

## Walter Veith and implications of End time setting

Recent analysis of the end time by professor doctor Walter Veith, under the title "[What's Up, Prof? with Walter Veith, Is it the End ?, Special Episode](#)", needs to be commented on in light of the Bible's understanding and the serious implications that something like this carries with it. By the way, I warn viewers of a rather poor-quality translation (subtitles in Serbo-Croatian).

Understanding the graveness of the time, and tracking the signs of the times we live in, which Veith talks about in the opening part of the lecture, are certainly not in dispute. This is something that is expected of those who know Bible prophecy and the Spirit of Prophecy. Likewise, the comparison of Jesus' prophecy concerning the end, which gives a local and global picture of the final moves in relation to the earth's forces and the people of God, is not in dispute.

Then Veith discuss some methods of the prophecies time settings. At about 45:00, he successfully uncovers a speculative methodology for interpreting prophecies, which was once established by Desmond Ford (1929-2019), an Adventist controversial theologian. Veith emphasizes the method of historicism as the only valid one for understanding Bible prophecy, where the Bible itself is the interpreter, in the sense of giving the keys to follow and understand things correctly, which we would absolutely agree with. Everything else is about getting on dangerous ground and being exposed to various forms of manipulation. Another wrong method of time calculation is certainly the one based on the Jubilee computation, typical for pro-Jewish theologians.

Around 50:00, Veith is referring to a James White work related to the understanding of Christ's statement recorded in Matthew 24:36: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." Veith is a Trinitarian and obviously has a problem with saying that Jesus "does not know" something, because it is not possible if He is God or equal to God. And he tries to reconcile it with the aforementioned commentary by James White, who is quite sufficient, and relates to proper understanding of this statement in the context of signs of the times that give guidance as to how close the Second Coming really is.

After about 1 hour of his presentation, Veith finally turns to the things which misunderstanding can be really problematic. It is a hypothesis about the so-called "Great cosmic week", that is, a belief in the concept of 6000 + 1000 years. According to this hypothesis, 6000 refers to the rule of sin, whereas 1000 years, i.e. the millennium refers to a rest for the earth, when the saved, in a time truly defined as thousand years in Revelation 20:3.6.7, will dwell in Heaven. So, this is the time after the Second Coming of Christ, when the earth will be empty and desolate, and its only inhabitants Satan and fallen angels, with no way to go anywhere else. The teaching of the millennium is biblically grounded, and these are things that are very important to know (see the book [Fundamental Biblical Beliefs](#), Chapter 16, "The Millennium and the End of Sin"). And this is where the tensile evidence for the correctness of the concept begins, quoting Psalm 90:4 and the reference verse in 2 Peter 3:8, which should prove that 1 earth's day corresponds to the cosmic 1000 years.

Then comes his analysis of Ellen White statements regarding the terms 4000 years and 6000 years, from which it is clear that she spoke of 6000 years as a tentative period, as evidenced by the adverbs for time such as "about", "almost", "nearly", "more than", and "over". Veith himself says that he had great doubts about these vague statements, because at that time he was looking for a confirmation of the age of the Earth that would solve the controversy between creation and evolution that bothered him as a former evolutionist. Then he came across information from her biography (BIO 366.1) where she affirmed a prophetic vision that indicated a chain of 6000 years of events on Earth (she received this vision in 1858). The next point is the research of an Adventist named Warren H. Johns from Andrews University, who came to the conclusion that Ellen White believed that exactly 4000 years had passed since Creation until the birth of Christ. Veith does not completely agree with this, but goes into explaining Ellen White's various statements in which he seeks to show why she used uncertain adverbs for time in connection to the 6000 years term. Then, again from one statement made by Ellen White (Confrontation 32.1; 45.1), he has concluded that at the time Jesus was

tried in the wilderness, right after His baptism, in 27 AD, exactly 4000 years had passed since Adam's fall into sin. From this misconception, Veith builds another about exactly 6000 years.

In order to reinforce the argument regarding the Second Coming of Christ, which, according to this model of thinking, should occur when it comes to the age of 6000, Veith compares the world situation at Jesus' first coming with that of today, in terms of globalization under one government and one dominant language. The calculation is simple: 4000 years unto 27 AD + 2000 years = 2027. And of course, all this because of the belief in the exact Cosmic Week 6000 + 1000. But Veith goes one step further after the millennium, when the second resurrection of the Earth's inhabitants will take place at the Executive Judgement on Christ's third coming. Specifically, according to the prophecy in the Book of Revelation, chapter 20, Satan will have one short season to resume his activities, this time focused on a determined attack on New Jerusalem and its conquest. And since we do not know exactly how long it might take, then, according to Veith's interpretation, this shorter period should also be deducted from the 2027, which means that Christ would come before 2027. But in the end, he allows that all this may not be true projection.

### **What are the problems and possible implications of this timing of Christ's second coming?**

(1) Dr. Walter Veith, as a serious and respectable scientist, had to deal with more accurate calculations when he wanted to find out the proper age of planet Earth, which can be derived with great certainty from [Bible chronology](#), from which it is clear that more than 6200 years passed so far. This is in no way in agreement with the exact "Cosmic week", an otherwise biblically unsustainable thesis.

(2) Professor also showed that he did not really understand [how divine inspiration really works](#), especially when it comes to time prophecies in relation to time frame statements, as we find in many passages in the Bible, and in the Spirit of prophecy as well (4000 or 6000 years). For example, the predicted 400 years of Israel's slavery in Egypt (Genesis 15:13) did not last exactly 400 years, but 430 (see Exodus 12:40.41)!

(3) This utterly simplified fixation of time is no less dangerous in making problematic assumptions, which may easily lead to fanaticism of people who believe in them, than those drawn from the more complicated calculations of the time of the Second Coming of Christ. It was always up to the believers to be prepared as if it would be tomorrow, instead of preparing for certain years, which was not in accordance with God's intention or with common sense.

(4) Extremes and disappointment with the possible departure to the other extreme or unbelief may be one of the more serious implications of these unnecessary constructions.

(5) After the fulfillment of the great time prophecies (Daniel and Revelation), i.e. entering the Investigation Judgment period, there are no more time prophecies (Rev. 10: 6). If we really believe this, then why deal with speculation?

(6) Veith should also be aware of the fact that the Adventists did not completely fulfill their mission, and that's why Ellen White said that Christ's second coming was therefore delayed.

(7) Theologically speaking, this opens up a very big problem of God's predetermination in temporal terms. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that Veith limits the exact 6000 years to the rebellion and activities of Satan, as if rebellion is what matters and must be fixed precisely, not salvation or the possibility of salvation of even more human beings, which is possible as long as grace time lasts. So here we find the wrong approach and the wrong focus.

If things were really that simple, Satan would be the first to know easily when it came to the Second Coming of Christ, which is clearly not the case. Only God the Father as the Source of all knowledge and supreme authority can have that foreknowledge, but it is by no means a fixed predestination.

### **What do we do at a time when things are getting complicated and understanding becomes more difficult?**

First of all, I want to point out that this brief critique analysis does not in any way mean support for believing in the prolonged coming of Christ for some long period. That's not the point.

What is very important is to be sensible and reasonable in every situation, to study for ourselves, while respecting the collective legacy of good faith, not to be easily subject to any speculative theories and dramatic announcements or projections. This is possible if we are established and rooted in the truth, if we truly understand the basic beliefs and biblical prophecies. So there must be order in our understanding of things. In other words, we cannot deal with integrals if we have not mastered basic mathematics before. Only constructive knowledge, which has its own clear concept and properly set priorities, will be able to withstand the difficult repercussions brought about by the confusion of different projections and opinions. This is especially the case in times of crisis when people are prone to panic, unreasonable opinions and hasty moves.

Finally, I do not want to discourage anyone to give up Veith's lectures that are meaningful and very useful for understanding the world we live in. But we would have much to discuss with Veith, even with respect to his basic beliefs, which led to his stubborn loyalty to the church and his stubborn consistency with his own (unsustainable or unbiblical) views, for which he often applies himself in sophisticated philosophy. There is no human from who is inerrable authority. Obviously, neither professor doctor Walter Veith is.

Cetinje, May 4, 2020

Pavle Simovic