

## ***Part II: Objections to Glenn Moore's "Answers to Objections"***

**I**n view of how lengthy this dissertation had become by March 2009, I decided that it might be best to discontinue incorporating Glenn's "Answers to Objections" into the relevant portions of our study and instead add an "Objections" section of our own, dividing the individual topics into separate chapters for easier cross-referencing. Here, then, are a few of my responses to Glenn's answers, which I will periodically update as time allows.

## ***1. The New Course Charted by Glenn Moore ... Did We Quote Him "Out of Context"?***

**I**n our introduction, I brought out some things that led to our separation from Glenn Moore. The primary factor, of course, was his proclivity for setting dates. We had no problem with him *privately* sharing these thoughts because we strongly believe that everyone has a right to an opinion on these matters. I have my own opinion, which I choose to keep private. This way, if and when I find out I'm mistaken, I will not have "egg on my face," so to speak, nor will I have contributed to the general skepticism that is so prevalent with regard to date-setters. Thus far, date-setters have proven to be wrong 100% of the time. We have known for several years that Glenn believes the 6,000<sup>th</sup> year of history will begin during the year 2015, but since he was expressing this view to us *privately*, this difference of opinion did not impact our relationship. It was when Glenn decided to "go public" with his date-setting that our relationship "went south."

In our introduction, I demonstrated the fact that, in the beginning, Glenn was supportive of not publicly sharing his date-setting views, and I did this by quoting from a commentary that he submitted to a forum in January 2007. In that commentary, Glenn explained why he could not be dogmatic about his Jubilee calendar conclusions and he even expressed concern about publishing his Jubilee calendar due to his fear that someone would accept every single date he gives as "gospel." I quoted from that commentary to demonstrate that Glenn's "fear" has dissipated, which contributed to our separation -- since his original "fear" is one that I still consider a "healthy fear." During the week of March 29 - April 4, 2009, Glenn added the following piece to his "Answers to Objections" page, and expressed the notion that I took his comments "out of context":

QUESTION: You have been quoted as saying that "In all of my studies into Biblical Chronology I have learned that determining the exact years of Biblical events is like putting together a 10000 piece jigsaw puzzle with half the pieces missing (and you don't even have much of a clue as to what the puzzle is supposed to look like). One of the reasons I have yet to publish my Jubilee Calendar is that I fear someone will accept every single date I give as "gospel" and form some new religion around it!. . . as much as I believe in the Jubilee research I have done--I cannot be dogmatic regarding all of my conclusions." You also are quoted as saying: "Using my Jubilee Calendar I went back to the "beginning" (the year which I believe MIGHT be the year of creation, based upon the idea that the Jubilee cycles begin at creation). The year I have chosen is 3985 BCE. I believe it would have begun in the fall at around the time just after the fall solstice, so I plugged in October of that year. And sure enough, it seems that the moon was in it's "dark" phase in the exact middle of the week (October 23rd) of that year--which is the most likely time that the sun, moon, and stars were created (on the 4th day of creation). So, that would mean I could say that creation week was from October 20-26 in the year 3985 BCE!! Isn't that exciting? Well, yes, it would be exciting EXCEPT for the fact that you and I were not there at the creation, we have no SOLID evidence to prove that this is actually the date of creation. And so, for now, it remains a theory. I accept that year date as a POSSIBILITY, and other alignments within the Jubilee Calendar reinforce this POSSIBILITY. However, I would not be one to bet my last dollar on it. Chronology is not an EXACT science." What has changed since then in regard to your views?

ANSWER: First, it is important to have some background information regarding both of these particular quotes. These statements from me were taken out of context--since I was addressing a "lunar sabbatarian" about his own theory that he could prove lunar Sabbaths by knowing which year and day that a certain event took place--such as creation or the year and day the first temple was destroyed. This person I was debating was acting like it was easy to figure it all out, and he was simply assuming that the year this happened was 586 BCE, when in fact it could be either that year or the year 587 BCE. He was simply making the typical error of accepting at face value a certain date as found in the history books--dates which are often only unconfirmed approximations. We need to recognize that this is not a good way to determine exact historic dates. The truth is, as I have stated, it is actually very difficult to figure it all out with any degree of certainty--however, it is possible--at least it is possible to determine some of these exact years (generally not to the exact day, however, as I clearly indicated). So, having said this, let it be known that I have been looking at chronology in connection with the Jubilee cycles for about 20 years, so this is not some new adventure that I have started. Second, I still believe that "determining the exact years of Biblical events" is extremely difficult--as any honest chronologist will admit. However, that does not mean it cannot be done, at least in some cases. For example, I believe that I have successfully determined that Ezra came into the land of Israel (with the decree that was recently issued by Artaxerxes) in the summer of 457 BCE. This is just one of several such historical dates which we can "nail down" for a certainty. So, yes, I cannot be dogmatic concerning everything, especially dates over 2000 years old. However, some of those dates we can be fairly certain of (like the first temple destroyed either 586 or 587 BCE), and other dates we can be very certain of (like 457 BCE and the decree of Artaxerxes)--it all depends upon how much and what type of corroborating evidence can be found to support it. And third, I did avoid publishing the results of my Jubilee Calendar for many years for fear that those who are unstable would take this all in a direction I did not wish nor intend. Of course, it is not my goal to "form some new religion" around the Jubilee research that I have engaged in, nor can I be dogmatic regarding all of my conclusions--none of my concerns in these areas have changed. I do not believe that every single date listed on the Jubilee Calendar can be proven conclusively--but I believe that some of those dates can be proven conclusively, and I have highlighted those dates in red. Please notice also that while I strongly believe that 3985 BCE is the year of Creation, I did not highlight that date in red--because we cannot prove 100% conclusively that this is the year of Creation. After years of research, **I strongly believe** that it is the year of Creation--but you will have to look at all the evidence I have presented here [evidence which very definitely points to that year as the year of Creation], weigh the evidence in your mind, and decide for yourself if this is indeed an excellent candidate for the year of Creation.

The only major things that have really changed are: my documentation of Jubilee evidence reached a point where I was much more comfortable sharing the information with a wider audience. Also, we are fast approaching the key pivotal dates, and all the signs I have mentioned appear to confirm the accuracy of the Jubilee code and its timing sequence. It could be that now is the right time to reveal this information.

Our response: What Glenn essentially does here is tell his audience that we quoted him out of context, but he then proceeds to validate our concerns that prompted us to quote what he wrote. He actually agrees and confirms that, previously, he shared our view that our personal beliefs regarding the

dating of future events is something best kept private. Without warning, however, Glenn suddenly changed his approach, which he validates with his latest commentary. He writes, "My documentation of Jubilee evidence reached a point where I was much more comfortable sharing the information with a wider audience." That was our only purpose in quoting from Glenn's 2007 commentary, and it was this new course charted by Glenn that led to a deterioration of our relationship, as expressed in our introduction.

Glenn also asserts, "Let it be known that I have been looking at chronology in connection with the Jubilee cycles for about 20 years, so this is not some new adventure that I have started." It may interest some readers to know that the bulk of those 20 years of study were during Glenn's tenure as a Seventh-Day Adventist, an organization known for setting dates ... and failing on each attempt. In fact, Glenn freely admits this in his study entitled "Seventh-Day Adventists and the 1844 Dilemma." In this study, Glenn addresses the Seventh-Day Adventist teaching that an "Investigative Judgment" began in the year 1844. This belief came about as a re-interpretation of the Millerites' belief that the Messiah's Second Coming would occur in 1844. Thousands of once-faithful members, disillusioned by the group's failed attempt at date-setting, left the organization. Others remained. Those "faithful few" who remained reasoned that since the Messiah didn't return in 1844, there "had" to be an alternate explanation that they hadn't considered, and the answer came in the form of the "Investigative Judgment" doctrine. Millions of Seventh-Day Adventists accept this doctrine, and until a few years ago, so did Glenn. Here is an excerpt Glenn's study "Seventh-Day Adventists and the 1844 Dilemma":

I do not share their beliefs with regard to the importance of 1844, as they attempt to link it to the prophecy of Daniel 8:14. Therefore, for those who may be interested in learning more, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly explain why I believe this view is in error.

Having been a member of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church for nearly 20 years, I can honestly say that I have devoted much time towards the study of this teaching, and during that time I accepted it as truth. Even after leaving this denomination, I continued to hold on to much of what I considered the core teachings of Adventism, including this particular belief regarding Daniel 8:14.<sup>1</sup>

During the time that we spent with Glenn, we knew that he had a fascination for historical events and connecting them to prophetic fulfillments. We *thought* we understood from Glenn that he learned from the Adventist mistakes with regard to date-setting, so even though he shared his personal beliefs regarding dates in private, we trusted that this was not something he ever intended to go public with. We felt that Glenn affirmed this understanding with the commentary he submitted to the forum in 2007. However, it is now apparent that he had an underlying desire to share his dates with the world, which came to fruition in 2008.

Another change in Glenn's approach that evolved since the early days of our relationship includes the degree to which he relies on Scripture for his "final answer." I did a general review of Glenn's April 2009 version of his "Answers to Objections" page and found 58 general Scripture references (25 of which were devoted to the book of Daniel) and 30 references to either the Talmud or the *Seder Olam*. Each of Glenn's references to the Talmud and/or *Seder Olam* was used in a manner supportive of their credibility insofar as validating his belief as it pertains to the length of the Jubilee cycle. The combination of

---

<sup>1</sup> Excerpt taken from Glenn's study "Seventh-Day Adventists and the 1844 Dilemma." This study may be read online by accessing the following URL: <http://www.itsaboutthattime.net/PDF%20Files/1844%20Dilemma.pdf>.

Scripture and Talmud/Seder Olam references is a total of approximately 90 references. It is possible that I overlooked a couple of Scripture references, so if I give Glenn credit for using Scripture to support his position 60 times in his "Answers to Objections," this means that one-third of his "supportive evidence" consisted of either the Talmud or the *Seder Olam*. This may seem relatively minor to some folks, but if you were to have known Glenn three years ago, you would see that Glenn's views of the Talmud have undergone a major shift.

When you throw in the fact that Glenn's purpose in incorporating such passages as Judges 11 into his "Answers to Objections" was an attempt to prove that Jephthah didn't *really* keep his vow, as well as the fact that Glenn he used Nedarim 61a (from the Talmud) to demonstrate that Leviticus 25:3 doesn't *really* mean "six years of sowing" for each Jubilee cycle, it becomes obvious that several of Glenn's Scripture references weren't *really* for the purpose of upholding what the Word actually says. I feel this pseudo-support of Scripture was culminated when Glenn quoted 2 Kings 25:8-9 and a passage from Jeremiah 52:12-13. These two passages, as noted elsewhere in our study, may *seem* contradictory if not properly reconciled. Glenn elected to reconcile them by incorporating the Talmud's explanation (Talmud Ta'anit 29a). In his introduction to the quote, Glenn wrote, "Regarding this issue, it would appear that the rabbinic answer to this apparent contradiction (in Judaism 101) is worthy of our **highest consideration**." It is comments such as these that betray any explanations to the contrary regarding the level of prominence that Glenn attributes to the Talmud. Elsewhere in Glenn's "Answers to Objections," he writes that he doesn't believe the Talmud was inspired. However, when we attribute "highest consideration" to a commentary on Scripture, the impression is created that we are placing greater value on the commentary than on the verses upon which the commentary expounds.

As demonstrated by the above quote, Glenn presently believes the "rabbinic answer" is worthy of our highest consideration. This is not something Glenn would have written three years ago. To fully demonstrate how Glenn has turned from his previous view as it pertains to "rabbinic answers," here is a quote from a study that Glenn authored in 2006:

Our only goal should be to discover Yahweh's message to us as given in Scripture, and we should do so without any filters, and then do exactly what He says to do! If that includes rejecting the false teachings of rabbinic Judaism, evangelical Christianity and our modern western culture, then so be it. I fear that many are falling back into the same trap Yahushua warned us about, the trap of viewing Scripture through the vain traditions of men (whatever the source). Therefore, I ask the question—are you, my Messianic friend, looking at Scripture through the filters of rabbinic Judaism?<sup>2</sup>

As far as June and I can see, Glenn has charted a completely new course since authoring the above commentary. He has chosen to use the Talmud as his "filter" for interpreting Scripture. He has incorporated other changes as well, but those are best saved for another discussion.

---

<sup>2</sup> From Glenn Moore's study entitled "Are Believers Commanded to Keep the Oral Torah of Rabbinic Judaism?", June 2006, p. 12.