Real Millennium Group ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$<br>Highlights from the Message Board Posts<br>$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$

These are just a sampling of the messages contained within the posting pages section. Some detail the facts of why the millennium began in 2001 and others are just some of my favorite responses. My posts
and comments are in Bold lettering.
***********************************
Subject: The 3rd Millenieum Started in about 1997
Date: Wed, 16 June 1999 09:57 PM EDT
From: AndyMerten
Here's why: Christ was born in the year 3 BC (give or take a few years). So, if your going to count the Millenium from a RELIGIOUS standpoint, then the 3rd millenium started in 1997, '96, '95, or maybe '98. But if your going to go by a SCIENTIFIC standpoint, then I'd say 2001. But WHO CARES? I'm going to celebrate the year 2000 as the new Millenium. Why? Because everyone else is! No matter what scholars say, everyone's going to go crazy over the year 2000 simply because the digits change. And I have no problem with that!

Subject: Re: The 3rd Millenieum Started in about 1997
Date: Wed, 16 June 1999 10:49 PM EDT
From: BJWyler
Would you then have no problem if our schools started teaching our kids that the American Revolution started in 1876 instead of 1776 ? Wrong is wrong, whether the whole world will celebrate it or not. This is just the result of the ignorance people would rather embrace in today's world rather than going to the trouble of trying to learn something.
***********************************
Subject: The American Revolution Began in 1876!!!
Date: Fri, 18 June 1999 05:02 PM EDT
From: BJWyler
Wouldn't that be something? Can you imagine our schools teaching our kids the Revolution started 100 years later than it actually did? This controversy with the millennium is the same way. People don't care about the true starting date because it suits them not to. Plus the system was developed so long ago, it has no bearing on our lives today. Well, why not start with other important facets of our history? There's a lot we really don't need to know between 1776 and now, so let's just cut out 100 years of our history (after all, it's not going to affect our lives if we do that!), and just say the Revolution began in 1876.

The Real Millennium Group thinks that ALL history is important, not the least of which is our good fortune to be able to witness the dawning of a new decade, century, and millennium. The least we can do for ourselves, and future generations is show we care about this momentous historical moment, AND GET THE DATE RIGHT!!!!

For the correct and full details of this subject (the intro page to this board is wrong), visit hometown.aol.com/bjwyler/IntroPage2.htm. You should find it enlightening.

$$
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
$$

Subject: 2000/2001 from when ??
Date: Wed, 23 June 1999 12:18 PM EDT
From: Elwood1946
since the reference is 2000 or 2001 AD. when should you celebrate?? AD stands for ANNO DOMINI
or year of our Lord.. So do you start the years on his birth in which case the new year would begin Dec 25 or do you start it at his death which is three days before Easter or do you start it on the day of his ascension which is Easter ( some say AD means after Divinity).

Add to this the corrections made to the calendar over the years since it was created. One correction was the omission of several days and others have been on the order of hours and minutes.

Put all of these together and we have either missed the actual change by 29 years and some days or we should celebrate around Dec 27 at 9:00 PM.

Since all of this is just Mans way of causing confusion for his fellow Man, we should just celebrate each day we get to see the sun rise and raise a toast to the sunset in case we don't get to see the next sun rise

Subject: Re: 2000/2001 from when ??
Date: Wed, 23 June 1999 12:52 PM EDT
From: BJWyler
There is no question when is comes to dealing with the Religious Millennium. The ambiguity caused by time has lead to the confusion of just when the millennium of rule under Christ begins. I think we're all in agreement that this issue may never be solved.

It is the issue of the Mathematical Millennium that most of us are debating. Those who choose the side of the year 2000, most often quote the ambiguities of the Religious Millennium to support their argument that it either doesn't matter when we celebrate, or that since the years are wrong anyway, we might as well celebrate in 2000.

The ultimate conclusion, though, can only be that the actual date of the new decade, century, and Millennium is January 1, 2001. simple mathematics proves this (as does history) beyond any reasonable rebuttal.

Since the AD system begins with year one. All further calculations must be based on this number. Since decades, centuries, and millennia are all round mathematical figures of 10,100 , and 1000 years, respectively. The only mathematical solution to when the new divisions begins is 2001.

Just because the media, and monetary contributors to various organizations wants the celebrations to begin in 2000 , doesn't make them right, and doesn't change the fact of mathematics, however much they would like it to.

It doesn't change the facts any more than celebrating Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays on Presidents' Day (2/15/99), even though Washington was born on Feb. 22, and Lincoln was born on Feb. 12. The same holds true for Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday, which is Jan. 15, but celebrated on the 18th this year.

If the media and the monetary contributors were to say that Presidents' Day and the Observed Day of Martin Luther's birthdays were their ACTUAL days of birth, how many of you would believe them?

How many would not care?
How many would take up the side of the truth, as we are doing now in regards to the

Millennium?
This subject in and of itself has little bearing on history, aside from the way we will be viewed by future generations in the footnote of the textbooks. But it is the ATTITUDE that has me worried. It starts now, with the millennium. How long before we start convincing ourselves of the Presidents' Day theory? How long before that translates into more important aspects of our past?

It is the way society today views the past that has this small molehill growing into a mountain of controversy and debate. We don't appreciate the time spent on this earth, and consequently care not for anything that has gone on or been done before us, if it does not directly affect our day to day living.

It is this view of our past and our world that must change, and making people acknowledge the errors made regarding the century and millennium is only one small step in that struggle. Maybe if we, as a whole, cared a little more for the people and world around us, as well as for those who have toiled throughout the ages to bring mankind to the place we are at for now, the violence so prevalent in today's world might just start to go away, and leave us all in a much more civilized world that is better for everyone.
***********************************
Subject: lets just make it 2000.
Date: Mon, 28 June 1999 04:24 PM EDT
From: PICMERCHNT
since man has been around since b.c. times who cares? just make it 2000 solve all the problems and fighting

Subject: Re: lets just make it 2000. PICMERCHNT
Date: Tue, 29 June 1999 09:24 AM EDT
From: BJWyler
Well, then, let's just say that 2 plus 2 equals 9! We can't change simple mathematics just to suit everyone's purpose. The millennium starts in 2001, based on simple mathematics -- nothing can change that. It is a proven fact, and to change something just because it doesn't suit our purposes is ignorant.
"The true measure of a man is the ability to look beyond personal desires and uncover the Truth."
-- Hanok Odbrook

$$
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
$$

Subject: Something to ponder
Date: Wed, 28 July 1999 10:35 PM EDT
From: BJWyler
I'm back!! It's been while since I've had time to sit down and peruse the board. I see nothing much has changed. It's amazing to me that so many people think that dates don't matter, for all sorts of ridiculous reasons: 2000 sounds better than 2001, the calendar is a human convention for human purposes, everyone else is celebrating in 2000 - so why shouldn't we?, Who cares? Let's party twice, etc.

The people who really amaze me are the ones who want to ignore the dates and times, for whatever reason. To say that chronology is a human device is exactly one of the points I'm trying to make. We developed a chronology because we needed a tangible way of keeping track of time. If we decide to ignore it's trappings, then let's do away with watches and calendars altogether,
and live our lives in chaotic bliss.
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
Subject: !PLEASE!
Date: Tue, 03 August 1999 01:50 PM EDT
From: SOFTLEGGED
Everyone is looking forward to a happy new year 2000. There is always some partypooper trying to take away from the happiness of this experience. I say the people dwelling on this "technicality" are going to miss out on all the fun Dec.31, 1999! And I am glad, that's what they get for being so picky.

Subject: RE: !Please! - SOFTLEGGED
Date: Wed, 04 August 1999 01:42 AM EDT
From: BJWyler
Being truthful, and wanting to promote the truth is not being picky. Humankind invented calendars and other timekeeping devices so we could have a tangible way of keeping track of time. To ignore that now because it's inconvenient is just plain stupid.

The millennium begins January 1, 2001. Just like Independence Day is July 4th. Just like the Bicentennial was in 1976. These are not "technicalities," but hard facts. There's nothing picky about them, nor is anyone being a party pooper for making note of them.

BJWyler
The Real Millennium Group (TM)
"The true measure of a man is the ability to look beyond personal desires and uncover the Truth."
-- Hanok Odbrook

Subject: Re: my feelings. - AmyD1027
Date: Tue, 10 August 1999 01:04 PM EDT
From: TESHEYBOY1
Who is to say any one of us are wrong or right. Some call it the turn of the Millinium for the sake that the year 2000 is in fact to them a new beginning. Others base their views on facts and numbers. People let's not forget that these so called facts were decided upon by one man... "one man", no different than you or I. He made the decision between a One or a Zero. Who was he judged by, or by any if that is the fact. Man himself.... We make the decisions and we can change them as well. Point: Do what you want to do if it makes you happy then so be it. No one person can take that away from you.... Enjoy!!!!

Subject: Re: my feelings. - Tesheyboy1
Date: Wed, 11 August 1999 01:09 PM EDT
From: BJWyler
First of all, these are not "so called facts" they are a basic mathematic principle -- nothing can change that. Dionysius would have made the first year AD 1 whether he had the benefit of a symbol for zero or not, because of the basics of mathematics.

Second, being human, or man, or whatever has nothing to do with this point. Nor does God or Jesus, or anything else. Everything we use to keep track of time -- a product of nature if anything, HAS to be manmade, so to say that we should ignore the true date of the millennium because of the conventions of man is to say that we have no need for anything created by man - calendars, watches, laws, what have you.

Third, your point stating do what you want to do if it makes you happy is the direct cause of school shootings and the other violence we have been witness to over the last few months.

BJWyler
The Real Millennium Group (TM)
"The true measure of a man is the ability to look beyond personal desires and uncover the Truth."
-- Hanok Odbrook
Subj: Re: I misunderstood
Date: 8/19/99 8:40:08 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: NOSNAH2
To: BJWyler
It realy doesn't matter to me.... I think it will start on January 1, 2000 you think 2001. I don't care what you think, you have a mind of your own. I'm not gonna try to convince anyone to think 2000. This is just some stupid thing that man has created in his own mind. No one told us to fight over it. Time in general is way past the year 2000, if we had started from the beggining of time we would be in like the 47 millionth millenium!!(Yes I did the math).... that's how I think about it. But ever since some foreign guy came up with our calendar, we've lived our lives day to day. The big thing is, look at how far we've made it!! We've managed to get from year 1 to 2000 with little error. (Just a little side note: in year one, you hadn't been through a year yet, you were beggining the first year. Therefore you hadn't finished a year til January 1, 2. You were then going into your second year.... so on and so forth. That's my logic, if you don't like it don't complain.) I just think it's cool that all the numbers in the year are gonna change all at once. So stop making such a big issue out of it. New millenium or not, it's still gonna be a big party, and you don't even have close to enough will power to change everyone's mind....

NOSNAH2
P.S. Just consider what I said.....

## Subj: Considering What You Said

Date: 8/23/99
To: NOSNAH2
Sorry it took so long to respond, unfortunately, business called, and I have little time enough to go on-line and work on the web site as it is.

At any rate, I'm not trying to ruin anybody's fun, or create arguments, or the like. I am just someone with an interest in history, and is just trying to get the truth out about this little segment of it. I really don't care if people celebrate it or not, this year. I just want to make sure that they know when it really gets here (like celebrating Washington's birthday on President's Day, even though his birthday is on another day).

As regards to when the year's end, I never said anything different. Of course the year is not complete until December 31. That's just the way the calendar is designed, so we can have some order in our day to day living, instead of chaos. Just like today isn't over until 11:59:59 PM, yet we refer to the whole day (from Midnight until that point) as the 23rd day. The month isn't over yet, but we still need to refer to it some way, and so on.

Mathematically, there is no way to deny that the millennium begins on January 1, 2001. The 2000th year of our calendar is not complete until December 31, 2000, so you really proved my
point with your statement.
We can also celebrate the Birth Date Millennium (Christ's 2000th birthday) on December 25th, 2000. There is also the Religious Millennium (the period of 1,000 years of Christ's rule over the earth), but we have to wait until he returns, and announces himself for that. So, as you said, this is just really an arbitrary point in time designed by humans to have some order to our lives.

As for changing anybody's mind, that's not my purpose. I'm just putting the facts out for those who want to know the truth. If you want to ignore it, fine. But the influence of the Real Millennium Group is growing as the truth gets out. Our members have had several letters published in local newspapers, and I have been contacted by several local TV news programs about having segments done about the group, so we'll see what develops.

As I said, you can believe me or not. I did the research, so I know the truth. Am I still going to party this New Year's? You bet, 2000 is a milestone -- but $I$ know it for the milestone it is, and the milestone the year 2001 is as well.

Thanks,
BJWyler
The Real Millennium Group (TM)
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
Subject: calender start date
Date: Sun, 29 August 1999 01:07 AM EDT
From: LSGVIPER1
Before I could make a stand on 2000 or 2001 for the mellinium, I would like to know how long it took to figure the calender out in the first place. Does it not Figure that if the calculations to put together the calender as we know it started at 0 AD that it would have taken at least 1 year to put the information together in order to make the calender!

Thus, I put this to you. A mind intelligent enough to figure a calender that exist unto this day surely would not make the mistake of starting his calender on year one, if 1 year had not already passed. I don't claim to be any expert on this particular matter, but is it not feasable that the calender was started on year 1 because it WAS year 1 . Can anyone of us truthfully say that 1 AD was NOT year 1!!

Subject: Re: calender start date - LSGVIPER1
Date: Sun, 29 August 1999 01:51 AM EDT
From: BJWyler
I am currently reading a book I picked up at the library that is very good about explaining how the calendar was developed, and gives the history of how man has tried to mark the passage of time.

It is called (oddly enough) Calendar, and is written by David Ewing Duncan, and was published in 1998. Book stores should have it available -- I'm going to buy a copy so I'll have another handy reference guide.

As for year 1 -- that is the first year of the AD chronology. Perhaps looking at it this way will help clear up some confusion:
When a baby is born, it is not a year old. It does not become a year old until its first birthday, signifying the completion of its first year of life. Everything that happens to that baby from the
day it was born up to its first birthday occurs in its FIRST year of life -- Year 1.
The calendar is the same. The year is not completed until December 31, but in order to make it easier we refer to the whole year by a single number. Instead of referring to today as One thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight years, plus eight months and twenty-nine days, we call it the twenty-ninth day of the eighth month of the year 1999 -- or August 29, 1999.

The One thousand nine hundred and ninety-ninth month will not be complete until this coming December 31. So the millennium doesn't get here until the two thousandth month is ended -- on 12/31/00.

BJWyler
The Real Millennium Group (TM)
"The true measure of a man is the ability to look beyond personal desires and uncover the Truth."
-- Hanok Odbrook

Subject: Human Time
Date: Mon, 30 August 1999 08:24 AM EDT
From: MHeberlein
Do we ignore the birth of a human and pretend that they do not exist until they are 1 year old, then after that 12 month "non existant" phase, do we begin to acknowledge their presence?
We celebrate January 1, 2000 as The Birth Of The Millenium.
Those anal retentive sorts who want to push the Gregorian Calender blunder (Jan. 1, 2001 ) as THE REAL THING, can stay home and go to sleep this year. Less jerks on the road and more champagne for me!

Subject: Re: Human Time - MHeberlein
Date: Mon, 30 August 1999 08:02 PM EDT
From: BJWyler
That very same blunder means you can't celebrate the year 2000 as the millennium either, if you want to use that as an excuse.

The simple fact is, blunder or no blunder, simple mathematics dictates that the new millennium can ONLY start after the completion of the 2000th year of our current chronology, which is December 31, 2000.

BJWyler
The Real Millennium Group(TM)
(PS Visit our site, and you'll know that WE are not staying home this New Year's. We're just celebrating the year for what it is, and not the millennium).
"The true measure of a man is the ability to look beyond personal desires and uncover the Truth."
-- Hanok Odbrook
Subject: Re: Human Time - MHeberlein
Date: Mon, 30 August 1999 08:58 PM EDT
From: SailingJR

I would like to respond to the many references to the Gregorian calendar being called a blunder or "odd bit of logic". It is neither a blunder and the logic is perfectly clear. When we count things, we start counting with the number 1. The very first of anything is number one. The first year of a new calendar is the year 1 , not zero. Therefore, the 1000th year of any millenium is the number ending in 3 zeroes. It is only with the advent of the computer that people would even consider beginning a "count" or enumeration of items with zero, as computers do in counting "offsets" from a particular address. The mentally challenged among us may search for any reason to party and justify their meager existence. I for one choose not to party at either time. After all, it is only another year. If you think about it, it is only significant because someone started a calendar at a given time. Whether you choose to celebrate it on Dec. 31, 1999, or Dec. 31, 2000, there is only magic and significance associated with it for those who believe in superstitions, fairy tales, and other forms of mental opiates.
$* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *$
Subj: Re: An answer about the millennium
Date: 9/8/99 9:53:12 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: T1Mischief
To: BJWyler
So, why don't me just begin at 2001? 1999, 2001? This I don't understand. Your right we begin counting at 1 ! Thanks for all the information, that was really kewl.

Subj: Re: An answer about the millennium
Date: 9/8/99 10:12:56 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: BJWyler
To: T1Mischief
Thanks. As for why we don't skip 2000 by going from 1999 to 2001, that is because zero is used in a different context. In fact, when a symbol was developed for zero by ancient societies, they didn't use it as a numeral in and of itself, but only as a marker to differentiate different numerical amounts without having to create more symbols.

It's like this -- the Romans had seven basic symbols, I, V, X, L, C, D, M. By making combinations of these symbols, or placing a bar over top, they could express all numbers from 1 to 1 million. However, if you notice, where movies and other things that still use R.N. to express the year, there are a lot of symbols just for what we now use 4 symbols for (in the Arabic system). At any rate, the "I" becomes a position marker to distinguish 4 and 6 in Roman -- IV and VI. Thus the symbol " 0 " was first used -- 15 became 105 by adding 0 , which became 1050 by adding another 0 . Thus, we are able to count and write down an infinity of numerals with only 10 symbols $-1,2,3$, $4,5,6,7,8,9,0$.

In most cases, we have to ignore zero in and of itself because it represents naught, or nothing. Therefore, we do not use it for simple things like counting. But because we need it to distinguish between 2, 200, and 2000, we don't ignore these numbers, or skip over them because they are numbers in and of themselves, and must be used in our counting and calculations according to the rules of mathematics. Simply put, we don't skip from 1999 to 2001 for the same reason we don't skip from 3 to 5, or 11 to 13 , and so on.

Not being a mathematician myself, I hope this long-winded response answers your questions.

## Thanks Again,

BJWyler

Subject: Re: 21st century in 2000?-RPGLordX
Date: Wed, 08 September 1999 12:40 PM EDT
From: BJWyler
$\lll<$ Ok, get this. This morning as I was driving to work i heard the DJ say "enjoy this last labor day of the century." $i$ called him up and told him that he was wrong. he said "dude, $i$ said century, not millennium"....so some people think that the century ends this year and thek know that the millennium starts in 2001. how weird is that?>>>>>

I just got back from the book store (picking up a copy of Calendar) and happened to notice they had a display with Peter Jennings' book The Century. Perhaps the DJ got the asinine idea from here because, on the first page of the introduction, it says, "The 20th century began in 1901 and [will come to a close] on December 31, 1999." And just a paragraph or two before, it made reference to a century being a period of 100 years.

So far, this is the stupidest thing I have seen yet. Either whoever wrote the intro is a complete idiot who can't even count, or the editorial staff needs a better proofreader (who one who can count).

## BJWyler

## Subject: Does Baseball have a 0 inning?

Date: Tue, 18 January 2000 08:41 PM EST
From: BJWyler
Here's an example that closely relates to years and why we don't have a zero. Baseball has 9 innings. Not one is labeled "zero." The first inning, as is proper is labeled 1. At the top of the inning, no one has batted yet, but it is still inning 1. At the middle of the inning, only one side has batted, the inning is only half over, yet it is still inning 1. At the bottom of the inning, as the home team is finishing up, it is still inning 1 . I don't see any zero's around, and this is exactly how we label our years. The whole year, from beginning to end is labeled with it's position in the system -the 2000th year is labeled 2000. The first year was labeled 1.

Very easy, and mathematically correct, is it not?
BJWyler
The Real Millennium Group (TM)
www.RealMillenniumGroup.com
"The true measure of a man is the ability to look beyond personal desires and uncover the Truth."
-- Hanok Odbrook
Subject: Re: Does Baseball have a 0 inning?
Date: Tue, 18 January 2000 10:00 PM EST
From: Independence 72
Does a bowling game start in the 0th frame?
Does a race start on the 0th lap? Does a golf game start on the 0th hole. Do you start a book on the 0th page. Of course not people. That would be impossible. 0 would mean that nothing has even started. Do u see a 0th month or day? No. BJWyler is exactly right when that is all compared to years

Subject: Listen UP EVERYONE WE ALL KNOW THIS!!!!!
Date: 2/7/00 7:19 PM Eastern Standard Time
From: Keck805
WE ALL KNOW THE NEW MILLINIUM IS 2001. STOP GIVING MROE AND MROE DETAILS. THE POINT IS MOST PEOPLE THINK ITIS 2000 LET THEM HAVE THERE FUN IT IS NTO A BIG DEAL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!1

KECK
Subj:Re: Listen UP EVERYONE WE ALL KNOW THIS!!!!!!
Date:2/22/00
To:Keck805
Hi. I was planning on responding to your post sooner, but unfortunately, didn't have the time, and forgot until I was cleaning out some files and saw the file I saved it under. I am glad that you can be counted in on the side who knows and speaks the truth, but I have found that the majority of the people in the world, and the U.S. know that the millennium begins in 2001, and not 2000, but simply can't or won't stand up for the truth and speak it out loud. Also, as for the millennium not being a big deal, I must disagree.

We are (hopefully) going to be around to witness a once in a lifetime (once in a thousand years as well) event -- the turning over of a decade (mathematically speaking) century and millennium. While that may not rank as a world-changing event, it is something special that only we, living today can share -- as in watching the dawn of the 21st Century and 3rd Millennium of the Christian Era -- a truly one-time event. But enough of the metaphysical.

It just simply comes down to the truth being important. The millennium itself may be no big deal (yet we hear it at least a dozen times every hour in the media), but the truth and history surrounding it is important. If we forget or ignore the past, truth, and knowledge, we might as well be living back in the Stone Age. I have more info about this on our web site: www.RealMillenniumGroup.com. Feel free to take a look around and let us know what you think.

BJWyler
The Real Millennium Group (TM)
"The true measure of a man is the ability to look beyond personal desires and uncover the Truth."
-- Hanok Odbrook
Subj:Re: Listen UP EVERYONE WE ALL KNOW THIS!!!!!!
Date:2/23/00 4:06:24 PM Eastern Standard Time
From:Keck805
To:BJWyler
I see your point, I had no idea people just didn't wana speak up..

