


When Was The Garden of Eden?



**By
Arnold Kennedy**



When Was The Garden Of Eden?

By
Arnold Kennedy
September, 1999.



When Was The Garden Of Eden?

By

Arnold Kennedy

September, 1999.

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 in the second chapter of Genesis. But few people know that "Eden" occurs elsewhere in the Bible, and that it occurs concurrently with both Pharaoh, King of Egypt and the Assyrian empire in the Ezekiel 31-32 passage. As this is so it immediately calls for a rethink of what we have believed, that is, that the Garden of Eden could not have been "*at the beginning*".

When we take a good look we must conclude that the people created by the Elohini in Genesis 1 are different in many ways those people 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 chapters to get a starting point, noting that the things that are emphasised are concurrent.

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 chestnut 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".

Without going into all the meanings of the Biblical symbols of trees as being different peoples, what this means of course is that "**Eden**" of chapter 2 of Genesis is about something different from what we find in Genesis chapter 1, and that "Eden" was long after Genesis chapter 1. Theologians have muddied the waters claiming that Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 must have been written by different people 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 the above account of Ezekiel? 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**" where we can find both kinds contrasted within the one verse in places in the Bible. In Genesis 1 pre-Adamic man is "created" [Heb], and in Genesis 2 Adamic man is "formed" [Heb] separately. [Note: These terms "**pre-Adamic**" and "**Adamic**" are not strictly correct but for convenience are used to identify and separate the two peoples].

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 which follow, the orders of creation as shown in Genesis 1 and 2 are compared. All extracts are from the King James Version.

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 and reveal answers that are not in line with religious tradition.

GENESIS CHAPTER ONE [First Scroll] THE ORDER OF THE CREATIONS

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 free 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 fowls that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven.

1.21 And God created great 'Whales, and every living creature that mote& 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 hiring 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.

**GENESIS CHAPTER 2 [Second Scroll]
THE ORDER OF THE FORMATIONS.**

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

25 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 and 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 alone; I will make him a helpmeet 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.

SOME DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENESIS 1 AND GENESIS 2.

- 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.
- In Genesis 1, man is created **after** the beasts of the earth. In Genesis 2. Adam is formed **before** the beasts of the field.
- In Genesis 1, certain trees are created **before** man. In Genesis 2 certain trees are made **after** Adam.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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".

- 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].

- 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 cultivation with a need, as with all cultivation in a garden, of being dressed and kept.

- 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.

- In Genesis 1, the high flying migratory birds were created, those which fly above die 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.

- 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.

These are the main differences. 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 end 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 which took place between the first and second scrolls., but many clues exist.

In Genesis 2:5 we are told that the situation, setting the stage, as it were, for the opening order of creation of Chapter 2, was a time, "before every plant of the field was in the earth, and before every herb of the field was grown". The use of the term "of the field" in both these cases reveals that there was, as yet, no enclosure, 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.

In Genesis 2:5 we come across the reason why nothing was cultivated. For we are told that, "**AND THERE WAS NOT A MAN TO TILL THE GROUND**". Note the interesting and carefully chosen combination of words, "not a man." There were men, of course, created in Chapter 1, but "not a man" who was able to till the ground.

THE PRE-AGRICULTURAL ERA

As the archaeological record shows, for a considerable amount of man's history on the earth there was "no man to till the ground". This pre-agricultural phase forms the major time period prior to the last six thousand years. Cultivation is a relatively recent phenomenon. In fact, all ancient cultures record that agriculture was a "gift of the gods". This gift 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. The rain at the time of Noah occurred outside the garden.

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 an horticulturist. As archaeology reveals, agriculturists emerged on the scene long after hunter-gatherers, namely about 6,000 years ago.

THE BIRTH OF AGRICULTURE

The descriptive material at the commencement of the second scroll, shows the Creator'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. We are not told where exactly Adam was made but in Eden he was an import, whilst Eve was home grown.

A HELPMATE FOR ADAM.

Now we come to a very interesting item. Eve, apparently, was not formed for the same purposes as Adam. Adam was formed to: "dress and keep" a garden. Almost as an afterthought as it was noted that "***it is not good that man should be alone, I will make a help meet for him***" (Gen. 2:18). .At this point was Eve made. Seemingly, as the very next verse tells us, all the domesticated animals were made to fulfil this need and were brought to Adam so he could name them. Then we find the same statement being made again. But this time it is prefixed with the word "but" to show Adam's animal friends were not sufficient to alleviate his loneliness: "But for Adam there was not found a help mate 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". Animals, domesticated or otherwise, are necessary in a garden. In fact "***beasts of the earth***" need to be kept out of a garden especially if one is planting herbs. etc. Clearly then, the domesticated animals were created as a solution for Adam's loneliness, a solution which was not adequate. Note the use of the word "found" in this second statement: "**A help-meet was not found**", Found where? Found among the domesticated animals, obviously not. Then and only then, was Eve formed so that Adam and Eve could become the parents of all of their line.

"REPLENISH THE EARTH"

The choice of the word "replenish" used in Genesis I is also worthy of note. "Replenish" means to "fill" in Hebrew. This word taken literally means that the people created in Genesis I were created for the purpose of restocking the earth after others had departed. Who were the others? Where they the earlier species of man? Where they the Australopithecus? Neanderthal? Cro-Magnon? -- All now extinct. And why fill with people at all? We are told that this was so that they could "***have dominion over living creatures***" Man has certainly done that. Man is the greatest predator on earth, rendering some species extinct and others nearly so.

What would have been the situation had pre-Adamic man not been created? Would the seas now be full of shoulder-to-shoulder whales? Or the jungles "wall-to-wall gorillas". Interesting thought! Genesis 1 tells us also that pre-Adamic man was to have dominion over: "***the fish of the sea***". But not Adam! He was placed firmly in a garden bounded by four rivers., presumably a long way from the sea.

THE LORD GOD

One of the most interesting differences between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 is that of the name of each manufacturer. In Genesis I the name is translated as "God" Elohim (plural), whilst in Genesis 2 the name is translated as "(he lord God" Jehovah-Elohim (singular). I've (he terminology of Genesis 1 "***let us make man in our image***" indicates the plurality of the Creator in Genesis 1. This is used tip 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***".

Without making this separation, it would give rise to the appearance that the Creation in Genesis I and ill 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 claim that Genesis 2 is simply a repeat of Genesis 1. 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:-I. after the earth and heavens were finished, we read Jehovah-Elohim made an earth and a heaven out of what already existed, thus making a stark contrast with Genesis I where the creation was out of nothing. There was a restructuring of the earth making a garden and the restructuring of atmosphere to make it rain. Thus Genesis 2:4 could read:

"These air the .generations (creations or changes made) of (to) the heavens (the atmosphere and sky) when they were created (restructured) in the day the Lord God made (remade) the earth (into a garden) and the heavens (into a water vapour recycling system)".

EVE

Eve (so we are told) was made from Adam's rib. the word "rib" (isela) 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. Could it be that this was the simplest way of tell 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 chromosomic structure apart from the obvious X and Y factors, Eve being female, of course.

Accordingly, if Adam had the beauty of an Adonis, Eve would have had the beauty of an Aphrodite. Same skin tones, same hair shades, same eye colouring, same physiognomy, exactly! 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. We are shown that these have a spirit-bearing capacity the others do not have.

This is the most telling factor of the whole story, and the one which proves that Adam and Eve could not be the parents of all mankind. Had nothing happened to upset this genetic situation, we would today have living among us a family, perhaps even a whole nation, of individuals resembling each other in an important way. Something, of course, did happen to upset this pattern, but that is another story or many other

stories; after all, we have only looked at the first 2 chapters of the first book of the Bible. In this we can see that Genesis 1 and 2 differ in every respect. These differences include:

- 1. Two distinctly named Originators.**
- 2. Two different orders or sequences of creations.**
- 3. Different species created.**
- 4. Different atmospheric conditions.**
- 5. Different geological conditions.**
- 6. Different purposes outlined for man**
- 7. 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. Look at Gen. 1:27 again noting the "**them**".

WHERE DID CAIN GET HIS WIFE?

Should further proof be needed to support the premise of pre-Adamic peoples, certain events described in a later chapter of Genesis lend their support. The first event is that of the identity of Cain's wife. Everyone has 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. We will not discuss here the origin of Cain who "**was of the evil one**".

Cain took a wife from the pre-Adamic peoples, the hunter-gatherers. He built a city to house his children, his wife and her kindred peoples, the pre-Adamites. Hunter-gatherers do not build cities. Hunter-gathers do not cultivate. Cain did! He was, as Genesis 4:2 tells us, a "**tiller of the**

ground' Cain taught the hunter-gatherers how to cultivate, and how to build cities.

THE MARK OF CAIN.

Let us try to picture the situation after the murder of Abel. According to existing and wrong popular belief which states that Adam and Eve are the father of all, three people only existed on earth. 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 judgment 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?

From what we have gleaned thus far, it is clear that Cain was afraid of being killed by the existing pre-Adamite peoples, the hunter-gatherers, who, presumably being primitive and warlike, would resent Cain's intrusion into their midst. But more importantly, Cain, being born later by possibly tens of thousands if not hundreds of thousands of years, would have no doubt looked markedly different in physical features from the hunter-gatherers. 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].

Many have speculated as to what this mark of Cain might have been, and how a mere mark could serve to deter people from killing him. The answer is obvious. It was not a mere mark - it was a complete physiological change.

FOOD FOR THE PEOPLE - FOOD OF THE SON OF GOD (THE DIFFERENCE)

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

(a) Food for the people ("Them"- male and female - Gen. 1:27)

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

(b) Food for the son of God- male and singular -(Gen. 2:16).

In the Genesis 2 creation, Adam did not eat "**every herb**" as did the pre-Adamic 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" (Genes is 2:9)

Eve was not included in these verses, because she, as yet, did not exist. Thus the pre-Adamic 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 "free 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: 1 8).

If, as the majority claim, Genesis chapters 1 and 2 are indeed the same story and that no pre-Adamic 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 the "*tree of life*" eaters of Genesis 2 represent two distinct lines of people.

After being "*driven*" out of the garden of Eden by The Lord God, where he ate 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 sneak back in for a meal of the "*pleasant trees 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*".

THE "TREE OF LIFE" - THE SOURCE OF IMMORTALITY

Some claim that man and animals, as created in Genesis 1 (the pre-Adamic 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!

In the Adamic world, the Bible reveals only one source of immortality namely the "*tree of life*" located in only one place on earth (the garden of Eden), and placed in only one position in the garden (in the midst), and there was only one tree. 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 s. to know good and evil: and non, 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 access to the "*tree of life*" and from "*living for ever*". From this we can reasonably conclude that:

1. Outside the garden of Eden in the rest of the world there was no immortality because there were no "*tree of life*".
2. If one were removed from the garden, and from being able to eat from the "*tree of life*", one would eventually die.

Had Adam and Eve not sinned, and because they were commanded by the Lord God to eat of the "*tree of life*" presumably they would have lived for ever. Note that God did not give the pre-Adamic peoples the same privilege in Genesis 1:29. Nor did the Lord God provide the animals and birds with such a tree of life food in Genesis 1:30.

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 pre-Adamic peoples they would have been created to "live forever" like Adam and Eve. Such a view holds that, in the world created in Genesis 1, no death means nothing died in beast, plant, microbe - all biological life - lived without death. However, the seeds and fruits 'died' in the eating. By inference, the death of these species was already in the world, to say nothing of the herbs and probably root vegetables eaten by the pre-Adamic peoples.

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, these verses say nothing of other species and refer to only to one kind of "man" in particular. Thus, in this context, the Bible is talking of Adamic man. It was Adamic man who was designed to be sustained without death, not pre-Adamic man. Adamic man was sustained by:

1. Living in the garden of Eden (an isolated biosphere), and

2. Thereby having access to the "tree of life" (a "live forever" inducing device)

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 pre-Adamic 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 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 save.

COULD GENESIS 2:4 BE MERELY A SUMMARY OF THE GENESIS I CREATION?

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 by. The structure of other verses in Genesis does not support the summary viewpoint. 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...' at 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.

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 had become one single creation according to them. This is why 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 which is behind it. This "*universal church*" tries hard to include the pre-Adamic man in redemption and to make everyone else believe this is valid.

EVE - THE MOTHER OF ALL LIVING?

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*'. 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*"; 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 Lord God'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,"

From the sequences there is no way Genesis 2 could be a re-run of Genesis 1. On a weight of evidence basis, there is more to say that Adam

[as we use the word] was the first man with the Spirit of God, but not the first biological - man. In other words, God took one man either from Genesis 1, [some think from "*space*"], 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. Eve was the "***mother***" of all living with God's breath, not of the others. This indicates that 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.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper is not to make identification of the "***Trees of Eden***" as peoples, 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 did Paul 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.

The ancient Vedic scriptures of the East 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***" as being "***sons of God***", a phrase not unknown in the New Testament. They also give the location of the Garden of Eden, something that will not be discussed here. But the matter of "***the holy seed***", the line through Adam-Noah-Abraham-Isaac-Jacob/Israel is denied today. Much of the story of the Bible is about the attempts to destroy this holy seed, primarily by racial intermarriage.

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 Levite's, lime 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”*

The solution is this is given in the next chapter. *“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”.*

Thus 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 what we have been taught is wrong, such as:

- The gospels are wrong where we read in, Matt. 1 .21 And she shall Ming forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall sate his people from their sins." [i.e. Who and who only?]
- What the churches teach based upon the "**Brotherhood of Man**" today is wrong.
- "Everyone", "all" and "whosoever" being be extended beyond each particular context is wrong.
- The idea that Tares born as such can change into Wheat and that Goats born as such can turn into Sheep is wrong.
- The spiritualised interpretation of "**Come ye out and be ye separate**" of the New Testament is also wrong. -["Touch not the unclean" involves sex].
- The popular use of the word "**Gentiles**" is wrong -[easily proved].

When Was The Garden of Eden - Arnold Kennedy

- Jesus would have to be 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*".
- And God too must be 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.



When Was The Garden of Eden - Arnold Kennedy

THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE CHURCH

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

