

WHEN WAS THE GARDEN OF EDEN?

By

Arnold Kennedy

Published by:

Christian Identity Ministries

PO Box 146

Cardwell QLD 4849

Australia

Email: hr_cim@bigpond.com

WHEN WAS THE GARDEN OF EDEN?

By Arnold Kennedy

INTRODUCTION.

The organization, "ANSWERS IN GENESIS", has offices in what we would call "white" countries, and is doing a valuable work in producing books and videos that counter the claims of evolutionists, mainly from a scientific viewpoint. However, I find it needful to examine some of the other doctrines presented by 'ANSWERS IN GENESIS'. I am aware of the forces supporting ANSWERS IN GENESIS, these being the same powers that are supporting similar multi-cultural organisations such as Alpha, Promise Keepers, The Full Gospel Businessmen's Association and producers of modern Bible versions. These forces are the anti-Christian powers seeking One World Government under man, not God. The essence of my criticism is to show that "ANSWERS IN GENESIS" supports the humanistic and unbiblical "Brotherhood Of Man" doctrine (which also is a Roman Catholic/Masonic and World-Church belief).

There is a major acceptance today in Judeo-Christianity of defiance to revealed Biblical law. I use the popular phrase; 'Judeo-Christian' which infers Christianity arose from Judaism. We can appreciate that if a form of Christianity did arise from that source, then it arose from those whose traditions Jesus condemned as, "*making the word of God of none effect through your tradition*"-(Mark 7:13). Thus 'Judeo-Christianity', as stemming from Judaism, must involve 'another Gospel'. This is what concerns me about *ANSWERS IN GENESIS*. What might be termed "Hebrew-Christianity" or "Israel-Christianity" does not defy revealed Biblical law, as does humanistic "Judeo-Christianity", nor is it multi-cultural.

For instance, less than 50 years ago, mixed racial unions were illegal in America and the other White nations. But now, they are tolerated and condoned as being supposedly within God's plan. Under the influence and promotion of the Jewish-Masonic-Papal-Communist/Socialist controlled governments and media, Western Christianity has succumbed to the approval of race mixing, and we will be looking at what is behind this. The Bible abounds with evidence of God's clear will that the races be separate in every way. "*ANSWERS IN GENESIS*" moulds all its answers around Judeo-Christian doctrines and traditions, and claims a different basis and definition of 'race' from that which the Bible gives. Furthermore, there is evidence of Jewish Talmudic sources, or of what Paul calls "Jewish fables", in "The Answers Book".

Because some might think these are extreme statements, I will deal in more detail with six of the major errors in the doctrines found in, "The Answers Book", as promoted by *ANSWERS IN GENESIS*. I have not read their other books in detail.

NOTE: I will not touch upon such matters as the race of Rahab and Ruth (page 223) both of whom can easily be proved to be of Israelite descent. I am happy to send papers on Ruth and Rahab by email, on request. Even within the Old Testament, *ANSWERS IN GENESIS* is already implying that Jehovah is not faithful to His own laws regarding racial intermarriage (as an example), and thus is not, "*I am the Lord, I change not*", in their view. As the implications of this are serious, some judgement must be exercised as to whether *ANSWERS IN GENESIS* is calling God a liar by saying Rahab and Ruth were not Israelites, as they must have been according to God's own Law.

Also: saying that Jesus is the Redeemer of other than kinsmen

- *ANSWERS IN GENESIS* denies one basis of the whole doctrine of redemption.
- In claiming there is only one race, "the Human Race", *ANSWERS IN GENESIS* denies the basis of the doctrine of predestination, or any concept of a 'chosen race' which features through the Bible.
- In claiming one origin and destiny for all peoples, *ANSWERS IN GENESIS* denies the prophetic word about, "*The Seed of Abraham*", "*the re-gathering of Israel*" and "*the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel*".
- *ANSWERS IN GENESIS* denies the Old Testament origin of "*The Church*" - (Acts 7:30-34, 1 Cor. 10:5, Heb. 3:8 = 17).
- In saying all vessels are the same, *ANSWERS IN GENESIS* denies, "*Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?*"
- I am not discussing other aspects of the Armenian nature of the doctrine that is promoted by *ANSWERS IN GENESIS*, from the scientific side.

[Note: Whereas some people use the word "pre-Adamite" for the males and females of Genesis One I am using the word "para-Adamite", and "Adamic" for the Adamic family that arose from Genesis Two, in order to identify and separate those without the "breath of Life" and those with it].

FIRST ERROR – “Jesus descended from Noah”.

Blasphemy is a serious charge! What we read in Luke’s genealogy is, “*And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was (the son) of Heli*”. The genealogy goes back to Adam and nowhere says explicitly that Jesus genetically descended from Noah or Adam. The words, “as was supposed” = *nommizo* = “by custom” in this verse, have to do with the legal father, not any natural father of Jesus. In Luke’s genealogy, the expression “the son of” in the Greek is found only in this reference, “*being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph*”. In all the rest of the genealogy translators have added the words “the son”. Without having any Greek knowledge, we can immediately discern that the birth of Jesus is being treated differently from the rest of the genealogy.

Matthew’s genealogy on its own does not take us back to Noah or Adam either, the genealogy starting with, “*The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham*”, so no such claim about Jesus descending from Adam can be made from this passage alone.

Caution must be exercised here. In these precise genealogies, there are “legal” (the Throne) and “regal” (the Crown) matters involved. In this paper, the subject is solely the one of “race”. It is common to see “law” and “race confused, but at no time does the woman control the race. In God’s Law, a woman may inherit her father’s estate, and Mary provided Jesus with the legal inheritance to the Throne, but not the Crown. As the legal father, Joseph provided the legal right to the Crown.

We do not ascribe race to God the Father and thus do not to the Son of God either, and as far as racial descent is concerned; Jesus was, “*Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life*”-[Heb 7:3] -as being a priest after the order of Melchisedec. So Jesus did not descend from any created human male (or female) as ANSWERS IN GENESIS suggests!

A “father” is one who reproduces himself, and Jesus is wholly-begotten God. This Middle-Voice verb tells He performed the action upon Himself. John 1:12 tells us Israel was *not out of bloods* (which is ordinary human descent), nor *out of the will of the flesh* (which was Sarah’s desire for Abraham to have a child by Hagar), but are *begotten of God*.

Where we read, “*When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost*”, and, “*Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost*”, it is clear that Joseph was NOT the genetic father of Jesus. Also, if no human male sperm was involved, why then should an egg from Mary’s ovaries be involved? Suggested involvement is used is to back up the idea of Jesus’ descent from Noah, presumably through Mary. It is common to presume that Jesus obtained his humanity from Mary, but this is supposition. If the Father did not need human sperm, why should He need a female egg? Today a fertile egg can be implanted into the womb of an infertile woman, and thus any child from this womb would have both a birth mother and a genetic “mother”. Mary was the birth mother of Jesus, but without racial gene input. From the viewpoint of Answers In Genesis, if the “first Adam” did not need a mother’s genes, why should the “second Adam” need them either!

Some might consider that, “*Behold a virgin shall conceive*” (Is.7:14) and “*behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son*” (Luke 1:31), indicate normal conception, but a study of the different words translated as “conceive” in both Testaments show this is not so. For example, in Luke 1:31 the word in Greek is *sullambano* whereas in Heb. 11:11, “*Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed*”, the Greek word is *katabole*, the latter being about conceiving seed.

So we will look at how Jesus came into the “generation” (= *genesis*) of Abraham shortly. “Generation” is usually translated from *genea*, but here it is from *genesis*. Yet “ANSWERS IN GENESIS” still makes the claim that Jesus descended from Noah, in support of their wrong declaration that everyone except Noah and his family were destroyed by Noah’s flood. Hence we will be looking further into this.

ANSWERS IN GENESIS then drops in the idea that the racial blueprint is in the female mitochondrial DNA, and that, “*one woman provided the mitochondrial DNA which gave rise to the sequences in all people alive today*”. In a subtle indirect way this lines up with the New Age Earth Mother, ‘Mother Mary’, Lilith, and Gayia, etc.. Thus their idea seductively becomes that, “*Jesus descended from Noah*” through women. This is approaching the Roman Catholic teaching that Jesus came through Mary, who, “*as the Saviour of the human race, was preserved exempt from all stain of original sin*”. (This quote is from Roman Catholic teaching about their doctrine of the Immaculate Conception).

Likewise the teaching of multi-racial Jewry is that a Jew is a person who has a Jewish mother, but here we must remember how Jesus taught about those “*who say they are Jews but are not*” (Romans 2:9 +3:9). In this case, “Jewish” cannot mean either Hebrew or Israelite. The Jewish idea indicates that a

woman is the source of all races, an idea also promoted by these false Jews who control the media. But both Testaments of the Bible show that genealogies are reckoned through the male side, i.e. a male begets a male down the line. Thus the popular saying, “*Jesus was born to a Jew making Him also a Jew*”, is totally unscriptural and therefore is false. Let us consider why.

Through the Bible men “beget” children at conception, which children are later “born” of women. Women cannot “beget” children in the biblical sense, although their DNA can affect many other things than inheritance and race. The genealogies show us that the inheritance (racial) genes of God’s people come from the male side only, although the females must also be of suitable stock for their offspring to be genetically acceptable to God.

For ANSWERS IN GENESIS to claim Jesus descended from Noah is absolute wickedness for another very good reason. Jesus had no human father, Joseph being his legal father only. **If Jesus descended from Adam or Noah, He would have had man’s sinful blood and could not be the spotless Lamb of God, and thus could not be the Redeemer of His kinsmen (or any other people).**

Some explanation is given here as to how Jesus came into the “generation” of Abraham and to be associated as a Kinsman to Abraham’s seed. Where we read, “*Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God*”- (Heb 2:17). Thayer’s lexicon indicates that “to be made” means “to become as a thing”, and the verb “might be” = *ginomai* which is used in the sense of coming onto the stage (Strong), or of bringing something to pass. This is what we see in Phil. 2:7, “*But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men*”. Some other passages that confirm this meaning are Rom. 5:10, 2 Cor 5:18-21, and Col. 1:21. Jesus was “begotten” the same as Israelites are, that is they are begotten “of God”. Thus He is able to be the Kinsman Redeemer of Israel.

Jesus says, “*I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father*”. He came forth as “*the only begotten of the Father*” and, “*All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made*”.

ANSWERS IN GENESIS claims all people come from one original man, but Scripture does not say all other races come one “womb”. Isaiah 51:1 tells us about the narrowing down to one particular womb of God’s chosen people. Of this womb we read:

Isaiah 51:1-2, Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the LORD: look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged. Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you: for I called him alone, and blessed him, and increased him.
Churches and ANSWERS IN GENESIS will not accept this one origin of God’s people.

People use Hebrews 7:14, “*For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood*”, to say Jesus was born a “Jew”. What this is about is the determination of either the Israelite tribe amongst whom Jesus appeared, or in the land of Judea. “Sprang out” does not refer to descent. Jesus was “born” of a woman of the tribe of Judah but “begotten” [from the past] of the Father.

In denying the sinlessness of Jesus in His incarnation, ANSWERS IN GENESIS needs to be able to answer this question, “If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?”-(Matt. 22:45). This was a question the Pharisees also could not answer.

SECOND ERROR - “The Bible teaches that Adam was the first man”.

It is obvious that ANSWERS IN GENESIS sees their view that Adam was the first man as an important foundational statement to their doctrines. All doctrinal direction in “The Answers Book” comes from this belief and this is where ANSWERS IN GENESIS creates problems and then tries to answer its self-created questions. They even try to do this using scientific evidence. But ANSWERS IN GENESIS only succeeds in promoting error in the matter of race!

Without any doubt at all, ANSWERS IN GENESIS’s use of the phrase “*The first man Adam*” is utter misuse of context **because the context of 1 Corinthians 15 in which this is found is “resurrection”, not “creation”**. This resurrection subject starts at verse 12, and is still the same in verse 42, where the phrase, “*So also is the resurrection of the dead,*” is even closer to the phrase, “*The First Man Adam*”. The comparison in this passage is between the ‘natural’ and the ‘spiritual’; between the ‘earthy’ and the ‘heavenly’, with “*the first man Adam*” referring to the Adamic Creation. The “we” and “they” in this passage

are both plural – and the context is still resurrection, not creation! The phrase, “the first man Adam” has absolutely nothing to do with the first singular individual man on earth!

When Adam was told, “*Thou shalt surely die*”, ask yourself if “Adam” here carries the meaning that only one singular “first man” died, or if the punishment included his offspring also, according to, “*For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive*”. Does not the “in Christ” involve other than just one singular man”?

If “**I speak as a fool**” (using an expression Paul used), **there were ever only two men on earth, namely “the first man” (V45) and “the second man” (V47). Fancy that - Most people would agree that there were other people on earth between Adam and Jesus! Yet, ANSWERS IN GENESIS avers there have been only the two people!**

Thus to base an argument on “The first man Adam” from 1 Corinthians chapter 15 must result in a wrong conclusion. ANSWERS IN GENESIS says, “*Defenders of the Gospel must be able to show that all human beings descended from one man and one woman – as only those people who descend from Adam and Eve can be saved*”. This is a decidedly odd statement for them to make, since “*only those people who descend from Adam and Eve*”, immediately implies there are other people who did not descend from Adam and Eve. The first statement in this quote in no way demands that there were not people before the “Adam” of Genesis Two. But the latter part of this quotation is absolutely true, because the “breath of lives” was not in the “men and women” (plural) of Genesis One, as we will be seeing!

Despite the good meat in this book, the drip feed of this error poisons whatever benefit the good meat has.

THIRD WRONG DOCTRINE. Noah’s flood covered the whole globe.

In the Old Testament the differences between “*earth*” and “*face of the earth*” are very important ... [e.g. where Cain went out from the “**face of the earth**” and became a fugitive and a vagabond in the “**earth**”]. “*The “face of the earth ” is a limited area of the globe, and so is, “the whole face of the earth” - it is also that limited area covered by Noah’s flood. Cain did not leave the planet when he went from the “face of the earth” into the “earth”, did he? Although ANSWERS IN GENESIS mentions the phrases, they will not point out the difference between “the face of the earth” and “the earth”, in order to claim that the entire globe was inundated.*

Nor will ANSWERS IN GENESIS accept other ways “earth” = ‘*erets*’ is used. For instance, where Abraham was told to walk throughout the “earth”, did he walk around the whole globe or just that particular “earth” God promised to him? So did the flood cover the globe or the whole of that particular “earth” of the context? Each race had its own “earth”, e.g. “*The land of Egypt*” or “*the Land of Israel*”. To weakly say the flood covered the whole globe ignores these things and deceives people into thinking that Noah and his sons did not overspread those Genesis One para-Adamites who were not destroyed by the Flood.

Race mixing was the cause of Noah’s flood, for we read:

Genesis 6:12, “*And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth*”.

This is referring to that “earth” occupied by the Adamites who now lived outside of The Garden of Eden, together with local para-Adamites. How had they corrupted themselves? (Heb. “spoiled”).

Gen. 6:2 *That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.*

The Adamite “sons of God” had mingled sexually with para-Adamite “children of men”, and God moved to save Noah (and family) who had remained, “pure in his generations” -(Gen.6:9), in order to destroy the rest of the corrupted Adamites, and what they possessed.

Gen. 7:20-23, “*All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth*”.

The flood destroyed those corrupted Adamites with “the breath of life”, not all of the unmixed para-Adamites.

FOURTH ERROR. All mankind is “OF ONE BLOOD”.

It is acknowledged that more recent discoveries in the field of genetics have been made since ANSWERS IN GENESIS produced their books. These include precise definition and identification of racial and behavioural genes. The insistence of modern geneticists that any suggestion of racial genetic equality or origin are totally untenable, remains.

Acts, 17:26 is the verse which many people (including ANSWERS IN GENESIS) like to use to support the idea that there are no differences between races.

KJV: ***"And hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation".***

Three immediate points need to be made.

ONE. In the majority of Bible manuscript texts (over 400), the word "blood" is not there. This will be examined further below.

TWO. This verse is an excellent demonstration of how people can try to use one part of a verse to prove their point, but at the same time ignore the rest of the verse that flatly contradicts what they are trying to say. The second part of the verse is stating that God made "boundaries" where differing peoples/races were ordained of God to live separated from one another. People cannot have it both ways. The Book of Acts here confirms the Old Testament:

Deut. 32:8-9 "When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. For the LORD'S portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance.

Judeo-Christianity (including 'ANSWERS IN GENESIS') refuses to accept either the first or the latter portion of this verse, and many others like it that say the same thing in both Testaments.

THREE. Likewise, chapter 18 of *"The Answers Book"* uses a different definition of "race" than the Bible does. It ascribes different groups supposedly arising from Noah's descendants as being a development over an undefined period of time, whereas the Bible presents racial origins such as, ***"the same is the father of the Moabites unto this day. And the younger, she also bare a son, and called his name Benammi: the same is the father of the children of Ammon"*** –[Gen. 19:37]. The Moabites and Ammonites did not arise from any such undefined 'development', and remain as specific races through the Bible, being precisely defined, rather than "undefined. The claim that all races come from Noah cannot hold water as it is based upon the manufactured wrong idea, "of one blood". We can now look at an imported paper about this.

FROM A PAPER BY J.O.ADAMS OF MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA...

"The word "blood", Greek ' *haimatos*', as in the Stephens' text and the King James' Version, is omitted by practically all authorities. Bullinger states, *"The texts omit "blood"*, and Scofield agrees with, *"Blood" is not in the best manuscripts.*" Four of the six editors of the Stephens' text (A.V.) omit the word. It is also omitted by the following: Westcott and Hort, Panin, the Concordant Version, the Diaglott, Douay Version, the Vulgate, Revised Version, the Nestle Text and the Revised Standard Version, and by Ferrar Fenton. Moffatt has *"from a common origin"*. Clearly then the consensus of opinion among authorities is that the word "blood" should be omitted as not being in the original manuscripts.

[INSERTED NOTE: There are other places where we can study the use of *hice* = one. These also show the addition of "blood" is wrong].

It now becomes necessary to introduce an "understood" word to qualify "one" and so indicate what Paul meant when he used this word. Though some do think that "blood" is appropriate, it hardly seems possible that the varied races of men in the nations could have their origin in "one blood".

I suggest that Paul is using "one" to mean "one man" - i.e one father, or ancestor. I have no doubt that Adam was NOT the first "man" on this earth, but that he was the progenitor of the Adamic, or "white" race. However, he was certainly not the progenitor of all the races on this earth. It would seem that by nature, the pre-Adamite men, being instinctive, and lacking creative or organising ability, were incapable by themselves of forming nations or civilisations, hence without the influence of the Adamic race, nations as we know them, did not come into existence. It follows that the word "nations" in this verse could only refer to organised groups of men established by Adam's descendants (irrespective of what other races may be included in them).

Adam then was the "one" from (or "out of") whom God made "every" nation of men that should dwell upon the whole of the earth's surface". (Note the Greek preposition *ek* used here. This denotes "from, out of, of", etc. As in this verse, it is frequently used to denote origin.).

As the verse must be read in the context of verses 22-34, here is a translation of them from the Greek. It should be compared with the A.V. or the R.V.

"Then Paul, standing in the midst of the Areopagus, said, "Men, Athenians, I see that in all things ye are very religious, for passing through and looking at your objects of worship, I even found an altar on which was engraved, "to an unknown God". What therefore ye are worshipping without knowing, this I am proclaiming to you. The God who made the world (or "order" - kosmos) and all things in it; the One who is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made by hand. Nor is He served by human hands as being in need of anything, for He gives to all, life and breath and all things".

Paul was addressing "Greeks", and knew that these people were from the outcast ten tribes of the House of Israel - his "brethren" [= "of the same womb"].

God was not revealed to all nations. Now notice Paul's change in the pronoun from the third person to the first person. All nations could only "grope blindly", but to "us" (the House of Judah and the Greeks as the Greek-speaking House of Israel), God was not far away.

"For in Him we are living and moving and existing, as indeed some of the writers (or "poets") among you have said; because we are indeed His offspring."

Notice the reason why He is "not far from each one of us". This is "because we (Israel) are indeed His offspring.

[NOTE: God is described as being, "our father" and "a father to Israel". There is no contrary Scriptural direct statement].

"Therefore, being God's offspring, we ought not to suppose the Deity to be like gold, or silver, or stone, engraved by man's skill and invention. Truly then, God, overlooking the times of ignorance, now declares to the men, that all of them, everywhere, are to repent" (i.e. "undergo a change in frame of mind and feeling").

[NOTE: Here "all" refers to "all" of the men of that context only. In both Hebrew and Greek, "all", "every" and "whosoever" is always confined to the context people only].

God is "overlooking the times of ignorance". i.e the time when the Israel people were divorced from Him. Now the men of Israel must repent. These statements, and those in verse 31, are only applicable to the people of Israel.

"Because He has set a day in which He is going to judge the inhabitants of the earth in righteousness by a man whom He hath appointed, some scoffed, but others said, 'We will also hear thee again concerning this'"

The Greek word here for "scoffed" is the same as that used in Acts 2/13, and its implication is the same. The scoffers were not of Israel.

"But some men, joining him (or "being on his side"), believed. Among these were both Dionysius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them."

The following are a few of the passages which support my views on this:

Gen.2:15. Prior to the formation (not creation) of Adam of Genesis Two, we are informed that:

"There was not a man for cultivating the ground."

By implication - up to this time - although "mankind" had been created (Chapt.1.), there was no one capable of cultivating the soil. Pre-Adamite man was a hunter, not an agriculturist.

Gen.3:20. Eve was so named because, she was "*the mother of all living.*" She was the mother of those with, "The breath of lives" only. Eve was certainly not the mother of the coloured races of mankind. So too, Adam could be regarded as the father of "all living" - but only of the race that came from him - not of the pre-Adamite races without "The breath of life" (plural).

Gen.4:13. When Cain was expelled from the land of Eden, he complained that others might kill him. Jehovah admitted that this was a possibility and set a mark on Cain to protect him. This implies that there were people other than Adam's descendants on earth.

Gen.4:17. Where did Cain get his wife? There is no record that she was a daughter of Adam. It is therefore logical to assume that she was a pre-Adamite. Cain also built a city. Surely not just for himself and his wife! A large number of men would be required for this. it is possible, but most unlikely that the city was built by Adam's descendants. It is far more probable that Cain "established" a city by organising and superintending para-Adamite men to do the work. Scofield's note to verses 16-22 is interesting:

"The first civilisation, the one which perished in the judgement of the flood, was Cainitic in origin, character and destiny. Every element of material civilisation is mentioned in verses 16 -22, city and pastoral life, and the development of arts and manufactures."

It is also interesting that Cain named his son, Enoch, which means "teacher" or "initiator". The city was named after this son.

Gen. 10:22. "These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations; and from these the nations in the earth were divided after the flood."

The descendants of Noah were divided or scattered amongst the nations of the earth that remained after the flood.

Gen.9:19 "These are the three sons of Noah and from them the whole earth was overspread."

Deut.32:8. "When the Most High gave to nations (goyim) their possessions (or "inheritance"), when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the children of Israel."

Notice that "peoples" is plural. It is to Adam's sons (descendants) that God sets national boundaries. This agrees with the view that the primitive races did not, indeed were unable to, establish organised communities (or "nations"). This likewise agrees with my remarks on Gen.2:5 and 4:16.

NOTE: The people "overspread" by Noah's sons were the para-Adamites.

FIFTH ERROR. "After their kind"

I will incorporate notes from a paper by Lawrence Blanchard (USA). This matter of "kind" is where "The Answers Book" is very wrong.

"The first chapter of Genesis reveals that the Creator God set up His first Law of kind after kind, applying it to all of His creation: "trees bearing fruit after their kind". God created different kinds of plants, trees, fishes, birds, and land creatures, each to reproduce "after its own kind". At God's command, He established a law of nature that ensured racial purity or otherwise, separation of all creatures from other kinds'.

Definition of 'Kinds'.

One objection to this interpretation by professing Christians today (and ANSWERS IN GENESIS) is based upon their assumption that the term "kind" means "family," such as the family of all fish, birds, or cattle. In other words, they believe that God created one male and female fish, bird, or cattle, for example, from which all fish, birds, and cattle were reproduced. Therefore, in this view "kind" refers only to the general family category of all fish, birds, and cattle, and not to different species within each family, such as sharks, sea bass, or salmon (for fish); pelicans, crows, or sparrows (for birds); or the different species of cattle.

Among the most prominent promoters of this theory is ANSWERS IN GENESIS and their book, "*One Blood. The Biblical Answer to Race*". The initial problem with *One Blood* theory is that its authors presume that their definition of the term "kinds" is the biblical definition. One Blood assumes that "kinds" refers to the general "families" of creation, such as all dogs or all bears, for example. As will be shown, however, the biblical definition of "kinds" is very similar to the science of taxonomy. A review of the taxonomical terms will be helpful to assist in the biblical understanding of "kind." Basic taxonomy breaks down the classification of all living things as follows: *kingdom, phylum, class, order, family, genus, and species*. Although "kind" is not a specific taxonomic term, it does relate to "genus" and "species."

The word "kind" is the Hebrew word *miyn*, appearing nine times in the first chapter of Genesis. It means "to portion out"; "a sort", i.e. species." (*Strongs* #4327). According to *Strongs*, "kind" means "species." "**Kinds**" **does not refer to general categories (families) of dogs or cats or birds**. It refers to the subsets (genus and species) within these categories. This is illustrated by its usage within Genesis and the rest of the Pentateuch. For example, in the creation account of Genesis 1: 11-12, there are many "plants" and "fruit trees" that were to reproduce "after their kind." Likewise, in verses 24-25 God created many water creatures and "beasts of the earth" and "cattle" and every land creature "after their kind." There were many different species or kinds of plants, water creatures, and land creatures that God created, which were subject to the law of nature He set up in the beginning - "kind after kind." This law is readily observed in nature (as opposed to domestication). The species stay within their own kind and reproduce after their own kind. As the saying goes: "Birds of a feather flock together".

Further, this word "kind" is used in Genesis 6-20 when God commanded Noah to take "birds after their kind, and of the animals after their kind" on the ark to be kept alive. There were many different "kinds" or species within the region of the Flood. Genesis 8:7-10 reveals that Noah first sent out "a raven" and later "a dove," from the ark. These are not only two different Hebrew words indicating two different birds, but also they are categorized taxonomically in two completely different orders within the bird class. One is categorically clean and the other is unclean.

In the *Septuagint* (LXX), the Greek word for "kind" is *genos*, the equivalent for the word *miyn* in the Hebrew Masoretic text in the above Bible reference. *Genos* is "a noun expressive of relationship of various degrees and kinds"

with the primary meaning of "ancestral stock" or descent or family of relatives (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Frederick Danker, ed., 3rd Edition, p. 194).

Another lexicon adds "race" and "offspring" (Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, p254). So, *genos* is inclusive, for example, "of all cattle ... of all reptiles and of all wild beasts" (Genesis 6:21, Brenton Translation). *Genos* plainly refers to not just one pair of all cattle, wild beasts, cattle, or winged birds, **but to all "kinds"** of cattle, wild beasts, cattle and winged birds. Therefore, each "kind," as used in the biblical passages above, is the equivalent of a "race."

Returning to the Masoretic text and the Hebrew word *miyn*, the Mosaic Law (in Leviticus 11:13-19) continues the distinction between different "kinds" of unclean bird: "*the eagle and the vulture and the buzzard, and 'the kite' and the falcon... every raven....* and so forth- (See Deuteronomy 14:11-18). The eagle, vulture, buzzard, and kite are of the same family taxonomically, **but each is a different genus or "kind"**.

In Leviticus 11:22, there is a delineation between different kinds of clean insects, such as "locusts in its kinds" ... and the "cricket in its kinds", and "the grasshopper in its kinds". Notice the plural "kinds, that is, many kinds or species of locusts, crickets, and grasshoppers. Again, verse 29 distinguishes between unclean animals and reptiles: "*the mole, and the mouse, and the great lizard in its kinds*", that is, different kinds or species of mole, mouse and lizard. This is followed by verse 30 reading: "*gecko, crocodile ... sand reptile and the chameleon*", inferring that all are of the reptile family, but comprise different kinds (genus) or species. **The word "kind" in the Law clearly means different genera or species within a general category or family of bird, animal, or reptile.**

In the above Leviticus and Deuteronomy passages, the *LXX* does not use the Greek word *genos*, but instead substituted the term *auto*. This term is a reflexive pronoun used as an "Intensive marker, setting an item off from everything else through emphasis and contrast ..." (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, p. 152).

Again, in the context of differentiating between the kinds of clean and unclean birds, insects, animals, or reptiles, *auto* separates, emphasizes, and **contrasts between them, all within each general category.**

From the above analysis of the use of the term "kinds" in Scripture, it can be readily seen that the biblical definition is quite broad. Depending on the context, "kinds" can refer to the taxonomical term "genus" (eagles, kites, vultures); or it can refer to that of "species" (kinds of locusts or kinds of grasshoppers). Therefore, it is correct to say that the Bible uses "kinds" to differentiate the species within a genus, as well as the variety of *genera* (plural of "genus") within a family. The biblical "kinds" can apply to the taxonomical terms of both "genus" and "species" **but not to "family"**.

"One Blood"'s premise is, therefore, skewed at the first instance by a misleading and otherwise untrue definition of the meaning of "kind," contrary to the Scripture's intention. Rather than "kind" referring to genus, or even the species within each genus category, as it is ascribed biblically, it is applied to the family of dogs, cats, or bears, for example. A corrected *definition*, however, would not only put One Blood's theory on hold, but also provide an emerging picture of what the Creator actually did in His creation. All *species* did not develop through natural selection from one pair of created plant or animal kind. God created all the different varieties of creation - every "kind" or specie of plant, tree, cattle, bird, reptile, fish, and so forth,

To say otherwise is to rob God of His intended meaning in His written Word and diminish His creative power".

NOTE: This is what "ANSWERS IN GENESIS" does.

DOES "KIND" REFER TO MANKIND TOO?

Now, of course, we have to face the matter of "kind" about man. Are there differing "kinds" of 'men'? Modern geneticists have their reasons for claiming this. A first-time reader of the Bible with no church background would soon pick this. Race is an inescapable subject through the Bible. God simply does not treat all races the same and never did! Even each tribe of Israel has a different destiny for the 'last days'. Only Israelites (from 12 tribes) are to be found within the New Jerusalem! Oh yes, there are many differing words for "man", "men", "people", "nations", tribes. etc. which we will not look at now.

Earlier it was pointed out that the dove is a "clean" bird and the raven is an "unclean" bird. Both are birds, but are of differing "kinds". So is there Biblical evidence that there is a clean "kind" of people and an unclean "kind" of people? It is clear-cut that if God has a chosen (= *bachar*, or "*elect*") race, then all other races must be "unchosen". 1 Peter 2:9 tells the people he is writing to that they are "A chosen generation = *genos*". Now these "chosen" people were commanded not to have sexual relations outside of a limited Semitic gene pool. This is very clear, but most churches declare that this matter has changed from one of

race into one of belief, even if they cannot support this scripturally. ANSWERS IN GENESIS likewise accepts this because it is a popular teaching. But in the New Testament the racial separation continues.

For instance, we read,

2 Cor 6:16,17 *I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be MY PEOPLE. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean [thing], and I will receive you.*

The addition of “thing” [akathartou, genitive, singular, neuter] at the end of this verse is grammatically justified. But, preachers wrongly use it in the sense of “things” rather than “people”. When we look at this verse, it is obvious that “them” signifies the separation of one people [not thing] from another. It is about people, as we see in the words “them” and “you”. In Greek, the word “separate” = *aphorizo* that means “to border off ... to limit off ... to separate and to sever from the rest”. In the next verse below we see how this word is used; it is used of the separation of Israelites according to whether they are sheep or goats. [Note: *nations* is a neuter noun whereas *them* is masculine and thus refers to the people within the nations].

Matt 25:32 *And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats:*

This specifically mentions nations. Any such suggestion of election or national/racial separation horrifies some Church people because of the conflict between this and their wrong understanding of “God so loved the world” and similar Scriptures where they put the wrong meaning on “the world” and wrongly use the word “all”.

Going back to 2 Cor. 6:16, we find the word “touch”. In this verse, “touch” = *haptomai* is a word used of carnal intercourse with a woman, like it or not [confirm this in 1 Cor. 7:1-3]. The “them” in this verse are “unclean” people that are not to be “touched”. “Unclean” = *akathartou* that shows that there is a difference between ‘clean’ and ‘unclean’ people, with the clean not to “touch” the unclean. Note here that in Acts 10:28, “but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean”, this is about men who are “*allogenes*” = “from a kindred tribe” (of Israel).

The “yoke” in 2 Cor 6:14 is with *heterozugeo* which means “a different sort” -[Vine], or “one who is not an equal” -[Thayer]. God also made clean and unclean animals and fish; each were born that way. They simply are different and are not equal.

Biblical genetics is a great biblical subject, but no Judeo-Christian or Roman Catholic church will handle it, probably because either:

- (a) “it is not given to them to understand the mysteries of the Kingdom of God”, or
- (b) their manufactured doctrines will not cope with it.

ANSWERS IN GENESIS still wants to argue with The Potter who makes different people (vessels), some for glory and some for destruction. Please see Romans 9:20-22 about this.

As a final thought about this, when it was said that modern geneticists have their reasons for claiming the non-equality and the differing origins of races, those with the facility can search the Internet and find that science confirms what the Bible actually presents. It is claimed that racial genes do exist, as do behavioural genes.

SIXTH ERROR. “Genesis One and Two are about the same event”.

This is about the highlighted sentence on page 38 of “The Answers Book” which reads, “*Genesis chapter two is not a different account of creation – it is a more detailed account of the sixth day of creation*”. Let us see why this is wrong, starting by answering the following question.

WHEN WAS THE GARDEN OF EDEN?

Without a thought, most people would answer by saying, “*Why? At the beginning of course*”. By “the beginning” they mean something like, “*At the beginning of the Bible*” as if it had something to do with the first man on earth.

Well, that only seems right since we find what is commonly called the Garden of Eden, is found in the second chapter of Genesis, and is not in the first chapter. It comes after the creation of men and women in Genesis One. But few people know that “Eden” occurs elsewhere in the Bible, and that it occurs concurrently with the Assyrian empire in the Ezekiel 31-32 passage below. Although this passage is symbolic, it immediately calls for a re-think of what we have believed, that is, that the *Garden of Eden* may not have been “*at the beginning*”. So we will take a look as to when it was. We can see in Genesis 1:27 that men and women (plural) were created and lived upon the earth. But when we come to Genesis Two, we find, “*And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed*” -

(Gen. 2:8). "Formed" has a different meaning to "created", so "the man" here has little to do with those in males and females of Genesis One. In Genesis Two we have a "garden" = *gan* = an enclosure, which was "planted" for one man only in that one part of the earth specified. A "garden", as a planted enclosure, cannot be the whole earth. It was made exclusively for one man, to start with.

When we take a good look into these things, we must conclude that the people created by the Elohim in Genesis 1 are different in many ways to that man, and thus his offspring, formed by Jehovah-Elohim as presented from Genesis 2:4 on. This is why the "Brotherhood of Man" doctrine of the humanists, together with those seduced by them, is not Biblical. Before we look at this further, let us consider the first part of these Ezekiel chapters to get a starting point.

*Ezek. 31:1 "And it came to pass in the eleventh year, in the third month, in the first day of the month, that the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, speak unto **Pharaoh king of Egypt**, and to his multitude; Whom art thou like in thy greatness? Behold, **the Assyrian** was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top was among the thick boughs. The waters made him great, the deep set him up on high with her rivers running round about his plants, and sent out her little rivers unto all the trees of the field. Therefore his height was exalted above all the trees of the field, and his boughs were multiplied, and his branches became long because of the multitude of waters, when he shot forth. All the fowls of heaven made their nests in his boughs, and under his branches did all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under his shadow dwelt all great nations. Thus was he fair in his greatness, in the length of his branches: for his root was by great waters. The cedars **in the Garden of God** could not hide him: the fir trees were not like his boughs, and the chesnut trees were not like his branches; nor any tree **in the Garden of God** was like unto him in his beauty. I have made him fair by the multitude of his branches: so that **all the trees of Eden, that were in the Garden of God**, envied him".*

There is much symbolism in these passages, such as Kings being like trees, and of "trees" being able to envy. However, from this account, long after the Garden of Eden, we can see that the "Garden of Eden" and "the Garden of God" are being presented as being contemporary with the civilizations mentioned in this passage. There is no reason to say that Ezekiel would be "out of line" with what existed at the time of Genesis Two.

We are going to see a number of other confirmations why The Garden of Eden was not "at the beginning".

SOME OF THESE OTHER CONFIRMATIONS.

In Genesis 2:13-14, we find, "*And the name of the second river is Gihon: the same is it that compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia. And the name of the third river is Hiddekel: that is it which goeth toward the east of Assyria*". Here we find references to nations that existed at the time of the Garden of Eden, and thus before it.

In Genesis 2:8, Where we read, "*And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed*", the word "eastward" = *qedem* = 'from that which was aforetime'. This tells us the Garden was different from that which had gone before in Genesis Chapter One. ("Eastward" here is not the same word as "East" in verse 14).

Chapter 1:25 of the book of Jasher (referred to in Joshua 10:13 and 2 Samuel 1:18), records, "*And Cain hastened and rose up and took the **iron part** of his ploughing instrument, with which he suddenly smote his brother*". Iron is the product of a civilisation, and this indicates the existence of civilisations such as Assyria and Egypt at the time of the Garden of Eden.

- (4) The Book of Jasher speaks about the art of writing being known and practiced from the pre-flood period.
- (5) Genesis 3:16 says, "*And Cain went out from the presence of the LORD*". The Book of Jasher confirms this was going from one place to another, "*At that time Cain went forth from the presence of the Lord, from the place where he was*". This indicates that God's presence was not found outside of the Garden, and that Cain went from one place to another.
- (6) The mention of the harp, the organ, iron and brass as early as Genesis 4:21 indicates an earlier period of civilised development.
- (7) History, science and archaeology back up the Bible one hundred percent. Skeletons of Whites, Negroes and Asiatics are far different and easily identifiable. Radioactive tests determine the age of these archaeological findings, not to the day or even the year but very close. Skeletons of Negroes have been found in the caves of Kilimanjaro and elsewhere dating back some 74,000 years, and

Asiatics have been uncovered dating back almost 1,750,000 years ago. This is very important: no trace of a White Man has ever been found over 7,400 years old, which coincides with the Bible period that gives the white man as being formed about 5,500 B.C.

- (8) The ancient Vedic scriptures of India also tell the story of the coming of what they, (and the Bible), call “*the holy seed*” who are described as being the “*tall white ones*”, and as being “*sons of God*”, a phrase not unknown in both Testaments. But the matter of this “*holy seed*” (see *Ezra 9:2, Isaiah 6:13, Daniel 8:24, 12:7*) as the line through Adam-Noah-Abraham-Isaac-Jacob/Israel as “*the holy people*”, (Deut. 7:6, 14:2, 14:21, 28:9, Isaiah. 62:12, Dan. 12:7, etc) is denied today by almost every church, and also by “ANSWERS IN GENESIS”.. In Exodus 19:8 and 1 Peter 2:9 these “holy people” are described as “an holy nation”. Most of the Bible is about, and is addressed to, this one people. Much of the story of the Bible is about the attempts to destroy this holy seed, primarily by race mixing, and unbelief in whom they are, as God’s people. These holy people were conceived that way, and did not become such in the way modern evangelism says.
- (9) Chinese records from the flood period, (the reign of King Yao), record floods in the Hwang Ho river, as the Tarim Basin drained. this is the same area mentioned in the Vedic Scriptures where the Sons of God came from. Chinese history was not interrupted by Noah’s flood, and neither was that of Egypt, India, South America or Africa, and so the flood did not cover the areas of the globe these were living in.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

What this means of course is that the “Garden of Eden” of chapter 2 of Genesis is about something different from what we find in Genesis chapter 1, and that “The Garden of Eden” was long after Genesis chapter 1.

It is interesting that “The Bible Timeline” by Thomas L. Robinson Ph.D., MD. dates the creation of men and women in Genesis One but then dates Genesis 2:15 about Adam and Eve being placed in the Garden of Eden as being not until the year 3941.

Theologians have muddied the waters claiming that different people must have written Genesis 1 and Genesis 2, because the two chapters are not consistent. That they are inconsistent is true, but it is their claim that the two chapters are different accounts of the same event is what is not true. If they were an account of the same event, whatever would they do with accounts like that of Ezekiel, and the multiple differences between the two? To clear this up, it is necessary to make some comparisons between Genesis 1 and 2, since they reveal two different orders of origin at two different times. This is confirmed by the different words in Hebrew used for “man” and we can find the two major words as “kinds” contrasted within single verses in places through the Bible.

In Genesis 1 the para-Adamite man seems to be created out of nothing and in Genesis 2 Adamic man is formed out of what already existed.

A critical examination of Genesis Chapter 1 and Genesis Chapter 2 reveals that not only did these **different men** arise at **different times**, but they were also made with **different purposes** in mind and to fulfil **different functions**. Paul confirms this when speaking of how the Potter made **different vessels** for **different purposes**. On the pages that follow, the orders of mankind as shown in Genesis 1 and 2 are listed for comparison. All extracts are from the King James Version.

THE ORDER OF THE CREATIONS FROM NOTHING.

GENESIS CHAPTER ONE [First Scroll].

1.1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

1.3 And God said, let there be light: and there was light.

1.5 And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night

And the evening and the morning were the first day.

1.7 And God made a *firmament*.

1.8 And God called the firmament heaven

And the evening and the morning were the second day.

1.10 And God called the dry land *earth*..

1.11 And God said, “Let the earth bring *forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit...*”.

And the evening and the morning were the third day.

1.16 And God made two great lights, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night.

And the evening and the morning were the fourth day.

1.20 And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life and the fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

1.21 And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly.

And the evening and the morning were the fifth day

1.24 And God said, "Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping things and beast of the earth after his kind".

1.26 And God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over all the earth".

1.27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

1.28 And God blessed them and God said unto them, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

2.1 Thus the heavens and the earth were finished

2.1 And on the seventh day God rested..

2.3 And God blessed the seventh day.

This is the end of the first scroll.

THE ORDER OF THAT WHICH WAS MADE FROM WHAT ALREADY EXISTED.

(Second Scroll).

2.4 These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created in the day that the Lord God made earth and heavens.

2.5 And every plant of the field before it was in the earth and every herb of the field before it grew for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the earth. And there not a man to till the ground. But there went up from the earth a mist which watered the whole face of the ground.

2.7 And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

2.8 And the Lord God *planted a garden* eastward in Eden and there he put the man whom he had formed.

2.9 And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food.

2:10 And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads.

2.15 And the Lord God took the man and put him into the Garden to dress it and to keep it.

2.18 And the Lord God said it is not good that man should be all; I will make him a help meet for him.

2.19 And out of the ground the Lord God formed the beast of the field and the fowl of the air and brought them to Adam to see what he would call them.

2.20 And Adam gave names to all cattle and to the fowl of the air and to every beast-but for Adam there was not found a helpmeet for him.

2.21 And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam.

2.22 And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man made he a woman and brought her unto the man.

2:23 And Adam said, This is now bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh....(a term of genetic agreement).

We can now list some of the many differences between Genesis One and Genesis Two. These are conclusive that each account is about different events at different times.

THE IMPORTANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENESIS 1 AND GENESIS 2.

1. In Genesis 1, man and woman are created together on the sixth Day as the **last act** of creation. In Genesis 2, Adam is made as the **first act** of formation.
2. In Genesis 1, man is created **after** the beasts of the earth. In Genesis 2 Adam is formed **before** the beasts of the field.
3. In Genesis 1, certain trees are created **before** man. In Genesis 2 certain trees are made **after** Adam.
4. In Genesis 1, male and female were "created" **together** on the sixth day. In Genesis 2, Adam was "formed" **all** as the first act and **before** other species, whilst Eve was made as the last act and **after** other species.
5. In Genesis 1 male and female were created together with the objective filling that "earth", which by inference, means to spread out all over it. In Genesis 2, Adam was formed to live in a specific

location namely Eden, a garden bounded by four rivers. There are neither rivers mentioned in Genesis One, nor any mention of a garden. Adam was planted firmly in a “garden” bounded by four rivers; presumably a long way from the sea.

6. In Genesis 1, man was made with the purpose of *"having dominion over every living thing that moveth upon the earth"*. In Genesis 2 Adam was formed with the specific purpose of being a gardener in Eden and *"to dress it and keep it"*.
7. In Genesis 1, the created men and women were told to go forth and multiply, whereas in Genesis 2, Adam (in whom was breathed the breath of lives) was told to tend to a garden.
8. In Genesis 1, the beasts of **the earth** were created (wild animals), whilst Genesis 2 the beasts of **the field** were made (domesticated animals). The use of the term 'field' indicates that the beasts of the field were to live in an enclosure (the Garden of Eden) and not to roam free like the beasts of the earth. [Note the important difference between “earth” in Gen. 1 and “field” in Gen. 2].
9. In Genesis 1, fruit trees were created before man, whilst in Genesis 2 trees *pleasant to the sight* were made after the formation of Adam. The use of the phrase: *"trees pleasant to the sight"* once again indicates a purpose of cultivation with a need, as with all cultivation in a Garden, of being dressed and kept.
10. In Genesis 1, *every living creature* was created at that time. These species of creatures would of course have had to run into thousands, whilst Genesis 2 the species formed (domesticated animals and fowl) were so small number that they all could be brought in front of Adam for him to name them.
11. In Genesis 1, the high flying migratory birds were created, those which fly above the earth in the *"open firmament of heaven"*; the stork, pelican, albatross, eagle, etc. These birds traditionally still live in the wild open spaces. In Genesis 2, birds were made requiring a different environment - the shrubbery and trees of a garden.
12. In Genesis 1, the food for men was herbs, whereas in Genesis 2 the food was fruit. Adam's later punishment was being condemned to eat herbs.
13. In Genesis 1 there is no mention of punishment for not eating something, as we find in Genesis 2, “male and female” are *"nakar and nequbar"*. These are collective nouns that distinguish between the sexes, whereas in Genesis 2 the words are “*'iysh*” and “*'ishshah*”, or “husband” and “wife”.

In Genesis 1, the sun is not created until after the creation of green grass, herbs and trees. So there must have been some form of photo-synthesis before the sun was created.

16. In Genesis 1, THE heavens and THE earth were created by the Elohim, whereas Jehovah made earth and heavens in Genesis 2 (in the reverse order and without the article). There are also a number of other contrasts with and without the article.
17. In Genesis 1, the Elohim (plural or collective noun) needed a day of rest, whereas, whereas in Genesis 2 there is no mention of a rest- day, or of Jehovah (singular) needing a rest.
18. In Genesis 1, men and women were created in the likeness and image of the Elohim, whereas in Genesis 2 there is no mention of Jehovah doing the same.

In Genesis 1, there is mention of light and darkness, a firmament and physical things that find no mention in Genesis 2.

In Genesis 1, mankind as “male and female” are created, whereas in Genesis 2, a man (singular) is first made. The latter was not told to subdue anything, but rather he was to tend to a garden. The “you” in Genesis 1:29 is “second person plural”, which confirms plurality. The man of Genesis 2 is *eth-ha-adam* which is used as a proper singular name.

The above points are the main differences. These differences insist that the two streams of people existed from Genesis One and Two. Let us now examine their significance in the light other facts disclosed in Genesis 2.

BEFORE EVERY PLANT OF THE FIELD.

It is to be noted that the first scroll ends with: *"Thus the heavens and earth were finished"*, revealing that the whole of the creation in Chapter 1 was at an end. We are not directly informed of the length of time that took place between the first and second scrolls, but many clues exist.

In Genesis 2:5 we are told that the situation. The opening order of formation in Chapter 2, was a time, *"And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew"*. The use of the term *"of the field"* in both these cases reveals that there was, as yet, no enclosed area, no field, no garden in existence. These statements indicate a time period between creations when only *"grasses, green herbs and fruit trees"* grew. No cultivated plants existed. These were to follow after the formation of the Garden of Eden, wherein cultivated plants could be planted and grown.

THE PRE-AGRICULTURAL GENESIS 2 ERA.

Archaeology reveals that for a a period of man's history on the earth there was *"no man to till the ground"*. This pre-agricultural phase relates to the time period prior to the last six thousand years. Cultivation came later. Experts tell us that all ancient cultures record that agriculture was a "gift of the gods". This marked the end of one epoch and the start of another.

The real clue that indicates two entirely different geological epochs between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 lies in the comparison between these two verses:

1. In Genesis 2:5 we are told that before the plants were in the field, the Creator *"had not caused it to rain upon the earth"*. This being the case; without rain, rivers could not have existed. This was the Genesis 1 landscape.

2. In Genesis 2:10 we are told that the Garden of Eden was watered by a source which divided itself into four separate rivers. We are not told the source of the rivers or whether it rained in the garden area.

Vast amounts of time therefore could separate the events of Genesis 1 and Genesis 2. During such a time period *"before every plant was in the field"* and when there was *"not a man to till the ground"*, the pattern of existence would have been determined by the food sources available. In Genesis 1, *"fruit trees"* and man's *"dominion"* over the animals and fish ensure that he had a plentiful supply of food. According to the terminology of anthropologists, at this early stage in man's existence he was known as a hunter-gatherer. Adam, on the other hand, was a man to till the ground- (Genesis. 4:2), as a gardener, a farmer and a horticulturist. As archaeology reveals, agriculturists emerged on the scene long after hunter-gatherers, namely about 6,000 years ago, or from about the time of formation of the Garden of Eden.

THE BEGINNING OF THE AGRICULTURAL AGE.

The descriptive material at the commencement of the second scroll, shows Jehovah's intention to make a garden first. Otherwise why the preamble about plants and water? But God does not make the garden first. He first forms the gardener (Adam), then the garden, and then He puts the man in the garden, and in charge of the garden.

A HELPMATE FOR ADAM.

Adam was formed to, *"dress and keep"* a garden, but then we read,

Genesis 2:18-20, *And the LORD God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him. And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him.*

Adam named these "beasts of the field" as well as *"cattle and fowl of the air"*, so we can see these "beasts of the field" were not of the live-stock class. We can find biblical reference to "beasts of the field" that have human qualities, as opposed to "beasts of the earth" as animals. It was the *"most subtil beast of the field"* that "beguiled" Eve. Since these were created before Eve, they would have been aware of the prohibitions about the Tree. But after this we are again told, *"But for Adam there was not found a help meet for him."* (Gen. 2:20).

We need to look more closely at this situation. Jehovah's purpose was to create a garden and have it "kept and dressed". *"Beasts of the field"* (as being human-like) need not be destructive in a garden, but *"beasts of the earth"* (as being wild animals) need to be kept out of a garden especially if one is planting herbs, etc.. The time gap between the forming of these "beasts of the field" and the subsequent "making" or cloning of Eve from Adam's body, may have been quite long...it is not stated, but it is clear that God saw that Adam needed a help suitable for him. So later was Eve formed so that Adam and Eve could become the parents of all of their line as those containing the breath of lives.

PLURAL “GODS” AND A SINGULAR JEHOVAH.

One of the most interesting differences between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 is that of the name of each manufacturer. In Genesis 1 the name is translated as "God" [*Elohim* (plural)], whilst in Genesis 2 the name is translated as "the Lord God" [*Jehovah-Elohim* (singular)]. Even the terminology of Genesis 1 "*let us make man in our image*" indicates the plurality of the Creators in Genesis 1. This term is used up to the end of the first scroll at Gen 2:3. There is no mistaking the singularity of the personal name of God in Genesis 2, nor the use of the first person singular in Genesis 2:18 where it is written: "*I will make a help meet for him*".

To give some understanding that there are differences between "*Elohim*", "*The Elohim*" and "*Jehovah Elohim*", we can see this where Jacob, after his wrestling with Elohim, said, "*I have seen God (Elohim) face to face, and my life is preserved*". In contrast we read of Jehovah, "*Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live*"-(Exodus 33:20). It is safe to say that ANSWERS IN GENESIS does not consider these differences.

Without making this separation, it would give rise to the appearance that the Creation in Genesis 1 and the formation in Genesis 2 narratives are about the same event. This further leads to the assumption that both creations are one and the same, or as some modern Bible notes wrongly claim that Genesis 2 is simply a repeat of Genesis 1, or part of it. We find that the story of Genesis 2 really starts at Genesis 2:4. wherein we read the name "The Lord God" or "Jehovah" for the first time.

In Genesis 1:1, the Elohim created the heavens [plural] and the earth, the heavens being the entire cosmos. The "earth" here is the physical planet and some of the things on it. But in Genesis 2:4, after the earth and heavens were finished, we read Jehovah-Elohim made a garden within what already existed, thus making an absolute contrast with Genesis 1 where the creation was out of nothing.

As has been pointed out, the popular view holds that Genesis 2:4 is not the start of the Genesis 2 narrative, but a summary of Genesis chapter 1. Genesis 2:4 starts: "*these are the generations of*". This is a preface of what is to follow, not a summary of what has gone before. The structure of other verses in Genesis does not support the summary viewpoint that "ANSWERS IN GENESIS" claims. Note that this style of opening announcement is also used to open other chapters or prefaces to subjects, for example:

Genesis chapter 5:1 "*This is the book of the generations of Adam*".

Genesis chapter 10:1 "*Now these are the generations of the sons of Noah*".

Genesis chapter 36:1 "*Now these are the generations of Esau*".

Thus, in keeping with these earlier examples, Genesis 2:4 is the preface or title announcement of what follows as another subject, not a summary of chapter 1. Gen. 2:4 starts off with: "*These are the generations of...*" as the beginning of each new subject or 'book', not at the end. Genesis 2:1 states that the work of the six days creation was 'finished'. After God's "rest" in Genesis 2:3 that was the closing statement of the Genesis 1 creation and the end of the first scroll. Genesis 2:4 should have been numbered 2:1.

EVE—AND ADAM'S RIB.

Eve (so we are told) was made from Adam's rib. The word "rib" [*tsela*] has been translated many ways. The most common translation is "chambers" as in "*the chambers of the temple*", or we might say "cells". This statement is loaded with significance. Adam was made from the "*dust of the ground*". What is the Bible trying to tell us here? Until this day and age, an understanding of genetics and cell biology was not available. Translators had no idea of how to translate this word about the framework that supported everything, and because it was used biologically, they used the word "rib", and used this word in only this one place. The same applies to "dust". Without any knowledge of elements, molecules, atoms or electrons, the smallest thing they knew about what the ground was made of was "dust".

Could it be that this was one way of telling us that Eve was designed to be identical in genetic structure to Adam - of the same cells or race, if you like? However, it would go further than that. If only one source of genetic material was used, then both Adam and Eve would have the same chromosomal structure apart from the obvious X and Y factors, Eve being female, of course. In modern language we might say that Eve was a clone of Adam. Hence Adam's exclamation when he saw her, "*This is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh*". Therefore, as a genetic replication of each other, there would be no 50/50 genetic differences in the DNA structure to recombine into a child bearing the resultant merged combinations of both parental features. Adam and Eve's children would be identical to them, and the children's descendants

would stay identical to their parents. These have a spirit-bearing capacity the para-Adamites do not have, even today.

Here we find evidence which proves that Adam and Eve could not be the parents of all mankind. Had nothing at all happened to upset this genetic situation, we would today have living among us form or "kind" of mankind similar to each other in important ways. Something, of course, did happen to upset this genetic arrangement, but that is just part of the picture as we have only looked at the two origins in the *first* book of the Bible. In this we have seen that Genesis 1 and 2 differ in every respect. These differences include:

- Two distinctly named Originators .
- Two different orders or sequences of creations.
- Different species created.
- Different atmospheric conditions.
- Different geographical conditions.
- Different purposes outlined for man
- Different functions required of man

At the end of the Genesis 2 formation, we have literally a different "*heaven and earth*". This is what the Bible plainly tells us. Genesis 1 and 2 are perfectly explicit, and of themselves, conclusive of the fact that peoples existed on earth before Adam and Eve. We will come back to the "them" (plural) of Gen. 1:27 again shortly.

WHERE DID CAIN GET HIS WIFE?

Should further evidence be needed to support the premise about the existence of para-Adamite peoples before Genesis 2, certain events described in a later chapter of Genesis lend their support. The first event is that of the identity of Cain's wife. Most people have heard the allegation put forward in an attempt to refute the Bible's authenticity in regard to Cain's wife. It goes like this: Adam and Eve had two sons, Cain and Abel. Cain killed Abel and was then banished to be a vagabond. He took a wife and built a city. Where did Cain's wife come from? To which we could add another question: Even if Cain and his wife had a lot of children, why would it be necessary to build a city to house them? From what we have read thus far in Genesis 1 and 2, answers are now obvious.

Cain took a wife from the para-Adamite peoples, the hunter-gatherers. He was by then living outside of the Garden of Eden, as all the Adamic people now were after their expulsion from the Garden. Cain built a city to house his children, his wife and her kindred peoples, the para-Adamites.

THE MARK OF CAIN.

Let us try to picture the situation after the murder of Abel. According to existing and wrong popular belief which claims that Adam and Eve are the father of all, three people only existed on earth. These would have been Adam, Eve, and their remaining son, Cain. Upon discovering Cain to be a murderer, the Lord pronounces judgement on Cain and tells him that in future, he will be "*a fugitive and a vagabond*". Cain responds with the statement to the effect that this judgement is greater than he can bear, because as he states, "*it shall come to pass that everyone that findeth me shall kill me*" -[Genesis 4:14].

Who was in existence to find and kill Cain? Adam and Eve, his parents, presumably, did not need to find him, and distraught though they may have been at the death of Abel, there is no evidence that they would kill Cain. If Cain had been referring to his parents, surely he would not have used the term, "*everyone*". Thus who was "*everyone*" if no one else existed? Accordingly, and in response to Cain's plea, we are told that the Lord marked Cain- "*and the Lord set a mark upon Cain lest any finding him should kill him*"-[Genesis 4:15]. With different facial characteristics, Cain was "markedly" different!

DIET DIFFERENCES.

There is a significant difference between the food granted by God to the para-Adamite peoples and the food granted by The Lord God to Adam and his wife.

(a) Genesis One Food -("Them"- male and female - plural- Gen. 1:27)

In the Genesis 1 creation, God gave "herbs" and "fruit" to the para-Adamite peoples for food, as follows: "*Behold I have given you every herb....(and) the fruit of the tree....to you it shall be for meat*"- Gen, 1:29

(b) Genesis Two Food.- for a singular male -(Gen. 2:16).

In the Genesis 2 creation, Adam did not eat "every herb" as did the para-Adamite peoples. Adam was commanded by The Lord God what his food was to be, "*and the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest eat freely*" -(Genesis 2:16), and "*Every tree*

that pleasant to the sight and good for food: the tree of life that is in the midst of the garden...." (Genesis 2:9)

Eve was not included in these verses, because she, as yet, did not exist. Thus the para-Adamite people ate "herbs" and "fruit". Adam, and later Eve ate, "*fruit of trees pleasant to the sight*" and no herbs. They also ate of the "tree of life". Why was Adamic man permitted to eat the "tree of life"? Because, "*Adam was (the son) of God*" -(Luke 3:38).

A confirming factor, which reveals that Adam and Eve ate no herbs prior to their expulsion from the Garden of Eden is to be found in Genesis 3:18. After Adam and Eve's sin, the Lord God ordained certain punishments for Adam and Eve, one of which was, "*...and thou shall eat the herb of the field*"-(Gen.3:18).

If, as "ANSWERS IN GENESIS" and the majority claim, Genesis chapters 1 and 2 are indeed the same story and that no para-Adamite peoples existed, who therefore was eating the "herbs", as ordained by God as a daily diet on the sixth day (Genesis-1:29)? And if you decide that the answer to the question is the Adam of Genesis 2, then you have to ask yourself why he was required to eat herbs as a punishment after leaving the Garden of Eden, if he had been eating them all along. It is clear that the "herb eaters" of Genesis 1 and those of Genesis 2 represent two distinct lines of people.

After being "driven" out of the Garden of Eden by Jehovah, where he had eaten of the tree of life and of all fruits and trees pleasant to the sight, Adam's future eating of "herbs" would be a punishment indeed. In case Adam and his descendants got fed up with eating the same herb fare as everyone else outside Eden, and they decided to steal back in for a meal of the "*every pleasant tree and the tree of life*", Jehovah after driving them out, placed at the east of the Garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life-[Genesis 3:24]. Note the use of the word "keep" in this context, which means, "to guard". Originally the Adam of Genesis Two had had to "keep" the Garden, but now he was outside of it he was kept from it. From then he had to till that ground he was originally taken from.

THE "TREE OF LIFE" - THE SOURCE OF IMMORTALITY

Many claim that man and animals, as created in Genesis 1 (the para-Adamite world), were all immortal and that there was no death in the world. If this was so, what was the source of that immortality? Were humans and animals created with immortal bodies? Nowhere does the Bible say that their bodies were immortal!

When he was first formed, Adam was attuned to the mind of God, living in harmony where God had placed him. Being perfectly innocent and uninhibited, continual access to the "tree of life" was a normal part of his existence. The Garden also contained the "*tree of knowledge of good and evil*", and he was forbidden to eat of this tree. He was warned that to do so would be punishable by death.

In the Adamic world, the Bible reveals only one source of immortality namely the "*tree of life*" located in only one place on earth, and that is in the Garden of Eden. It was placed in only one position in the Garden (in the midst), and there was only one tree in this position. Note, we are not talking about the "*Tree of the knowledge of good and evil*" that Adam and Eve ate from. The word, "immortality" does not appear in connection with the Adamic creation, but the phrase "live for ever" does appear and in only one verse, as follows:

Genesis 3:22-23 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.

Thus Adam was sent forth from the Garden of Eden to prevent his further access to the "*tree of life*" and from "living forever". From this we can reasonably conclude that:

Outside the Garden of Eden in the rest of the world there was no immortality because there were no "*tree of life*".

If one were removed from the Garden, and from being able to eat from the "*tree of life*", one would eventually die.

Adam and Eve sinned by eating from the "*tree of the knowledge of good and evil*". They were commanded by the Lord God not to eat of *the "tree of life"* any longer, and were sent forth from the Garden so "*the tree of life*" could not be accessed. None of this concerned the para-Adamite Genesis One peoples who did not have such a "garden", or access to the "Tree of Life".

DEATH ENTERS THE WORLD BY ADAM'S SIN?

A popular view maintains that prior to Adam's sin, there was no death in the world. Therefore, if there were para-Adamite peoples they would have been created to "live forever" like Adam and Eve. Such a view holds that, in the world created in Genesis One, "*no death*" means nothing died in beast, plant, microbe – (all biological life) - all lived without death. However, the seeds and fruits did die in the eating, so that destroys the argument.

Romans 5:12 and I Cor. 15:21 are the verses put forward by those persons seeking to sustain the view that the sin of Adam and Eve brought the death of everything into the world. But what we read is, "*Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression*", so death was a fact in the para-Adamites who did not sin the way Adam did. It was Adamic man who was designed to be sustained without death, not para-Adamite man. Adamic man was sustained in the garden by:

1. Living in the Garden of Eden (as a boundaried-off area), and
2. Having immortality through access to the "tree of life".

After the "fall" of Adam, he and his wife were denied access to the Garden of Eden and thereby denied access to the "*tree of life*". Without the sustaining power of "eating" of the "*tree of life*", Adamic man, like para-Adamite man outside the Garden, would die. Thus, as correctly described in the New Testament, Adam brought death to himself and his seed (offspring) by his sin; occasioning his separation from the "tree of life" and thereby incurring the sentence of death, because those who took "*also of the tree of life and eat and live forever*" -[Genesis 3:22].

Adam's sin caused death to enter into the world of Adamic man. Death for Adamic man resulted from his being expelled from Eden and being denied access to the "*tree of life*". It is to be noted that in Revelation, when the "seed of the woman" (Adamic man) regain their everlasting reward, the tree of life is again made available to them (Ezek. 47:7+12, Rev. 2:7 and Rev. 22:2). Why? So that they can live forever, that is, they can have eternal life. This is why redemption can only apply to the line from the Adamic man for whom Jesus came to redeem.

EVE - THE MOTHER OF ALL LIVING?

By the Middle Ages, Adam and Eve had, so the Catholic Church said, become the parents of 'everybody'. And the Genesis 1 and 2 accounts were one single creation according to them. This supports their one race concept and thus they call themselves the universal church. Thus the leaven of the Catholic Church has leavened almost all of the Protestant churches, so that they all now present the "Brotherhood of Man" doctrine, in accord with the dictates of World Government and the Catholic Church that backs it. This "universal church" tries hard to include the para-Adamite man in redemption and to make everyone else believe this is valid. This leavening doctrine has spread to Protestant churches, and now "the whole is leavened".

Many point to Genesis 3:20, which states: "*And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living*", as the primary evidence that Adam and Eve were the parents of 'everybody'. This is wrong because Eve was the "*mother*" of all those living with God's breath, not of the others without it. This is because there are those with the Spirit, and those "having not the Spirit"-Jude v19. The latter is the "natural man" who "*cannot receive the things of God*"-[1 Cor.2:14], but he may become very religious. What we believe about these issues in Genesis conditions what we believe right through the Bible.

But let us examine this statement and its positioning in Genesis a little more closely. The name "Eve" means "life". This is the first place in the books of Genesis that we hear that "the woman" has now been named "Eve" which is a name not given by Jehovah but by Adam himself. But look at the positioning of this verse in the narrative! Are we seriously to believe that in between the Jehovah's statement of the punishments Adam and the woman were to receive - (verses 17, 18 and 19) and their being "clothed" and expelled from Eden (verses 21, 22, 23 and 24), that Adam turned to his wife and said (verse 20), "Oh by the way, I am naming you Eve because you are the mother of all living"? **And of course, Eve was not Adam's mother, was she?**

GENESIS ONE – THE FIRST BIOLOGICAL MAN, BUT WITHOUT "SPIRIT OF GOD".

In view of the sequence differences, there is no possible way Genesis 2 could be a re-run of Genesis 1. **On a weight of evidence basis, there is more to say that the Adam of Genesis Two was the first man with the Spirit of God, but not the first biological man.** In other words, God took one man from Genesis 1, and breathed into him the breath of life. "*And man became a living soul*"-[Genesis 2:7]. The word "became" is consistently used in a manner showing the subject became something that it had not been before.

In Genesis 1:27 we read, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them”. The word “image” = *tselem* carries the idea of being like something but empty of life, such as a statue has likeness but no life. Genesis Two is about taking one of these men and filling that emptiness in him with “the breath of life”.

“Man” here is the same word as in Genesis One, so this is not about a biological change. For Cain to marry a para-Adamite and produce children shows there are no essential biological differences. The difference is that they have no spiritual relatedness. Through the Bible we can see how dilution of the spirit content from race-mixing leads to the rejection by God. The para-Adamites were not destroyed by Noah’s flood and are still about today, as are the mixtures. The thrust of World Government’s anti-Christ racial policies are to encourage Adamic/para-Adamite marriage, to dilute “*the holy seed*”, a term used solely of Israel, biblically.

There are seemingly endless arguments about Genesis Chapter three about how there came to be the two seeds, “*The Seed of the Woman*” and the “*Seed of the Serpent*”. That there are two seeds is the important fact. The mechanism of how Adamites came to have sexual relationships with para-Adamites is not so important. The New Testament tells us that this temptation is still “common” to the Israelite man today (who is “Caucasian”), and one that will lead him into idolatry-(1 Cor. 10:13)..

Now we can understand why Ezra was so concerned when he plucked out his hair, and rent his garments in astonishment.

*Ezra 9:1-4 The people of Israel, and the priests, and the Levites, have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, doing according to their abominations, even of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites. For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that **the holy seed** have mingled themselves with the people of those lands:*

These “people of the lands” mentioned were para-Adamite races or mixtures of the two peoples, and that is why even the children of Israelite (Adamite) and para-Adamites had to be divorced by a complete separation. This separation is still called for in the New Testament in 2 Cor. 6:17, “*Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean (thing); and I will receive you*”. As seen earlier, the context demands that the added word (thing) are people, that is the para-Adamites “them” are to be separated from. The word “touch” has to do with sexual activity.

What should be done when there is found to be such a mixed race marriage? The Book of Ezra offers an answer in chapter ten. “*And Ezra the priest stood up, and said unto them, Ye have transgressed, and have taken strange wives, to increase the trespass of Israel. Now therefore make confession unto the LORD God of your fathers, and do his pleasure: and separate yourselves from the people of the land, and from the strange [Lit. foreign] wives*”.

Some people claim that the “Trees of Eden” represent peoples, but it is not the purpose here to look at this or to identify the “*seed of the Woman*” as opposed to the “*seed of the Serpent*”. Jesus confirmed this difference when He spoke about those “*begotten from above*” and those “*begotten from beneath*” as being distinct separate origins. Paul did the same when he talks about the “*natural man*” and the “*spiritual man*”. The point is that only one side of each pair have the capability to “*see the Kingdom of God*”. This capability is not a matter which can be spiritualised as the churches do; this would be possible only if the Garden of Eden was the common starting point of all mankind.

CONCLUSION.

If, in spite of the clarity of Genesis 1 and 2, we have been led to believe a different story, then we need to ask ourselves a simple question. What else concerning the Bible have we also misunderstood? Genesis is the bottom line and if we have got the bottom line wrong in our own mind, all else above it is suspect. In the light of what we have discovered above, Genesis 1 and 2 become most revelatory and perfectly in alignment with archaeological and scientific knowledge. But this is not all. The remaining events described in the Bible thereafter take on a whole new dimension but they reveal answers that are not in line with religious traditions.

The view taken of Genesis 1 and 2 conditions everything we believe about the Bible. If the Garden of Eden was not “*at the beginning*”, then we have to reconsider some issues, such as:

Are the gospels right or wrong where we read in, *Matt. 1:21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.* [i.e. Who and who only?] Churches change this around to say people get saved and then become God's people.

Is what the churches teach based upon the "Brotherhood of Man" doctrine today, right?.

Is "everyone", "all" and "whosoever" extended beyond each particular context? It is not grammatically correct to do this in either Hebrew or Greek.

Is the idea that Tares born (as people) can change into Wheat (as people) and that Goats born as such can turn into Sheep, right?.

Is the spiritualised interpretation of "*Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean (people)*" of 2 Cor. 6:17 in the New Testament right or wrong? - [*"Touch not the unclean"* involves sex, in the Greek].

Is the popular use of the word "Gentiles" wrong -[easily proved] – since the words (un)translated as Gentiles are also used of Israel. The phrase "Jews and Gentiles" is supposed to cover all races, but the two parties involved are:

1. The House of Israel ...the "Greek"...the Uncircumcision.
2. The House of Judah..."the Jew".....the Circumcision.

These total "all Israel" as Romans 11:26 says, "*And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob*". The word "Jacob" could not include any para-Adamics or mixtures.

- Is Jesus really wrong when He said, "*I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel*". He would be wrong when He said to His disciples, "*Go not but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel*".

Are mixed-race marriages acceptable to God's plan? To the churches yes, but to God they are not -(See Ezra 10 and Neh. 13).

To say the Tree of life will be available to all races is not true. It was available only to the Adamic man only, and in "*the restoration of all things*" access will be restored to the Adamic seed that is called "in Isaac" only- (Rev.22).

Is Jesus wrong when he says some cannot hear His words? *John 8:43-43 "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word"*.

Are all people ordained to eternal life? Acts 13:48 "*And when the Gentiles - [Paul calls them, "Men of Israel"]- heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed*". "Ordained" is in the passive voice and in the perfect tense, that is, it is viewed as having been completed in the past, once and for all, not needing to be repeated. Being passive means the individual does not do the choosing.

Is it given to everyone to understand the mysteries of the Kingdom of God? (Matt.13:11 -"*Unto them it is not given*").

Does God "foreknow" all peoples, or just Israelites? Rom.8:29 and Amos 3:2. ("*Ye only have I known*").

Was Jesus sent to other than Israel? John 17:9, Matt.10:6 and Matt.15:24. ("*I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel*").

Can the names, "Israel", "Abraham", "Isaac", "Jacob" and "the fathers" (of Israel) really be spiritualised through the New Testament.

Can we find any record where the New Covenant is promised to or made with other than Israelites? Jer. 31:31 -Heb. 8:8.

If God says He hates any race for all generations, could they be part of the world God "so loved"? Rom. 9:13. -Mal.1:1-3.

Does God place His Name on more than one race? Deut. 26:19, Num. 6:27.

Is election really a matter of belief for anyone of any race, or is it belief in a race? Rom. 9:10-11.

And is God wrong when the city of God, the New Jerusalem, has only the names of the twelve tribes of Israel on the gates thereon, and only the redeemed of one people inside, with other races outside?

All these popular beliefs today illustrate how the Hindu concepts of universalism have spread through the churches, primarily through the influence of the Roman Catholic Church. I have seen Images of the Hindu god Kali in some of their cathedrals.

We can read about this "woman" of Rome in Revelation 17:1, and about her Jesus says:

Matt. 13:3 Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.

All organised Christendom has now been leavened by the Universalist/Communitistic doctrine. The racist predestination doctrine that was once taught by men such as Luther, Calvin, Spurgeon, Wesley, Knox, Booth, Finney and the Reformers, has been tossed aside in favour of the Brotherhood of Man doctrine. In other words, the denominations that arose from these men have departed from their foundations.

Most churches in their promotion of humanistic values are now supporting the anti-Christ powers seeking One World Government under man, not God. In doing this they promote a concept and doctrine that the "Commandments of God" are "done away with", replacing these with "The Commandments of men". In this they are closing the gates to the eternal city to Israelites in the same way Jesus told the lawyers they were doing in Luke 11:52.

Rev 22:14 Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

It was disobedience that prevented the Adamic man from continuing to eat of The of Life, and obedience once again will give the right to redeemed Israelites to eat of the Tree of Life.

Churches and organisations like "ANSWERS IN GENESIS", Alpha, Promise Keepers, Full Gospel Businessmen's Fellowship International and such shore up belief in the humanistic and unbiblical "Brotherhood Of Man" doctrine (which also is a Hindu/Roman Catholic/Masonic and World-Church, World government belief). To do this, the impression must be falsely created that all races evolved from one single origin, and that all the differences between Genesis One and Two are not there. "ANSWERS IN GENESIS" is one with these others in this matter, and thus has a false front. Thus they do not suffer persecution for what they present, from World Government sources! Rather, these forces back them! What does this tell us?

And so, what effect do the doctrines of modern churches and ANSWERS IN GENESIS have in practical terms? Well, probably 90% of the members of churches are creationists, and that is no problem on its own. But if that view of creationism insists on adding doctrines that promote the universalism that which flows from the idea of one singular origin of all races, then any concept of the Biblical chosen race has to be discarded. Further to this, God's purpose for choosing Israel as that race has to be modified by changing race to become a matter of belief instead. This paves the way for non-biblical multiculturalism which a dogma of humanism, the World Church and World Government!

This is why the "when" in "When Was The Garden Of Eden" is so vital to get right.