

Circular Letter. 311 Jul/Aug/Sep. 2025

In this Circular Letter

Page 1	Poem	
Page 2	Editorial	Brother by Ernest Brady.
Page 3	Can anything good come out of Nazareth?	Brother Edd Macintosh
Page 6	The Federal Principle	Brother and Sister Wilson
Page 8	The Creation, Adan: Sin: Death by Sin:	
	Death Reigns by Sin	Brother Phil Parry
Page13	Hey Hey DNA. Proving God's	
	Existence; Genetically	Mario Seiglie
Page16	Young Peoples Pages	Sister Dawn So
Page 20	Isaiah 40:1-5	Keys of the Kingdom Holy Bible

Correspondence may be sent to our E-mail address at : -

bygrace@nazarenes.org.uk

Also we have a website at www.thenazarenefellowship.co.uk which contains hundreds of articles of interest

MY HEARTS DEASIRE

As the deer panteth for the water,
So my soul longeth after thee,
You alone are my hearts desire,
And I long to worship thee.

You alone are my strength my shield,
To You alone may my spirit yield,
You alone are my hearts desire,
And I long to worship thee.

You're my friend and You are my brother,
Even though you are a king.
I love you more than any other,
So much more than anything.

You alone are my strength my shield,
To You alone may my spirit yields,
You alone are my hearts desire,
And I long to worship thee.

I want You more than gold or silver,
Only You can satisfy.
You alone are the real joy Giver,
And the apple of my eye.

You alone are my strength my shield,
To You alone may my spirit yield,
You alone are my hearts desire,
And I long to worship thee'.

By Mart Nyström

EDITORIAL

by Ernest Brady - June 1954

Here are a few selections from the articles produced by Bro. Broughton:- In one issue he deals with a question we are often asked by those who believe that Sin is a physical property of human flesh. "How did Jesus bear our sins in His own body on the tree, if it was not by bearing our sin nature?"

Bro. Broughton answers the question as follows: -

"Jesus bore our sins by suffering the punishment they deserved, and he quotes the following texts illustrating how in Scripture sins are thus 'borne.'

Leviticus 20:20 - "They shall bear their sin... they shall die childless."

Leviticus 24:15 - "Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin.. he shall surely be put to death."

Numbers 30:8-15 "...the Lord shall forgive her (but her husband) shall bear her iniquity."

Ezekiel 14:10 - "They shall bear the punishment of their iniquity."

Ezekiel 18:20 - "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the fathers."

Ezekiel 23:49 - "Ye shall bear the sins of your idols."

Lamentations 5:7 - "Our fathers have sinned, and we have borne their iniquities."

This selection of passages amply illustrate that to bear sin means to suffer the punishment due to sin, either one's own or, as can be seen from one or two of the texts, the sins of others.

I remember years ago a Christadelphian advancing Ezekiel 18:20 as proof that it was impossible for Jesus to have suffered for the sins of others, but if, as Bro. Broughton shows, the idea of sin-nature or the need for atonement for sin-nature, is entirely foreign to Scripture; if Jesus did not bear the punishment of the sins of others, He died in vain.

The fact is that Ezekiel 18:20 is intended as a prohibition of the practice of punishing the innocent instead of the guilty, a thing which no just person could tolerate. To use it for the purpose of discrediting the sacrificial death of Jesus is blind perversity. Jesus was not punished instead of the guilty. He voluntarily bore the punishment due to sinners

in order to set them free and show Divine Love. A person, and there are such, who claims to be unable to see the difference does not deserve to share the benefits involved.

Bro. Broughton goes on to show, by a literal example from Scripture, how Jesus bore our sin. He quotes Matthew 8:17 - "...He cast out spirits... that it might be fulfilled... himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses." He says, "Now Jesus took their infirmities by taking them from the people He cured: yet, He himself did not take the evil spirits into Himself. He bore our sicknesses like, leprosy, blindness, lameness, the palsy, not by becoming leprous, blind, lame, or palsied, but by curing those who had such diseases. In like manner Christ took upon Himself our sins when God laid upon him the iniquity of us all, by removing them from us.

But, he adds, there is a difference in the manner. A devil, i.e. a deranged mental state or a disease, could be removed as an act of mercy, pure and simple, by the exercise of Divine power; whereas sins could only be removed by transferring the penalty to Himself. And so He suffered, the Just for the unjust, on the Tree, bearing our sins, i.e. the punishment of them, and so God's mercy and forgiveness now abounds to all men.

I think that is a very reasonable answer, and taken in conjunction with the laws of sacrifice in the Old Testament, provides a complete explanation of how Jesus' death took away sins.

"Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"

John 1:46

Have you ever wondered about Nathanael's strange remark in the Gospel of John? When told about Jesus of Nazareth, Nathanael responded "What good can come from Nazareth?" (John 1:46) Since there are no throw-away phrases in the Gospels, especially in John's Gospel, what could this mean?

Was it just that Nazareth was a rural, backwater sort of place? No, there's much, much more.

In the very last verse of his Gospel, John wrote this: "But there are also many other things which Jesus did; were every one of them to be

written, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written" (John 21:25).

If this is true, we know John wouldn't just waste space with a useless line. So what gives? What insight does this give us into the mysteries of Christ? Stay tuned! This seemingly inconsequential phrase is actually the fulfilment of an ancient prophesy.

First off, let's dig into this mysterious passage from the first chapter of the Gospel of John. The next day Jesus decided to go to Galilee. And he found Philip and said to him, "Follow me." Now Philip was from Beth-sa'ida, the city of Andrew and Peter. Philip found Nathan'a-el, and said to him, "We have found him of whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph."

Who is "Him of whom Moses" and the prophets wrote? Moses wrote at Deuteronomy 18:15 that "The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brethren - him you shall heed." Interesting side note: what was the name of the leader of the Israelites who immediately followed Moses? Joshua. Guess what the name Joshua translates to in Aramaic, the language Jesus spoke! "Joshua" translated to Yeshua or "Jesus." More on this a bit later ...

This "prophet like unto Moses" is what Philip is referencing (more on what the Prophets wrote in a minute). So Philip is announcing the arrival of the long-prophesied, long-awaited New Moses, the Messiah, who will lead a New Exodus to a New Promised Land via a New Passover ... but Nathanael doesn't seem too excited: Nathan'a-el said to him, "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" Philip said to him, "Come and see." Jesus saw Nathan'a-el coming to him, and said of him, "Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" Nathan'a-el said to him, "How do you know me?" Jesus answered him, "Before Philip called you, when you were under the fig tree, I saw you." Nathan'a-el answered him ... "You mean you were spying on me? That's sorta creepy!" No ... that's not what Nathanael said. Pay attention when Scripture zags when it seems like it should zig. Something important is always about to happen. This is how Nathanael actually answers Jesus: "Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel!" Jesus answered him, "Because I said to you, I saw you under the fig tree, do you believe? You shall see greater things than these." And he said to him, "Truly, truly, I say to you,

you will see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.”

Whoa, Nathanael! That's a big flip-flop, isn't it? We know, as Nathanael exclaims, that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of David and the "Son of God", the "King of Israel" and the "King of Kings," whose coming was prophesied by Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and every prophet worth his salt -- but where did Nathanael suddenly come up with all that? What caused Nathanael's turnaround on Jesus? How did Nathanael go from poking fun at Nazareth to announcing the arrival of the Messiah?

The Prophecy of the Righteous Branch

To get to the answer, here is one of the many times the great prophet, Jeremiah, announced the coming of the Messiah: “Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah will be saved, and Israel will dwell securely. And this is the name by which he will be called: ‘The Lord is our righteousness.’” - Jeremiah 23:5-6.

Jesus would be the son of David, i.e. a descendant of David, according to the flesh, according to Romans 1:3. This is why we are given the genealogy of Jesus at the beginning of Mathew’s Gospel. But what of this “righteous Branch”?

The great prophet, Isaiah, also had something to say about this “branch”, cf. Isaiah 11: - “There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord. And his delight shall be in the fear of the Lord. The “stump of Jesse”?

What is that and who is Jesse? Jesse is David’s father. The tree that grew from Jesse was David and the lines of kings which succeeded him. When the line of kings was broken, the tree was cut down, leaving only a stump. A "shoot" springing forth from the "stump of Jesse" is the New David, the Messiah, who will restore Israel. Make sense?

So what does this have to do with what good, bad, or ugly comes out of Nazareth? Here's one last oracle from the Prophets. This time, we read from Zechariah: Hear now, O Joshua the high priest, you and your friends who sit before you, for they are men of good omen: behold, I will bring my servant the Branch. For behold, upon the stone which I have set before Joshua, upon a single stone with seven facets, I will engrave its inscription, says the Lord of hosts, and I will remove the guile of this land in a single day. In that day, says the Lord of hosts, every one of you will invite his neighbour under his vine and under his fig tree." (Zech. 3:8-10).

What?! Did you just hear that thunderclap? Remember "Joshua" from above? Remember "guile" from the Gospel passage? Does "under the fig tree" sound familiar? Nathanael, too, probably heard that same thunderclap when, at last, he understood Jesus' words, and that he, Nathanael, was now living the fulfilment of Zechariah's oracle.

But there's still MORE ... What about this Branch we keep hearing about? How does that fit in with Nathanael and "What good can come from Nazareth?"

What, Not Where, is Nazareth?

This brings us to the best part. How does the nowhere town of Nazareth fit in to all this? The town of Nazareth is only a couple centuries old at the time of Christ. It's too far from Jerusalem, far removed from the centre of action. It's too new to have been mentioned by the Prophets, much less Moses. Or is it?

What are we to make of the following verse from the Gospel of Matthew? "And he went and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that what was spoken by the prophets might be fulfilled, 'He shall be called a Nazarene.'"

What? When did the Prophets ever mention "Nazareth"? The town came into existence long after the deaths of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Zechariah. In fact, there is no such prophesy anywhere in the Old Testament that the Messiah would be called a "Nazarene." ... Or is there? What if the Prophets have been talking about "Nazareth" all along?

The question is what does "Nazareth" mean in Hebrew? Better yet, what is the word for BRANCH in Hebrew? The answer is the same! The

Hebrew word for "branch" is netzer, which is spelled NZR, same as "Nazareth." "Nazareth" means "branch" in Hebrew! Jesus shall be called the "Righteous Branch" - "He shall be called a Nazarene."

This realization, along with the significance of sitting "under the fig tree", is what came flooding over Nathanael when he began speaking with Jesus. This is why Nathanael responded with the exclamation, "Rabbi, you are the Son of God! You are the King of Israel!" Jesus is the Branch, the Netzer, shooting up from the Stump of Jesse. He is the New David, the New King of the New Kingdom of the New Israel.

Can you imagine how foolish Nathanael must have felt later, when he remembered saying to Philip "What good can come from Nazareth?" Can you imagine the facepalm? He had unwittingly made a great pun, but the joke was on him. I'm sure Philip must have reminded his friend of it many, many times. That's probably why it became part of the Gospel.

Brother Edd Macintosh

The Federal Principle

The First Principle of the Oracles of God.

All are agreed that according to Romans 5 alone, the posterity of Adam are all involved in the Sin of Adam, and in the death sentence incurred by him, on account of what is known as the "Federal Principle" being employed by God, but regarding the manner of its application there is a variety of opinions.

The majority understand it to be visited upon us through our physical organism which, if such procedure were attempted by mankind, would bring down the righteous anger of every son upon the "Unjust Judge." Moreover, they would realise in it the dastardly and horrible process of "killing by slow poisoning," and again, the crown of sufferers would pounce upon the "Unjust Judge" and consider themselves "Justified" in putting him out of existence as positively unfit to live.

Shall we then, accept such a horrible story in connection with the procedure of the Just God who "so loved" that He gave His "Own" Beloved Son to save the unfortunate trespasser from his merited

punishment, even though He knew that he wilfully transgressed? Would it not be more consistent with the attributes of a Just God if He, on account of the Federal Principle under which we, the members, are accounted parts of the Federal Body of which Adam is the Federal Head, included us under the sentence of death for Adam's sin when we became enlightened, and from which we can instantly become extricated by rendering obedience to the appointed form of doctrine for our participation in the redemption therefrom, effected typically in Eden, Antitypically on Calvary? (Genesis 3:21, Revelation 13:8, 1 Peter 1:18, Revelation 5:9.)

This understanding of it excuses the unenlightened, leaving then in the natural sphere, to die as do the beasts (Ecclesiastes 3:19) from physical exhaustion... and is decidedly a more just procedure than the "Slow Poisoning" assumption, is it not?

The reason for God introducing this Federal Principle seems to have been for the exercise of our faith in His promise to provide a Ransom Price (Genesis 22:8) and to incite our love toward Him for His merciful act and wonderful love toward Adam, but for which we had never come into existence at all, because had Adam been slain instead of the Lamb in Eden, we had perished in Adam.

Understanding and applying this Federal Principle in this manner shows plainly why only one random sacrifice was requisite to extricate the One Adam (ic) (body) from the effects of the One Sin committed in Eden, and why "without the shedding of (Christ's) Blood" no remission - and reveals a perfectly Just and gracious God, a loving "Father," and exonerates Him, also accounting for the One literal participant in the redemption effected thereby, and the many symbolical participations therein, does it not?

Personification of Sin

It seems evident that the language of personification was adopted to enable us more readily to perceive the absolute necessity for, and to understand, the scheme of redemption. Having become by transgression the "Servant" of, and sold under Sin, Adam became this sin's possession. No provision for remission having been made in the Edenic Law, Adam could do nothing to obtain, and having become the lawful possession of another, there was no other honourable means whereby his release from

this “Bondage” could be effected by “redemption” which necessitated that an equivalent be paid in Ransom.

How could this transaction be accomplished in harmony with the attributes of a Just God, other than by making provision whereby His Second Son could attain to a right Resurrection again? Having honourably secured this Son’s willing co-operation He then could honourably pay over to “Mr.” Sin the life “in the blood thereof” (Leviticus 17:11; 1 Peter 1:18,) of this Son as a Ransom to Redeem His brother, could He not?

“O Death, where is thy Sting? O Grave, where is thy Victory?”

Not a single soul of Adam’s race need have perished. “Thanks be to God who giveth us the Victory.”

A. and L. Wilson

The Creation: Adam: Sin: Death By Sin: **Death Reigns By Sin.**

Whatever evolutionists think or teach, they cannot explain the source and origin of those things upon which their theories are based. That source and origin we believe to be He who has chosen to reveal Himself in the books of the Bible by holy men moved by the operations of His Holy Spirit. Therefore the Scriptures are not for the evolutionist, nor the natural minded man; they must be spiritually discerned by those people who are exercised by faith resulting from belief in the Word of God, as the writer to the Hebrews, chapter 11 states, especially in verse 1 and verse 6. If we are of this class and in company with those mentioned in the whole of chapter eleven, then we believe the Genesis account (Chapter 1, verse 1), “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” We do not therefore question, “how?”, but merely arrive at verse two where at some period of the earth’s history “the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” To the evolutionist and unbeliever God speaks through His chosen Prophet Isaiah, chapter 40, verses 12 to 17.

My following considerations will not be a denial therefore of what is written for our admonition and learning, but a question of, what is written, and, “How readest thou?”

The Genesis account of six days of creation involving creatures of the waters and fowls of the air, cattle and beasts and creeping things, the herb of the field and trees with fruit, all for nourishment and preservation of this natural order of things, and the day of rest from all the Creator's work, is a record to be read with the utmost logic and discrimination by comparing scripture with scripture, and I believe the “key” is supplied in the record of Genesis, and the door fully opened for viewing, through God speaking to the fathers by the Prophets and in the last days speaking by His Son whom He has appointed heir of all things, and on account of whom He created the earth and its inhabitants.

Genesis means origin, so if we want an account of Creation we go to the first book in the Bible which records the origin of creation, not to Psalm 90 or 2 Peter, where the writers are stating and comparing the Majesty and Power of the Creator in contrast with man's feeble and corruptible limited nature; so that a 24 hour day to man is something to be reckoned on his standard, but to God it appears as almost nothing, because He is from everlasting to everlasting.

Psalm 90 and 2 Peter 3:8. A thousand years as a day. Let us feign ignorance of these statements when reading Genesis and we shall be more able to find the “key” as to whether creation took 6,000 years or 6 days as we understand it of 24 hours, but remember we are not talking about Genesis 1:1, but about things that were already in existence as regards the universe, with the exception of the animal life including man, herbs and trees. The Spirit of God in motion was essential. There must be Light and there was Light by the utterance of His Word. So the forming began to take shape out of the existing void, but in proper order of rotation by Him that worketh all things by the counsel of His own Will. To arrive at an understanding of what a day means to man and what it actually is by his own experience, we are informed in Genesis 1:14 to 18, concerning the lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night, and to be for signs and for seasons and for days and years, the greater light to rule the day and the lesser light to rule the night, the stars also. Now, from all this data man has learned to compile a calendar and he assumes its accuracy on the basis of what God has decreed, though he dislikes admitting to Him as the God of Abraham revealed in the Bible. We all

accept a day as of 24 hours duration, though part of it consists of light and part of it darkness, I say part because it varies in different parts of the world. There are people who have taken the view that creation took 6,000 years, a thousand years for each day recorded in Genesis, but is there evidence in Genesis to prove this? I think there is not, but again I am not referring to the beginning when the heavens and the earth were first created. Nevertheless, it is not for man to limit the power of God, the Creator; to do such a thing we compare Him with ourselves and by our own finite and limited comprehension. Let us remember that He is answerable to none but His own attributes which He declared to Moses in the Mount. And in another place He declared, "It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king: for he is turned back from following me..." 1 Samuel 15:11. Again, in Numbers 23:19, speaking through Balaam to Balak, king of Moab, "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? Or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" But we should not take these declarations out of their context, as we find it teaches us in Psalm 106:44 & 45 and Lamentations 3:32. God does not repent or answer to a higher authority, but in accordance with His attribute of Mercy. "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swear by himself, saying. Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee," Hebrews 6:13 & 14. Let us read Romans 9, and then we can consider His challenge, "Who art thou, O man, to dispute with God, does he not have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and compassion on whom he will have compassion?" Let us take account of this when we read the record of creation, and God's words to Adam in the Genesis account, realising with the Apostle James, in chapter 2 verse 13, "Mercy rejoiceth against judgement." God told Adam to have dominion over all creation, but we learn that this, and his freedom of the garden of Eden, depended on his continued relationship and affinity with God by obedience to the conditions. Therefore God set before him "life" or "death" for we know that death is the opposite of life, and the life Adam experienced was the life we experience now, in bodies which are of the earth, earthy, capable of dying and of inflicted accelerated death. 1 Corinthians 15.

The conditions to Adam involved freedom to eat of all the trees but one. The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, "thou shalt not eat of it for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die. It was not poisonous. Did Eve realise this because she had witnessed its fruit being eaten by some other species and no harm resulted? Did this move her to

thinking within herself, “Ye shall not surely die”? And seeing it as something to make one wise, which was to her a desirable thing, she partook of it and gave also to her husband and he deliberately ate of it? I myself have often wondered , why? Could he visualise the loss of a beloved wife whom God had given him that he might not be alone, and decided to suffer the penalty with her, and so ate of the fruit? This is only conjecture, but the fact is, they both sinned and Adam, having been the first to receive God's conditions of life in the garden, and all human life being in his loins by virtue of the power of fertilisation and reproduction through the woman, he was held to be more responsible. The sentence of death was upon them by their own actions in the day they sinned. So, in the day they ate thereof they were legally dead, their life was forfeited to that which they had allowed to become their master. Now would Adam have regarded a day as a thousand years? There is reason to think he did not, but if there is reason to think otherwise on the basis of Psalm 90, then there is every reason to believe that it took the Creator a thousand years to form Adam from the dust of the ground; also but a few minutes of eating the forbidden fruit (eating thou shall eat) but a thousand years in which to die, which would make him in effect, a “God-tolerated” sinner of almost a thousand years, and without redemption, reconciliation or hope. This indeed is Adam's position on the basis of the belief that natural decay and death is the penalty and which passed upon all men by Adam's sin; a sentence which cannot be removed this side of the grave apart from unconditional forgiveness from God and miraculous change of nature from the nature held to be physically condemned. What a hopeless condition to be in. Yet, to hold on to, and establish the creeds of men, people love to have it so!

“There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.” Proverbs 14:12 to 16 and 25. The wise man in Ecclesiastes 9 sums up the present situation, that one event happens “to the righteous and to the wicked, but while joined to the living there is Hope, and this Hope concerns the Way of Life. Verse 4). His advice in verses 7 to 10 is most appropriate and acceptable. “God now accepteth thy words” - “Let thy garments be always white... Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest.”

Sad to say, too many use such references as these to refute the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and reject the advice to work righteousness (in garments of white obtained), through the exercise of

knowledge and wisdom. May these thoughts be helpful and bring forth some constructive points that we may all continue to grow in knowledge, understanding and wisdom unto the perfect man Christ Jesus who was full of grace and Truth. So that we may realise and declare with the Prophet John the Baptist, “And of his fullness have all we received and grace for grace,” John 1:16. Nakedness was not regarded by Adam or Eve as shameful, for God had created them so, and the scripture declares, “They were naked but were not ashamed.” Was there something in the unlawful act of partaking of the tree of knowledge of good and evil which was meant to trigger off, as it were, a consciousness of sin committed, and reflected in an added knowledge of nakedness and shame before God? What took place later in the dialogue between the Lord God and Adam seems to indicate this. “Who told thee that thou wast naked, hast thou eaten of the tree?” Adam could not cover or atone for his own sin. The covering was of God's provision through the shedding of blood. It was left to them to keep those garments lest they be found naked again.

Our garments have also been provided by the grace of God, and Jesus takes up this fact in Revelation 16:15, Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame.”

Yours in the hope of His coming, Brother Phil Parry.

Hey, Hey DNA! Proving God's Existence – Genetically

By Mario Seigle

Recent discoveries about DNA have left scientists flabbergasted, and the evidence points clearly to a supreme Intelligence having imbedded an incredible multifaceted code in our genes.

Remarkable discoveries about the mind-boggling complexity of DNA are providing solid evidence of the divine creation of life. In fact, it was mainly for this reason that Sir Antony Flew, the late world-famous philosopher who had been the leading atheist in England, renounced his atheism a few years back and accepted the existence of God.

Regarding whether recent research on DNA had influenced his change of mind, he said: “Yes, I now think it does . . . almost entirely because of

the DNA investigations. What I think the DNA material has done is that it has shown, by the almost unbelievable complexity of the arrangements which are needed to produce (life), that intelligence must have been involved in getting these extraordinarily diverse elements to work together” (*There Is a God: How the World’s Most Notorious Atheist Changed His Mind* , 2007, p. 75).

He went on to say: “I now believe that the universe was brought into existence by an infinite Intelligence. I believe that this universe’s intricate laws manifest what scientists have called the Mind of God. I believe that life and reproduction originate in a divine Source. “Why do I believe this, given that I expounded and defended atheism for more than a half century? The short answer is this: this is the world picture, as I see it, that has emerged from modern science. Science spotlights three dimensions of nature that point to God. The first is the fact that nature obeys laws. The second is the dimension of life, of intelligently organized and purpose-driven beings, which arose from matter. The third is the very existence of nature” (pp. 88-89). Initially, scientists believed that DNA was a somewhat simple genetic code with extraneous material. But now they have found the code to be astoundingly complex, multilayered and even bidirectional—with no so-called “junk DNA.” This should lead us to do a double take as we learn what this code means and what its relevance is to God’s existence.

Spy codes—as in Washington’s day

Back in the days of the American Revolution, George Washington and his officers sent each other letters with double meanings. A letter intercepted by the enemy would simply have sounded like a typical message describing incidents on a farm. But to those with the deciphering key, the same message may have described troop numbers and locations. Yet without the key, the secret message would be safely hidden. Similarly, scientists have now discovered that certain areas of the genetic code have secondary messages that can be deciphered by a cell’s translating devices. Comparing DNA to a spy code, science historian Stephen Meyer explains: “In the same way, the cell has protein machinery and RNA codes that jointly function as a cipher enabling it to access and read the secondary imbedded messages within the primary message of the genome. “The presence of these genes imbedded within genes (messages within messages) further enhances the information-storage density of the genome and underscores how the genome is organized to enhance its

capacity to store information” (Signature in the Cell: DNA and the Evidence for Intelligent Design , 2009, pp. 463-464). Imagine how difficult it would be to write a message and inscribe within it other messages! Mindless evolution could never produce genetic information of any kind, much less in overlapping levels of this nature! Clearly, this demands a vastly superior Intelligence.

Backmasking—DNA’s bidirectional code

Some years ago, a few rock musicians recorded some songs with certain elements recorded backwards onto them—so that when these songs were played in reverse very different tunes and lyrics could be heard. (Unfortunately, a number of those messages were negative.)

Similarly, scientists have found the versatile genome to be bi-directional - relaying different messages when read from opposite directions - providing efficiency of space.

Dr. Meyer explains: “In the same way that words are ordered into sentences and sentences into paragraphs, nucleotide bases [within the DNA molecular chain] are ordered into genes and genes are ordered into specifically arranged gene clusters. Or think of these individual genes as computer data files and groupings of genes as folders containing several files. The groupings of DNA ‘files’ that we observe serve several roles. These groupings allow the cell to make longer transcripts that are combinations of different gene messages. In other words, the coding modules of the gene files in a ‘folder’ can be combined in numerous ways—and in both directions—to greatly increase the number of encoded transcripts and protein products from the same genomic region or resources” (pp. 467-468). Again, imagine how difficult it would be to design something like this! If you read forward, you find one message. If you read backwards, you find another message. Again, how could evolution possibly account for this? It is further clear evidence of a brilliant Mind at work!

From “junk DNA” to a complex computer operating system

Computer users are familiar with a computer’s operating system, such as Microsoft Windows, which sets and controls the environment in which software programs run. Scientists are now startled to find many regions of the genome, which they initially thought were useless, that in fact provide key functions similar to a computer’s operating system.

Dr. Meyer explains: “Indeed . . . portions of the genome that many biologists previously regarded as ‘junk DNA’ are now known to perform many important functions, including the regulation and expression of the information for building proteins. In this respect, the nonprotein coding regions of the genome function much like an operating system [does] in a software program, directing and regulating how other information in the system is processed” (p. 367). Molecular biologist Jonathan Wells adds: “The genome functions in a hierarchical fashion. The DNA molecule is only the first level; chromatin [cell nucleus contents of DNA with accompanying proteins] organization is a second level; and the position of chromosomes within the nucleus is a third level . . . There is evidence at all three levels that non-protein-coding DNA performs functions that are independent of its exact sequence” (The Myth of Junk DNA, 2011, p. 72). This is truly astonishing. What we have seen, as Dr. Wells points out, is that DNA is “bidirectional, multilayered, and interleaved, rather than simply linear . . . The organization of DNA strings along the genome is optimized for the establishment of multidimensional codes at all scales” (pp. 106-107). What powerful evidence this is that a great, divine Mind had to be at work to compose such a multifaceted code and imbed it into a tiny chromosome!

Discarding the “junk DNA” myth

To believe that all this incredible, efficient complexity simply evolved through mutation and natural selection is to deny the overwhelming facts. As Dr. Wells concludes: “Scientists make progress by testing hypotheses against the evidence. But when scientists ignore the evidence and cling to a hypothesis for philosophical or theological reasons, the hypothesis becomes a myth. Junk DNA is such a myth, and it’s time to leave it behind - along with other discarded myths from the past. “As recent discoveries have demonstrated, we are just beginning to unravel the mysteries of the genome. Indeed, the same can be said of living organisms in general. But assuming that any feature of an organism has no function discourages further investigation. In this respect, the myth of junk DNA has been a science-stopper. Not anymore. For scientists willing to follow the evidence wherever it leads, these are exciting times” (p. 107). God has truly left His “signature” in every cell of every life form—including you and me—the obvious and wondrous design of DNA. This is surely some of the most compelling evidence ever found for His existence

Young Peoples Pages

Dear friends,

I pray that Yahweh - the God of god's - is watching over you - and that you will be able to see His hand in your life - just like the people we are reading about in the Bible!

Remember that last time, Joseph had died and been embalmed in Egypt. His body was awaiting the time when his large family - the children of Israel/Jacob ('Israelites') would leave Egypt and return to Canaan - where Joseph had asked them to bury him, at the same place where his father, mother, and many other family members had been buried.

We are finding the next stage of this story, in a book called Exodus, in the Bible. It was given this name because the book tells the story about the departure (exodus) of the Israelites from Egypt, back to Canaan. Remember how, years before, they had come down to Egypt from Canaan at Joseph's request, because of the famine - and they had stayed there ever since.

Joseph and all his brothers had now died, and all that generation. The Israelites had grown much larger - until "the land was filled with them"! A new king in Egypt (the pharaoh - Thutmose 1) had taken over. He knew nothing about Joseph, and was very concerned about the size of the Israelite group - foreigners living in his land! He became afraid that if war broke out between Egypt and an enemy country, the Israelites might take sides with the enemy and help them defeat the Egyptians. So this king spoke to all the Egyptians and persuaded them that the Israelites were a threat, and something needed to be done about it! He came up with a plan to turn the Israelites into their slaves - make them do all the hard work building, mining, making bricks, digging, farming, etc - to keep them under control. And this is what happened. Suddenly the Israelites lives became much much harder! They were made to build huge cities for the Pharaoh and his people, and Pharaoh set taskmasters

over the Israelites to force them to work hard, and punish them if they didn't.

Pharaoh had imagined that all the hard work would wear the Israelites out, so that they wouldn't have so many children! He didn't want them to increase at such a rate! But his plan didn't work - in fact they were having even more children than before - and there was getting more and more Israelites! He and the Egyptians were getting more fearful of them! Something more would have to be done! Pharaoh ordered his taskmasters to be even more harsh with the Israelites! At the same time, he gave orders to the midwives (women who help pregnant women to give birth) to kill every Israelite baby boy as it was being born! What a wicked idea!

The midwives tried not to carry out the Pharaohs wicked plan, because they knew that Yahweh hated this idea! He alone has the right to take a human life! So they were letting the baby boys live! But when the Pharaoh found out, he had the midwives brought before him, and demanded to know why they were not carrying out his orders! They excused themselves by telling him that the Israelites women were giving birth too quickly, and that the boys were already born by the time they had arrived.

Because the midwives did not obey the Pharaoh, Yahweh blessed them! But meanwhile, the Israelites were growing in number at an alarming rate! Pharaoh then asked all his people to get involved in the killing program, so that if anyone - neighbours, friends, family - whether Egyptian or Israelite - if they knew that any Israelite woman had given birth to a boy, would be responsible for either killing it themselves, or reporting it, so that it would be killed - and anyone who failed to do so, would be in great danger themselves!

There was an Israelite couple - Jochebed and Amram - who already had a daughter (Miriam) and then - oh dear - they had another child - a boy! They had to keep him a secret! They didn't want anyone to know, or he would be taken and killed! They had to be so careful not let him cry in case someone heard him! Miriam helped to keep him calm and quiet, when her mother was busy. But it was growing harder every day as he grew, and all the time they lived in fear that

someone would find out! The little family prayed to Yahweh every day, to keep the baby safe!

According to Jewish tradition, Jochebed named her son 'Yekutiel' which means 'hope' or 'the hope of God'. But this was to change very shortly.

It was impossible to hide the young baby any more, and so, after prayer, Jochebed came up with a plan. She knew she couldn't run the risk of keeping him any longer. She plaited together a basket, made it waterproof, and laid the baby inside. Then she took it down to the riverside, where she knew the Pharaoh's daughter would often bathe, and placed it between the rushes growing in the water near the bank, so that it would not be swept away. Then she arranged for Miriam to hide somewhere nearby to watch and see what would happen. Sure enough, the Pharaoh's daughter came down to the riverside to bathe, with her maidens. She spotted the little basket and sent one of her maids to fetch it. She was very curious about what was inside it! But as soon as she opened it, she saw the beautiful baby - and he started crying! She guessed at once that he must have belonged to an Israelite - and that it must be a boy! At once she loved the baby, and decided to keep it herself. All this time, Miriam had been creeping nearer to see and hear better what was happening. She pretended she had just been walking by and just happened to notice. At once, she offered to find someone to feed the baby for her! There was no powdered baby milk or bottles in those days. Mothers breast fed their babies until they could eat solid food. Pharaoh's daughter agreed to this - she had to, if she wanted to keep the baby! She had no milk of her own - and he would die without it!

Miriam went straight off, and told her Mum what had happened, and that Pharaoh's daughter was looking for someone to breast feed him - and so Jochebed went with Miriam and spoke to the Princess and offered herself for the job! So Jochebed got her son back - and she was to be paid for looking after him! Now he was safe from harm! The Princess had no idea that Miriam was the baby's sister, and that Jochebed was actually his mother!

After some years, when he was grown, Jochebed brought her son to the Princess and gave him to her, as had been agreed. The Princess adopted him as her own son, and named the baby 'Mosheh' (Moses) and she said, "because I drew him out of the water". No doubt Jochebed, Amram, and Miriam were very sad to leave him with Pharaoh's daughter - but at least they knew he would well look after and have the best of everything - that he wouldn't ever have to work as a slave as they all did - but most important of all, his life had been saved! They had faith that because of this, Yahweh had a plan for his life.

We don't know exactly how old Moses was when he was given to the Princess, but he was old enough to remember his real family, that he was born an Israelite and not an Egyptian, and he never forgot them. It must have been difficult for Moses also, to have been so suddenly separated from his family to start a strange new life - as a royal person! No doubt his family had prepared him as best they could for what was to happen, and they would have continued to ask Yahweh to watch over him. And Yahweh did! He most definitely had a special plan for Moses, as we will come to find out later!

May Yahweh keep YOU also, safely in His care!

Your friend, Dawn

Isaiah 40:1.

"Comfort, comfort My people, says your Elohim; Speak to the heart of Jerusalem, and proclaim unto her hard service is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, for she has received double from the hand of Yahweh for all her sins.

The voice of him who cries out in the wilderness 'Prepare the way of Yahweh, make straight in the desert a highway for Elohim . Every valley will be raised up and every mountain and hill will be made low and the crooked places will become level place and the rough places a plain and the radiance of Yahweh will be revealed, and all flesh together shall see it, for the mouth of Yahweh hath spoken!

1 Thessalonians 5, verses 1 to 11: -

“But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. 2. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. 3. For when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape. 4. But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. 5. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day: we are not of the night, nor of darkness. 6. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober. 7. For they that sleep sleep in the night; and they that be drunken are drunken in the night. 8. But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for an helmet, the hope of salvation. 9. For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, 10. who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him. 11. Wherefore comfort yourselves together, and edify one another, even as also ye do.

Blessings to all. Russell Gregory