford's “thousand-page thesis” as a massive and irrefutable document. In reality, it only amounts to 691 large type-written pages. The rest, consisting of quotations from

WHEELING'S ATTACK ON DANIEL 8:14

**PART TWO
OF TWO**

Continued from the preceding tract in this series

liberals, was included to bloat its size. Examination of the 691 pages reveals that 529 of them constitutes an attack on our Sanctuary and Investigative Judgment beliefs; the other 162 pages are an attack on the Spirit of Prophecy. The first 31 tracts in my *Firm Foundation Series* (now in my 320-page *New Theology Tractbook*), along with my 158-page *Biblical Sanctuary*, all of it in small print, provide a powerful refutation of the Sanctuary errors of Ford and company. Adventist liberalism is not a solid wall of arguments. It is full of holes which are not difficult to locate. Taking the Bible, we can knock it all down.

“During His long tenure as head of the theology department at Avondale College in Australia, he trained half or so of the ministers in Australia.”

Burn that sentence into your thinking. That is what just one college Bible teacher did between the early 1960s and the mid-1970s! Ford changed the theology of Australia and New Zealand in that period of time! Just think what is happening in America, Canada, England, Europe, and Central and South America now! His clones are teaching our future pastors and administrators on several continents! Changing the situation must include firing most of our college Bible teachers!

“Ford never discussed the controversial aspects of the Sanctuary doctrine in public until October 27, 1979.”

What does that sentence tell you? A lot. For most of two decades, Ford had been sneaking around, teaching error to his students. But, in public presentations in his early years at Avondale and after moving to Pacific Union College in the mid-1970s, he was careful that church leaders and the general public not know what he was teaching the students and privately explaining to fellow teachers.

By the time he made the mistake of going public a little too soon on October 27, 1979, Ford had converted the faculty, and most of the student body, of Pacific Union College to his way of thinking. You can read about this in our 320-page *New Theology Tractbook*, half of which details the history of what happened back then.

“The PUC presentation [by Ford] was positive on the providential role of the Adventists and Ellen White. However, three retired ministers present detected what they thought was heresy, and reported their version of his remarks to the chairman of the college board.”

How thankful we are that they did! Those of you, who like me, shortly afterward heard the tape of that forum meeting were shocked by the sheer audacity of his attack on our historic beliefs. I replied to his charges, one by one, in my eight-part tract set, *How Firm Our Foundation [FF-8-15]*, which was the first study I did on the modern apostasy. Contrary to what Cottrell says, the lecture was not “positive”!

A key figure was Elder A.L. White, living in retirement at Elmshaven at the bottom of Howell Mountain, where the college is located. He was working on the six-volume E.G. White biography and immediately contacted the General Conference—demanding action. We owe him a debt of gratitude.

“In August 1980, 115 leading administrators and college scholars from all around the world, at what administrators estimated to cost a quarter million dollars, were summoned to Glacier View in Colorado, to serve as the Sanctuary Review Committee.

“Procedures at Glacier View consisted of a reaffirmation of the traditional Adventist interpretation of Daniel 8:14. Ford was given no opportunity to present the reason for his apostolismatic interpretation of it.”

That sentence is begging the question. In preparation for Glacier View, Ford had been moved to Washington, D.C. and given six months of paid leave to write his defense. The result, his so-called “thousand-page thesis” was sent to all the men who came to Glacier View. While in the D.C. area, Ford spent much of his spare time traveling around the Northeast, speaking in churches and spreading his heresies.

“Again, as always, the church neglected to consider the reasons for dissent from the traditional interpretation of Daniel 8:14, and merely affirmed it.

“As a matter of fact, the *Consensus Report*, voted at the close of the weeklong conference, tacitly agreed with Ford on six major points of his exegesis. Later, some forty Bible scholars signed the document, known as the Atlanta Affirmation, remonstrating with Neil Wilson for the way the church had treated Ford at and after Glacier View.”

A large number of our college Bible teachers met at Atlanta in the summer of 1981, in order to discuss ways to keep “doing theology” while avoiding ouster for their modernist teachings (*Atlanta Minutes [WM-36]*). N.C. Wilson’s response was to get the Annual Council to pass legislation, permitting them to do as they pleased (*Theological Freedom [WM-110]*).

Cottrell wrings his hands at the poor treatment given to Ford. What was the church to do with him? When you have a poisonous snake in your hands, do you hug it to your breast? No, you throw it as far as you can.

In reality, several events following Glacier View reveal that, by that time, a surprising number of our Bible teachers were already new theology. Most of the faculty at Pacific Union College wired a telegram to Neil Wilson on Sabbath afternoon, the day after he discharged Ford at Glacier View. Most of the Seminary faculty at Andrews sent him a petition of protest shortly afterward.

“It is said that more than 150 ordained ministers, mostly in Australia, lost their ministerial credentials in the aftermath of the Ford affair.”

All through those years, I was busily writing and mailing out anti-Ford tracts. Contacts made it clear that only the most troublesome liberal ministers were ejected. The rest laid low and continued contaminating our local churches, and rising to higher positions in the denomination.

“Hundreds of lay people left the church, in the United States, and formed effervescent churches as a result.”

Cottrell adds this:

“To her [Janet Brown, who left the church], the Investigative Judgment resembles Roman Catholic purgatory as much as it keeps people in suspense as to their standing before God and makes no sense Biblically.”

Cottrell comes through loud and clear in that paragraph, and so does Wheeling for the adulatory introduction he gives to Cottrell’s message. According to them, it is wrong for God to judge sin. The liberals want their own brand of Augustinian predestination! Once saved, always saved! Do as you please, and you will go to heaven anyway!

That’s the spirit we find here. The heaven they go to may have a higher temperature than what they expected. No one will be saved in their sins.

Instead of getting out of the church, they are determined to destroy its foundations. They have a implacable hatred for the Sanctuary message, because it cleanses from cherished sin—and that is something they definitely do not want to lose.

“The Sanctuary problem is still with us, late and soon, and is touching the lives of sincere Seventh-day Adventists.”

Then Cottrell directs our attention to the church crisis, known as the Evangelical Conferences.

“When in the mid-1950s, Walter Martin and Donald G. Barnhouse explored Adventist teachings in depth with persons appointed by the General Conference, they concluded that, with two exceptions, we are in harmony with the gospel: (1) Our Sanctuary doctrine and (2) the role we popularly ascribe to Ellen White as an infal-

lible interpreter of Scripture, in contradiction to her own explicit statements to the contrary.

“The former, they concluded, defied the Reform,—Reformation principle of *sola Scriptura* [Scripture alone]. And of it, Dr. Barnhouse wrote . . . ‘The Sanctuary doctrine . . . We personally do not believe there is even a suspicion in Scripture to sustain such a peculiar position. We further believe that any effort to establish it is stale, flat, and unprofitable.’”

Cottrell gives no sources. The one for the above statement is from Barnhouse’s magazine (*Are Seventh-day Adventists Christians?*) *Eternity magazine*, August 1957, pp. 6-7, 43-45). I was attending our Seminary in Takoma Park, throughout the time that most of the Evangelical Conferences were being held next door at the General Conference. As soon as it came out, we called it the “bombshell issue”; for it was the first leak of the massive sellout our leaders had been working on. We, as well as church leaders in the know throughout the world, quickly purchased copies. Barnhouse had only attended an initial meeting or two; so what he learned about our teachings, Martin had to tell him. It was Walter Martin who pushed our men (primarily Leroy Edwin Froom and Roy Allen Anderson) to capitulate on several points; so many in fact, that Martin ultimately could only complain that we had not budged on Ellen White and 1844. Our 1957 Review book, *Questions on Doctrine*, laid the foundation for the liberal takeover which later followed.

By the way, historic Adventists believe in *sola Scriptura*. They recognize that there is only one level of inspiration: either full or none at all. So the Spirit of Prophecy is equal to the Bible in divine inspiration.

In contrast, liberal Adventists do not believe in *sola Scriptura*; for they exalt man-made theories and speculations above the plain statements of the Bible. Their weak arguments for women’s ordination are evidence of this.

A CLOSER LOOK AT WHEELING’S RAM AND HE-GOAT

In the mid-1970s, as the Iran-Iraq War was in progress, Charles said that the event was a latter-day fulfillment of the ram and he-goat prophecy of Daniel 8:1-7. Since Iraq was coming “from the west,” Charles said it was the he-goat and would soon conquer Iran. Later, after that war fizzled into an inconclusive end, the Gulf War suddenly began in 1990. Elated, Wheeling said that Iraq was the he-goat and the ram had to be the United States coming from the west! Great events, he said, would soon follow! But then the war ended.

Today, Charles says that the real fulfillment of Daniel 8:1-7 is the expected attack led by America on Iraq in order to eliminate its chemical, biological,

and nuclear weapons (which we agree will happen). But, he predicts, a two-nation, American-led coalition (U.S. and Britain) will also annihilate Iran at the same time. This, according to Charles, will “turn the world upside down” and bring on final events.

Here are several points to consider. Have your Bible opened to Daniel 8:

- The year-for-a-day prophecies in Scripture are the monumental prophecies, spanning entire centuries. Indeed, most extend beyond a millennium in length. It would be strange indeed to apply one of these prophecies (the 1260, 1290, 1335, or 2300) to minor events in the last days which erupt and then disappear within a few months.

- There are no instances in the Bible when a year-for-a-day prophecy has a double application to the last days. The Spirit of Prophecy is the divinely inspired commentary on the Bible; and it never speaks, nor even hints, at the possibility.

- What nations would we identify as these two latter-day powers? Iran attacking India? China attacking Taiwan? Charles now says Iraq and Iran have to be the ram, because the ancient fulfillment placed the ram in the same territory: ancient Persia. But there are problems here:

(1) Ancient Persia included all of the Near East, from Iran to Israel, and even modern Turkey. So, if we locate the ram territory as that anciently held by the ram, the power attacking from the west in the last days would have to attack all those modern nations at the same time.

(2) If Iraq is the modern fulfillment of the ram, because it occupies part of the same territory as ancient Persia, then the latter-day ram would have to be the modern nation of Greece. It is not logical to require that Iraq be the ram, because it occupies the same location as its ancient predecessor,—and not require the same for the he-goat.

- The ram, in prophecy, has two kings—and one becomes more powerful than the other (Daniel 8:3). This has not occurred in modern memory in either Iraq nor Iran. Yet it would have to occur prior to the he-goat attack from the west!

- According to prophecy, before the he-goat attack, the ram had already made extensive conquests to the north and south, so that no other nation was able to effectively stand before it. Indeed, it was the most powerful nation in that part of the world. “He did according to his will and became great” (Daniel 8:4). Neither Iran nor Iraq has done this currently. Neither one has done it for centuries.

- According to the Bible, the ram is the only super-power when the he-goat attacks from the west. Neither Iran nor Iraq is a super-power now. According to prophecy, the he-goat cannot become a super-power until after it conquers the ram (8:4, 7-8).

- According to Daniel 8, the he-goat does not merely invade the ram and take away its weapons; it tramples it into dust, so that the ram nation no longer exists (8:7)! It does not merely war against the nation for a few months and then withdraw, as Charles predicts the U.S. coalition will soon do to Iraq and Iran.

- The ancient prophecy had a single nation attacking the ram. Wheeling says the latter-day he-goat is two nations (U.S. and Britain), under U.S. direction.

- The fulfillment of this prophecy in ancient history had the he-goat taking over the territory of the ram, as part of its own (8:8-9). According to the historical precedent, the conquering nation transferred its capital to the capital of the conquered nation (from Greco-Macedonia to Babylon). It does not just conquer and then leave.

- After the he-goat eradicates the nation of the ram entirely, the head of the he-goat suddenly dies and the he-goat nation is split by internal warfare into four separate nations (8:8). Yet, if all that happens, then the prophecies of *Great Controversy* cannot be true! They cannot be fulfilled as written. It will be the United States, as a single power, which will force the entire world to bow in obedience to the pagan Sun day of Rome; and it will occur soon in the future, not centuries from now as the following points would require:

- Out of one of those four nations, which arose out of the he-goat power, arises yet another nation, a fifth one, which would become extremely powerful (8:9-10). All these changeovers in the U.S. would, of course, require years and perhaps centuries.

- This fulfillment would also involve a takeover of the territory now held by the modern nation of Israel (8:9).

- After the he-goat had destroyed the ram power, the fifth power, which followed the four nations, would conquer all the nations which were south, east, and west of the former ram power (8:9).

- There is a strong linkage between the ram/he-goat prophecy of Daniel 8 and the four-beasts prophecy of Daniel 7. Daniel 8 is obviously an expansion of the Daniel 7 prophecy. We know this to be true because of 8:20-21, which identifies the ram and he-goat, and 8:9, which has the same “little horn” power. The description of the ram in 8:3 matches the bear in 7:5, and the he-goat in 8:5 is like the speedy leopard in 7:6. Then we come to the little horn which, in both 8:9-12 and 7:8, 21, 24-25, tries to magnify itself against God and His people. It is nice to say that Wheeling's theory of the ram and the he-goat supports the Revelation 13 concept of a coming crisis in the U.S.,—but not so fast:

- It is quite obvious that Daniel 7 is linked to

Daniel 2. If the two beasts of Daniel 8:4-5 are the same as the second and third beasts of 7:5-6,—then the iron kingdom must follow the leopard/he-goat power which, in turn, is followed by the little horn power!

- So now we find that Charles' predictions work out something like this:

If (if) the U.S. (with or without Britain) is the he-goat which comes from the west and attacks the ram, which is Iraq, it will utterly destroy that nation, so that it will never again exist.

The U.S. will transfer its capital to Baghdad and, soon after, its leader will suddenly die. Immediately afterward, a civil war within the U.S. will split it into four nations which will become exceedingly great.

Out of one of them, will eventually arise a power which will become the next world power, the iron kingdom (2:40), or nondescript beast (7:7).

Out of that will later arise a power (7:8) which is insignificant at first, but which will eventually overthrow all the others and become a super-power. It will greatly magnify itself against God, the laws of God, and the people of God (7:25).

So, according to the prophecies of Charles Wheeling, you have the future history of the world for the next several centuries unveiled before your eyes.

Whenever we violate our historic Bible/Spirit of Prophecy principles and statements, we always hit a wall.

- Unfortunately, Charles has forgotten that the prophecy of the ram and the he-goat extends, not merely down to verse 8, but to many verses beyond!

Daniel 8:11-12 is obviously referring to the power of the little horn throughout the Dark Ages (along with its parallels in Daniel 7:8, 20-21, 24-25) and takes us down to the destruction of that same evil power in the future (7:26). Indeed, that destruction follows the Investigative Judgment (7:8-11, 25-26).

In reality, we have here a single linked set of prophecies in Daniel 2, 7, and 8, with but one fulfillment—only one—which carries us down from ancient Babylon, all the way to the final close of probation and the coming of the Rock cut out without hands which, in the time of the feet, destroys the beast/horn power.

It is a magnificent solo-fulfillment prophecy which carries us directly into Revelation 12, 13, and 14 as extended aspects of it.

Why can we not be content with the glorious treasure chest God has given us in the Spirit of Prophecy? Why do we have to hunger for the chaff offered us by foolish men in the bowls of speculation. What

they have to offer is not nourishing food. It is worthless husks.

Let us, like the prodigal son, arise and leave the pig pen and return unto our Father; for He will abundantly provide for all our needs in His most holy Word. Trust the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. Obey the Bible, as interpreted by the Spirit of Prophecy. And soon you will find yourself in heaven. Indeed, heaven will begin here as you feast yourself in those sacred books.

PLANET X

On his tape, Wheeling explains that, when the ram "is thrown in the dust"—

"Get ready for UFOs and space ships from alien worlds."

Charles also mentions a book he recommends:

"This book is scholarly, balanced, and exposes fundamental religion for what it is and fundamental religionists for what they are: fanatical!"

Ever the sensationalist, Charles ends with this marvelous news bulletin:

"Planet X will enter Earth's orbit between May 15 and 30, 2003, and the earth will stand still for three days. Volcanoes all over the earth will erupt, along with multiple earthquakes, whereby two-thirds of earth's population will be annihilated. Another 20% will starve to death during the next six months, for lack of sunlight; and volcanic ash will cover the earth.

"Some feel this could be the third prophecy which was revealed to the children at Fatima, Spain in 1917, along with fulfilling the Catholic prophecy of the three days of darkness. Others feel this event may possibly apply to the prophecy of Ezekiel 38 and 39, as well as Revelation 8:1-12 in the Bible.

"The one absolute is that Planet X does exist! [Charles was emphatic about that.] The recorded history of Planet X had its beginning over 6,000 years ago [before the earth was created] with the Sumerians. The Sumerians, as well as the Egyptians, had an advanced knowledge of astronomy. The 6,000-year Sumerian description of our solar system includes one more planet, they called *naberu*, which they call 'planet of the cross'; the description of this planet, by the Sumerians, matches precisely the specifications of Planet X, well beyond the orbit of Pluto."

In addition to other flaws in this news report, Pluto, which is much closer than Planet X, has a magnitude of 13.7 and cannot be seen with anything smaller than a 20 mm. (8-inch) telescope. The naked eye cannot see anything over 6 magnitude. That is why Pluto was not discovered until 1930. The Sumerians, contemporary with the Bible patriarchs, did not have telescopes.