

Please Find Below The Official Creed Of The YORWW Congregation Presented:

"Three (3) Simple Statements Of Belief"

So The Question is...

What Do YOU Think?

Please find below three (3) simple statements of belief that will make our position at the YORWW Bible Academy perfectly clear on our unique message. First, let's consider a very familiar key bible verse found at **Genesis 3:15**, which says:

"And I shall put enmity between you and THE WOMAN and between your seed and HER SEED. He will bruise you in the head and you will bruise him in the heel." -- *New World Translation*

Seven (7) Pivotal Points to Consider in Understanding Genesis 3:15

1) The Watchtower Society simply assumes the "woman" cannot be Eve because she could not produce a perfect "seed." (But we can ask ourselves, does the "seed" need to be perfect to accomplish God's Will in this instance?)

2) If the "woman"" pictures the heavenly organization (as taught by the Watchtower Society), then her "seed" could NOT be Jesus because Jesus was created directly by Jehovah as His "only-begotten," and thus existed before any other spirit creature in heaven. And as we know, Jesus was responsible for the creation of the entire angelic family and so could not come from this group of angels, but instead they come from him. (John 1:18; Colossians 1:15, 16)

3) The churches who say the "woman" is Mary, overlook the obvious fact if you say the "seed" comes through Mary, you are still saying that the "seed" still came from Adam & Eve. You can't separate that fact. -- See Genesis 4:25; 12:3; 17:5; 22:17, 18; 2 Samuel 7:11-15; Psalms 89:3, 4.

Further, if the "woman" is Eve, Jesus could not be her "seed" or descendant because no imperfect human male was involved in his conception. This of course means in medical terms, Mary was used ONLY as a "**Surrogate**" mother in giving birth to Jesus. -- Please see the *****Footnote***** below for more information on Surrogacy and/or **being a "Surrogate Mother."**

4) The foretold "enmity" spoken of in this verse is strictly between Satan and the "woman" and then, between the "seed" of Satan and the "seed" of the "woman." Isn't that true?

YORWW Congregation

5) Since we know Satan's "seed" is earthly, so must the woman's "seed" be also. Further, they must co-exist together on earth, in order for genuine "enmity" to be expressed between the two, as foretold.

6) Since the foretold "enmity" is between the two earthly "seeds," so must the accompanying "bruising" action be delivered to one another, on earth. Otherwise, it would have been pointless to mention the predicted "enmity" was to be strictly between the "seed" of the Woman and the "seed" of Satan [Serpent]. If the "bruising" actions were to be between the Messianic Seed and Satan [Serpent], then why even bring up the "enmity" between the two "seeds" in the first place.

7) The Bible emphatically states Satan is to be destroyed by God, and not by the "seed" of the "woman" or messiah. So the "seed" of the "woman" does not "bruise" Satan or destroy him. (Romans 16:20)

A most curious and yet remarkably prodigious point must be made at this juncture, especially relative to the original Divine Promise given at **Genesis 3:15**. And what is that?

Let's consider **1 Corinthians 15:25, 26**:

²⁵ For he must rule as king until [God] has put all enemies under his feet. ²⁶ As the last enemy, death is to be brought to nothing." (*New World Translation*)

Well, think ... if the "last enemy" that is to be removed is clearly said to be "death" as bible prophecy indicates (Isaiah 25:8; Hosea 13:14), and just as we have read above in **1st Corinthians 15:25, 26**, then we must ask a most provocative question, namely:

How can Satan the Devil be done away with or shall we say "bruised in the head," yes destroyed or put to death by Jesus Christ, God's Heavenly King ... how can such a thing be, if the "rule" or "reign" of Jesus has already COME TO AN END, per the insightful comments of 1 Corinthians 15:25, we ask at the YORWW???

Yes, isn't it true, **1 Corinthians 15:25, 26** clearly shows us, Jesus only "rules" or "reigns" UNTIL...UNTIL he does away with the "last enemy," which in this specific instance, actually proves to be **death**? Isn't that so?

And then, the "reign" or "rule" of Jesus ends, isn't that so???

Therefore, if Jesus' heavenly reign ends ... ends with the full removal of "death," the "last enemy" per comments from **1 Corinthians 15:26**, then it is clear is it not, yes most clear that Jesus Christ actually does NOT destroy Satan the Devil, no but it is actually Jehovah God Himself, who righteously DESTROYS SATAN, which of course is exactly what **Romans 16:20** brings out. Think about it!

Therefore, this small bit of information provided above, shows us the "seed of the woman" mentioned in **Genesis 3:15** then, does NOT actually "**bruise**" Satan in the "head," as many religionists today believe. No, but the actual "bruising" action *initiated* by the "seed of the woman," then must be directed to his already foretold *earthly* (not heavenly) "enemy," yes the one that God specifically put real "enmity" against for this "seed," namely the "seed of Satan." God put "enmity" between the two (2) "seeds," namely the "seed of the woman," and the "seed of the Serpent" [or Devil].

YORWW Congregation

Yes, Jehovah God predicted He, Himself would put actual "enmity" between the "seed of the woman" and the "seed of the Serpent" [namely Satan the Devil], isn't that true? And of course, that actual "seed of the Serpent" [Satan] would prove to be the one spoken of in **Revelation 16:13, 14, 16**, yes the one that is destroyed fully at the battle of "Armageddon" itself namely, the "false prophet," and his great collaborator in wickedness, the "wild beast." Therefore, the "seed of the woman," namely the Modern Day "Servant" of **Isaiah 49:1-7**, will ***issue the command*** to finally destroy all *wicked* government and religious opposers of God's newly established *Earthly Kingdom* ... as depicted by a "long sword" proceeding out of his "mouth" to rid the earth of all unrighteousness. -- **Isaiah 11:4; Revelation 19:15, 19-20**

Think about it!

THREE (3) SIMPLE STATEMENTS OF BELIEF ON THE ABOVE BIBLE PROPHECY

FROM THE YORWW CONGREGATION

1. We firmly believe the "seed" of the "woman" spoken of above is NOT Jesus Christ.
2. We firmly believe this "woman" that will bring forth this "seed" is Eve, the person Jehovah was referring to originally.
3. We firmly believe because the "woman" is Eve, that the "seed" of Eve would have to be an imperfect (sinful) descendant of Adam and Eve.

Therefore based upon the above, we ([Y.O.R.W.W. Congregation](#)) vigilantly and dutifully teach, our earth wide religious community at large has made a major, enormous mistake in thinking the "seed" of the woman shown at **Genesis 3:15** applies to Jesus Christ. This is a critical mistake, in our viewpoint. We believe this misconception in itself, has caused people to *completely misunderstand the entire bible message*, yes from **Genesis to Revelation**.

For instance, when we examine closely **Psalms 45:16**, what does it tell us? Well, it tells us a descendant of "Eve," a descendant of King David, yes, the actual *Davidic Heir* will become something amazingly special. (2 Samuel 7:11-15) It states the *Davidic Heir* will become the "father" of those previously thought to be his progenitors or forefathers. This is a miraculous happening, just as the verse says:

"In place of your fathers shall be your sons; you will make them princes in all the earth." -- *English Standard Version*

When we compare this particular verse with **Psalms 89:27**, a great "Sacred Secret" is unveiled for us. This verses states:

"And I will make him the firstborn, the highest of the kings of the earth." -- *English Standard Version*

In **Psalms 45:16** and **Psalms 89:27**, Jehovah The Almighty tells us the promised *Davidic Heir* will be appointed or 'made' into the earthly "firstborn" son of God, the same way **Adam would have been if**

he had remained faithful. Did you ever notice that point before? Ask yourself, why would someone need to be made into the "firstborn" in God's eyes? Could this be because this person would be assuming the position that Adam (who failed God in the Garden of Eden) once had ... could this be possible???

Think about it!

In addition, we believe the things that we speak of, these three (3) simple statements shown above, unlocks the undiscovered, unrevealed "sacred secrets" from God Almighty, that He Himself has "reserved" [**Isaiah 48:6** *NWT*] for his "name people" in the last days, as indicated at **Revelation 10:7**. In turn, this specially called people [small remnant of repatriated, repentant Jehovah's Witnesses leading the powerful **YORWW Congregation**, some **200 Million** strong [**Isaiah 5:26-30; Revelation 9:16, 17**], will be used by Jehovah God to sound ["Seven Trumpets"] God's Message of Truth to all earth wide who wish to become the beneficiaries of God's Original Promise to Abraham, individuals we have named: **"Abrahamic People of the Nations."** -- See Genesis 22:18; Isaiah 11:10; Zechariah 8:12, 13; Matthew 24:14; Revelation 8:6.

Let's Suppose An Angelic Discussion Took Place...

For the sake of argument, let's suppose there were two angels holding a conversation in heaven, talking about this. The conversation went something like this,

1st angel: You know, I believe those people on earth are starting to really get close to the truth of the bible, and close to discovering the true meaning of the "sacred secret" of God. The Divine Secret we know that's mentioned at **Revelation 10:7**. They are finally coming to understand how the "sacred secret" of God has PERSISTED for so long, for so many centuries, and why the apostle Paul himself spoke of God's purposes as being a great "mystery" which was perceived to be a "hazy outline" [footnote: literally "obscure expression"] to him personally and to all 1st century Christians. (1 Corinthians 13:12 *NWT*) Imagine that! Paul said the Word of God was an **"OBSCURE EXPRESSION"** to him, an inspired apostle. What do you think of that?

But we angels in heaven are so annoyed when we constantly hear these preachers and religious ministers on earth saying, the bible nowadays is fully understood by good, churchgoing, "holy ghost people!" What a joke!

Anyway, these few people on earth are finally coming to understand this important fact about Genesis 3:15, and because of this, they can now get a MORE ACCURATE understanding of Genesis 3:15 as properly referring to [ANOTHER promised Messiah coming to earth](#).

2nd angel: Yes, I totally agree. And if they can finally come to understand the true essence of **Genesis 3:15** and its full importance upon mankind, then as you said, the whole bible will make total sense to them! They won't be like Paul and first century Christians anymore. No, but they will now have a MORE ENLIGHTENED viewpoint of things. They would now understand the "sacred secret" of God, mentioned in **Revelation 10:7**. The "Word of God," will no longer be "AN OBSCURE EXPRESSION" to them! - **1 Corinthians 13:12** see footnote large print Ref. *NWT*.

YORWW Congregation

And what's more, the verse in **1 Corinthians 13:9, 10** would make more sense. Let's consider this rendering found in the *New Living Translation*:

"Now our knowledge is partial and incomplete, and even the gift of prophecy reveals only part of the whole picture! But when the time of perfection comes [or "when that which is complete arrives" *NWT*, suggesting the coming of a **2nd Messiah** after Jesus] these partial things will become USELESS."

Of course, up here in heaven all us angels know the Wicked Devil doesn't want that to happen, and doesn't want people on earth to come to a proper understanding of this most important prophecy, namely Genesis 3:15. No way does he want this! Because then, these people would be "caught away to God," as **Revelation 12:5** says of the miraculous heavenly ascending of the "Male Child." (Isaiah 66:5-9) No way, Satan wants that!!! No way.

1st angel: That's right! The "Male Child" would then finally come to know this one, all-important mistake and misconception about the coming promised "Messiah" that has been perpetuated for so long by all the churches (Jehovah's Witnesses included), namely that Jesus is the promised "seed" spoken of in **Genesis 3:15**. Miraculously, they would now come to know this great truth, namely:

THE MESSIAH IS TO COME FROM ADAM & EVE IN THE LAST DAYS!!!

This is what **Genesis 3:15** is really saying. WOW!!!

Of course, everybody on earth knows Jesus is NOT to be considered a fleshy descendant of Adam & Eve.

Many Pastors (not all of course) of some churches attempted to *derail* this important point by suggesting the "woman" in Genesis 3:15 pictured "Mary".

The Watchtower Society attempted to *derail* this important point, by saying the "woman" of **Genesis 3:15**, pictures God's Heavenly Angelic Organization. Of course the obvious flaw with this teaching is that Jesus created the Heavenly Angelic Organization, and it's a known fact he even existed for a period of time *before* there ever was an angelic heavenly organization. So Jesus didn't come from this so-called heavenly "woman" at all. But, instead they came from Jesus, with Jehovah's Approval! So, that doctrine is dead from the start.

2nd angel: And too, the churches who say the "woman" is Mary, overlook the obvious fact if you say the "seed" comes through Mary, you are still saying that the "seed" still came from Adam & Eve. You can't separate that fact. -- See Genesis 4:25; 12:3; 17:5; 22:17, 18; 2 Samuel 7:11-15; Psalms 89:3, 4

1st angel: Its really good, a small band of faithful Ex-Jehovah's Witnesses called the **YORWW Congregation** since 1991, with the help of Jehovah (and Jesus) through much prayer and meditation, understood these facts and were undeterred, undaunted in their relentless pursuit of obtaining the truth and spreading the truth to all who would listen. - See www.yorww.com/history.htm for more information.

2nd angel: And it's such a shame that many Jehovah's Witnesses we can see on earth and know of, have vilified them, and closed their ears to anything said by these poor, trodden down people (called "Living Waters" people on the internet). Obviously, the Governing Body of Jehovah's Witnesses and/or

YORWW Congregation

Watchtower Society had something to do with that. But then, Jesus promised Satan would make sure all true disciples of his would be "**HATED WITHOUT CAUSE.**" (Psalms 35:19; Psalms 69:4; John 15:25) Jehovah Witnesses have been taught to hate "apostates", which means they always attack the "messenger" and NOT the message *ad hominem style*. And Jeremiah the prophet we know said that was the way they always treated him, with utter contempt and disrespect. Yes, Jeremiah did say:

"...These messages from LORD [Jehovah] have made me a household JOKE!"

(Jeremiah 20:8 New Living Translation)

~ End of angelic conversation ~

Written By Donald C. Burney

October 29th, 2011

*****FOOTNOTE*****

God's Sacred Secret Revealed In A Surrogate Mother Scenario!

The following news item has great biblical relevance to believers of God's Word, especially when we consider the full possible ramifications associated with the dynamic YORWW treatise called: [One Big Mistake Made By All Mankind!!!](#) Please consider this exciting new article (at the link shown above) at your earliest convenience...Thank You!

[Source of News Article Found Below](#)

A relationship in which one woman bears and gives birth to a child for a person or a couple who then adopts or takes legal custody of the child; also called mothering by proxy.

In surrogate motherhood, one woman acts as a surrogate, or replacement, mother for another woman, sometimes called the intended mother, who either cannot produce fertile eggs or cannot carry a pregnancy through to birth, or term.

Surrogate mothering can be accomplished in a number of ways. Most often, the husband's sperm is implanted in the surrogate by a procedure called Artificial Insemination. In this case, the surrogate

YORWW Congregation

mother is both the genetic mother and the birth, or gestational mother, of the child. This method of surrogacy is sometimes called traditional surrogacy.

Less often, when the intended mother can produce fertile eggs but cannot carry a child to birth, the intended mother's egg is removed, combined with the husband's or another man's sperm in a process called in vitro fertilization (first performed in the late 1970s), and implanted in the surrogate mother. This method is called gestational surrogacy.

Surrogacy arrangements are categorized as either commercial or altruistic. In commercial surrogacy, the surrogate is paid a fee plus any expenses incurred in her pregnancy. In altruistic surrogacy, the surrogate is paid only for expenses incurred or is not paid at all.

The first recognized surrogate mother arrangement was made in 1976. Between 1976 and 1988, roughly 600 children were born in the United States to surrogate mothers. Since the late 1980s, surrogacy has been more common: between 1987 and 1992, an estimated 5,000 surrogate births occurred in the United States.

The issue of surrogate motherhood came to national attention during the 1980s, with the Baby M case. In 1984 a New Jersey couple, William Stern and Elizabeth Stern, contracted to pay Mary Beth Whitehead \$10,000 to be artificially inseminated with William Stern's sperm and carry the resulting child to term. Whitehead decided to keep the child after it was born, refused to receive the \$10,000 payment, and fled to Florida. In July 1985, the police arrested Whitehead and returned the child to the Sterns.

Does Surrogacy Involve Making Families or Selling Babies? Medical science continues to devise new procedures and treatments that test the boundaries of law and ethics. One such result is modern surrogate motherhood, which has been made possible by Artificial Insemination and in vitro fertilization.

Surrogate motherhood has both advocates and detractors, each with strong arguments in their favor. A number of important questions lie at the heart of the debate over the ethics and legality of surrogacy: Does surrogacy necessarily involve the exploitation of the woman serving as the surrogate mother, or turn her into a commodity? What rights does the surrogate mother have? Is surrogacy equivalent to baby selling? Should brokers or third parties be allowed to make a profit from surrogacy arrangements?

The Case Against Surrogacy Nearly all opponents of surrogacy find it to be a morally repugnant practice, particularly when it involves a commercial transaction. Many base their opposition on religious grounds, whereas others judge it using philosophical, legal, or political criteria.

The Roman Catholic Church is just one of many religious institutions that oppose surrogacy. It is against all forms of surrogacy, even altruistic surrogacy, which does not involve the payment of a fee to the surrogate. It holds that surrogacy violates the sanctity of marriage and the spiritual connection between mother, father, and child. It finds commercial surrogacy to be especially offensive. Commercial surrogacy turns the miracle of human birth into a financial transaction, the church maintains, reducing the child and the woman bearing it to objects of negotiation and purchase. It turns women into reproductive

YORWW Congregation

machines and exploiters of children. The church argues that surrogacy also leads to a confused parent-child relationship that ultimately damages the institution of the family.

Some feminists oppose surrogacy because of its political and economic context. They disagree with the notion that women freely choose to become surrogates. They argue that coercion at the societal level, rather than the personal level, causes poor women to become surrogate mothers for rich women. If surrogacy contracts are legalized, they maintain, the reproductive abilities of a whole class of women will be turned into a brokered commodity. Some feminists have gone so far as to call surrogacy reproductive prostitution.

Other critics join with Catholics and feminists to decry surrogacy as baby selling and a vehicle for the exploitation of poor women.

The Case for Surrogacy Advocates for surrogate motherhood propose it as a humane solution to the problem of infertility. They note that infertility is common, affecting almost one out of six couples, and that surrogacy may represent the only option for some couples who wish to have children to whom they are genetically related. Advocates also point out that infertility is likely to increase as more women enter the workforce and defer childbirth to a later age, when fertility problems are more common.

Advocates of surrogacy also argue that Adoption does not adequately meet the needs of infertile couples who wish to have a baby. They point out that there are many times more couples than available Infants. Moreover, couples must wait three to seven years on average to adopt an infant. Here, too, social trends have contributed to a greater call for alternative reproductive options. Most important, an increased use of contraceptives and Abortion and a greater acceptance of unwed mothers have led to a shortage of adoptable babies.

Those who favor commercial surrogacy object to characterizations of the practice as baby selling. A surrogacy contract, they assert, is a contract to bear a child, not to sell a child. Advocates of surrogacy see payment to a surrogate as a fee for gestational services, just like the fees paid to lawyers and doctors for their services. Some advocates even argue that the prohibition of commercial surrogacy infringes on a woman's constitutional right to contract.

Surrogacy is also supported by those who believe that society is served best when the liberty of individuals is maximized. They claim that women and society as a whole benefit from the increased opportunity of choice offered by surrogacy.

Advocates also maintain that in a successful surrogacy arrangement, all parties benefit. The intended parents take home a cherished child, and the surrogate receives a monetary reward and the satisfaction of knowing that she has helped someone realize a special goal.

In 1987 the New Jersey Superior Court upheld the Stern-Whitehead contract (in re baby m., 217 N.J. Super. 313, 525 A.2d 1128). The court took all parental and Visitation Rights away from Whitehead and permitted the Sterns to legally adopt the baby, whom they named Melissa Stern. A year later, the New

YORWW Congregation

Jersey Supreme Court reversed much of this decision (In re Baby M., 109 N.J. 396, 537 A.2d 1227). That court declared the contract unenforceable but allowed the Sterns to retain physical custody of the child. The court also restored some of Whitehead's parental rights, including visitation rights, and voided the Adoption by the Sterns. Most important, the decision voided all surrogacy contracts on the ground that they conflict with state public policy. However, the court still permitted voluntary surrogacy arrangements.

The Baby M. decision inspired state legislatures around the United States to pass laws regarding surrogate motherhood. Most of those laws prohibit or strictly limit surrogacy arrangements. Michigan responded first, making it a felony to arrange surrogate mother contracts for money and imposing a \$50,000 fine and five years' imprisonment as punishment for the offense (37 Mich. Comp. Laws § 722.859). Florida, Louisiana, Nebraska, and Kentucky enacted similar legislation, and Arkansas and Nevada passed laws permitting surrogacy contracts under judicial regulation.

In 1989 the American Bar Association (ABA) drafted two alternative model laws involving surrogate motherhood. These laws are not binding but are intended to guide states as they formulate their own laws. One legalizes the practice of surrogate motherhood and makes surrogacy contracts enforceable in court; the other bars the enforcement of contracts in which a surrogate mother is paid to have a child and then give up any claim to the child.

Under either ABA model, states legalizing surrogate contracts limit them to agreements between a surrogate mother and a married couple. A genetic link must be established between the couple and the child, by the husband's supplying sperm or the wife's contributing an egg, or both. To be valid, the contract must be approved by a judge before conception takes place, and it must be accompanied by proof that the wife is unable to bear a child. The surrogate mother has the right to repudiate the contract up to 180 days after conception, in which case she may keep the child. If she does not repudiate the contract during that time, the couple becomes the child's legal parents 180 days after conception.

In 1993 the California Supreme Court issued a landmark ruling declaring surrogacy contracts legal in California. The case, *Johnson v. Calvert*, 5 Cal. 4th 84, 19 Cal. Rptr. 2d 494, 851 P.2d 776, involved a surrogacy contract between a married couple, Mark Calvert and Crispina Calvert, and Anna L. Johnson. Crispina Calvert was unable to bear children. In 1990 the Calverts and Johnson signed a surrogacy contract in which the Calverts agreed to pay Johnson \$10,000 to carry an embryo created from the Calverts' ovum and sperm. Disagreements ensued, and later that year, Johnson became the first surrogate mother to seek custody of a child to whom she was not genetically related.

After the child's birth, the Calverts were awarded custody. Johnson appealed the decision. The state supreme court finally upheld the legality of surrogacy contracts under both the state and federal constitutions. The court held such contracts valid whether or not the surrogate mother provides the egg. The U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear Johnson's appeal.

In many states, surrogacy contracts are considered unenforceable because of existing adoption laws

YORWW Congregation

designed to discourage "baby selling." These laws may, for example, forbid any consent to adoption given prior to the birth of the child. They may also make it illegal for a birth mother to receive payment for consenting to give up a child or for an intermediary or Broker to receive a fee for arranging an adoption. In states with these laws, a surrogate mother who wishes to keep the child rather than give it up for adoption may successfully challenge an already established surrogacy contract.

Laws concerning artificial insemination can also conflict with surrogacy agreements. Some states have laws maintaining that semen donors are not legally the fathers of children created with their sperm. These laws were originally designed to facilitate the development of sperm banks. In a surrogacy arrangement, they conflict with an attempt to adopt the surrogate child. Increasingly, states are drafting laws that clarify the legal status of surrogacy arrangements, including who is the rightful parent of a child born through surrogate mothering.

State laws differ in the way they handle surrogate motherhood contracts. Most state laws on the issue are designed to prevent or discourage surrogacy. Four states (Florida, Nevada, New Hampshire, and Virginia) specifically allow surrogacy contracts under certain conditions. Several other states (Arizona, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, and Tennessee) specifically prohibit surrogacy contracts as void and in violation of public policy. In some states (Kentucky, Michigan, Utah, and Washington, as well as the District of Columbia) entering into a surrogacy contract or assisting in procuring such a contract is a criminal act, punishable by fine, imprisonment, or both.

State laws likewise vary in the way they handle disputes over custody. Surrogacy laws in Michigan and Washington make custody determinations on a case-by-case basis, attempting to reach the decision that best serves the interests of the child. In New Hampshire and Virginia, such laws presume that the contracting couples are the legal parents but give the surrogate a period of time to change her mind. In North Dakota and Arizona, the surrogate and her husband are the legal parents of the child.

The Commissioners on Uniform Laws created a stir when it amended the Uniform Parentage Act to authorize gestational agreements as valid contracts. According to the prefatory note to the uniform act, the commissioners determined that such agreements had become commonplace during the 1990s, so the law was merely designed to provide a legal framework for such agreements. However, several organizations have decried the inclusion of these provisions. As of 2003, two states, Texas and Washington, had adopted the new uniform act, while legislatures in four other states were considering its adoption.

(For more detail information on Genesis 3:15 and God's Mystery "Seed," please see the article entitled: [**One Big Mistake Made By All Mankind!**](#))