**Upa7.org Response to the Debate on Marriages on the New Earth, Part 2: Addressing Private Interpretations and Faulty Hermeneutics**

In part 2 of this controversy, we at upa7.org need to address four serious issues that surfaced during the discussion on the upa7-Worldwide WhatsApp group on marriages and births on the New Earth, following the initial presentation by Harold Julimess in the upa7.org Davidian Sabbath School Zoom meeting held of February 12, 2022. A summary list of these errors is provided below and will be addressed one by one.

**Four serious teaching errors by Harold Julimess.**

* “that world” in Luke 20:36 is where there will be no marriages and giving in marriage in heaven during the 1,000 years.
* After the millennium the saints will no longer be “equal unto the angels” (Luke 20:36) or “as angels” (Mt. 22:30) but will be as men and women capable of reproduction birthing children as married couples.
* We cannot harmonize 3 SC 2:4-9 with 1 SM 172 because that would be private interpretation. Only a prophet can harmonize two inspired passages.
* Sister White’s statements about marriage on the new earth are to be superseded by what the SRod says about the subject. According to Isaiah 7 Bro. Houteff is the man who interprets all doctrine coming from the Bible and the SOP.

**How do we understand Matt. 22:30 in harmony with Luke 20:35, 36?**

“For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are **as the angels** of God in heaven.” – Matthew 22:30

“But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain **that world**, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: (36) Neither can they die any more: for they **are equal unto the angels**; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.” – Luke 20:35, 36

These two passages are accounts of the same exchange between Jesus and the Sadducees over the nature of the marriage relation after the resurrection. Although the account from Matthew is less detailed it does not in any way convey the idea that after the resurrection that the restriction of neither marrying or given in marriage is only during the 1,000 years in heaven and will somehow be lifted once the saints return to the New Earth after the millennium. The added details in Luke’s account prove this point irrefutably by dissecting the phrase “that world” which places the location where there will no more marriages in the New Earth, **not** in heaven. The forensic proof is determined by going to the Concordance and looking up the Strong’s number and definition for the word “world” which is as follows:

**Strong's Concordance No. 165**

**aión: a space of time, an age**

**Original Word:**αἰών, ῶνος, ὁ
**Part of Speech:**Noun, Masculine
**Transliteration:**aión
**Phonetic Spelling:**(ahee-ohn')
**Definition:**a space of time, an age

Now we can simply go look up all other Bible verses that use this same Greek word “aión” and determine the context they are used. Out of over 20 verses that use this same Greek word all are in complete harmony that the “world” Luke is referring to is on this planet earth and **not** in heaven. The context of calling it “**that** world” proves that this space of time is in the future, and we know that the future home of the saints after the millennium will be the New Earth. Here is a list of some the primary verses to prove the case that the word “world” used throughout the New Testament is referring the earth, either in the past, present, or in the future (Matt. 13:39, 40; 28:20; Acts 3:21, Rom. 12:2, 1 Cor. 10:11, Heb. 6:5).

Harold Julimess’s teaching that Mt. 22:30, and by extension Luke 20:36, applied to the 1,000 years in heaven is contrary to the plain teaching of the Bible and exposes him as a private interpreter of scripture of which the Bible explicitly warns us to avoid (2 Pet. 2:20, 21; Rev. 22:18, 19).

**After the 1,000 years in heaven the saints will return to the New Earth, not as angels, but as men and women capable of reproduction.**

This claim is truly a fantastic private interpretation that is directly contrary to scripture (see discussion about the setting of Luke 20:35, 36). It is remarkable that when Harold Julimess was asked specifically about the setting of Luke 20: 36 “that world” he responded by completely diverting the obvious and falsely charged “Any man who quotes the Bible to prove the Prophet wrong is a Laodicean” [WhatsApp 6:21 PM, 2/19/2022]. Is Harold Julimess really placing the Shepherd’s Rod message above the words of Jesus and the testimony of Ellen White? We will address this in the last section. We believe a more likely explanation is that Harold Julimess is a carnally minded man who wants to project his carnal desires for endless sex throughout eternity and has gone so far to directly contradict the plain words of Jesus Himself and even more tragically wants to push this debased doctrine on other naïve and unsuspecting Davidians. Why is it that he so desperate to avoid harmonizing his beliefs with statements that are so plain they do not need to be interpretated by Brother Houteff or anyone else?

For Harold Julimess to claim that we will be as angels in heaven and change back to humans in the new earth doesn't have any Scriptural basis whatsoever. It seems the brother enjoys dwelling on the unknown future which keeps him entrapped in the Devil's kidnapping bag.

Who fully comprehends Christ's words "shall be equal unto angels"? Why should we speculate what our future and the nature thereof entail when God has not yet revealed to us? This is a snare in which our brother has fallen into.

“The words of Christ are too plain to be misunderstood. They should forever settle the question of marriages and births in the new earth. Neither those who shall be raised from the dead, nor those who shall be translated without seeing death, will marry or be given in marriage. They will be as the angels of God, members of the royal family.” – **Selected Messages p. 172.3**

**We cannot harmonize 3 SC 2:4-9 with 1 SM 172 because that would be private interpretation.**

A particularly troubling trend that emerged from the discussion held on WhatsApp is the argument that New Earth Marriage (NEM) advocates tell us is that we are not allowed to harmonize 3SC2:4-9 with 1 SM 172 because only a prophet can do this. This can be seen as an obvious diversion tactic to avoid addressing inspired statements that contradict their pro-marriage position. The principle of harmonizing scripture with scripture is a most basic and fundamental method of how we study the Bible. It is one of the core principles of our Protestant heritage and to do away with it now would be akin to committing spiritual suicide. The same applies to inspired statements coming from the SOP and the SRod. To suggest that we cannot harmonize inspired passages coming from the golden bowl is an affront to common sense and logic directly contrary to scripture.

“Come now, and **let us reason together**, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” – **Isaiah 1:18**

“Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, **rightly dividing** the word of truth.” – **2 Timothy 2:15**

“Whom shall he **teach knowledge**? and whom shall he make to **understand doctrine**? [them that are] weaned from the milk, [and] drawn from the breasts. (10) For precept [must be] upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, [and] there a little:” – **Isaiah 28:9, 10**

Another fallout from the failure to the NEM advocates has been their diversion tactic of making claims that allege that because Ellen White gave incorrect counsel on celebrating Christmas that we are free to disregard her plain statements about marriage on the New Earth. This argument has severe logical flaws. Harold Julimess has created a straw man by claiming because Sister White was wrong about Christmas, she is also wrong about marriages on the New Earth. However, this side-step to another topic altogether proves nothing. What is the evidence that she was wrong about Christmas? Nothing was provided to support this bogus claim. And furthermore, what does this have to do with the current controversy?

**According to Isaiah 7 Bro. Houteff is the man who interprets all doctrine coming from the Bible and the SOP so we have to take 3 SC 2:4-9 and 1 TG 44:10 over the Bible and the SOP.**

This grossly inaccurate presumption by NEM advocates is a desperate effort to justify their position by attempting to elevate the Shepherd’s Rod above the SOP and even the Bible itself. Let us expose the fallacy of this uninspired reasoning.

1. It is true that the Shepherd’s Rod message arose to clarify and interpret many things that were not understood or revealed in the days of Ellen White. Some examples include the meaning of the word “daily” in Daniel chapter 8, the man “666”, the 7 trumpets, the 7 seals, the premillennial kingdom, Daniel 11:40-45, the war in the book of Nahum, etc.
2. However, the Rod did not come to overrule or contradict teachings and doctrines that were already revealed and understood. For example, the Rod did not have to reveal to us the basic principles of health reform and vegetarianism as these were already plainly revealed in the writings of Ellen White. The same goes for all other fundamental doctrines that led to the establishment of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.
3. In the case of marriages and births on the New Earth the words of Jesus Himself, and the strong endorsement by Ellen White, are so plain and definitive that they do not need some special added interpretation from the Rod to help us understand.
4. By committing to such a fraudulent and unscriptural method of reasoning exposes Harold Julimess as one of the false teachers that inspiration warned us about and told us to avoid at all costs lest we be snared in their devices and lose our eternal salvation for knowing and believing a lie.

“[Even him], whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, (10) And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. (11) And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: (12) That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” – **2 Thessalonians 2:9-12**

In the end all our doctrines are to be measured by the Bible and the Bible alone. To elevate the SRod above the Bible is a very dangerous and presumptuous sin and we at upa7.org have no part with individuals who so carelessly handle the Word of God.

“Although the doctrine of the Kingdom may not appear quite so complete under the lens of Sister White’s writings as under the lens of the Rod, one dare not thus superficially reject either, but must the more studiously compare both views of the doctrine under the super-lens of the Bible. He must keep in mind that we are not given license to harmonize the Bible with any other writings, but are charged to measure all others by It.” – **Answerer Book No. 2, p. 74.3**

“What a fearful responsibility rests upon those who carelessly handle the Word of God, who pose as soul guardians over the people but who in reality are guarding that no soul escape landing in hell. Both they and their abominations will fall in the ditch. Indeed, if any reform is needed in Christendom, it is certainly needed worst in this one line.

Having now learned better, let us no longer make idols of men; let us no longer give place within us to unclean spirits. Let us rather give the Spirit of God a chance to lead us into His ever-advancing Truth with personal understanding.

Let us be followers of Christ, never again of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, or of some other.” -- **Timely Greetings, Vol. 1, No. 18, p. 17**
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