

## Chapter Three: The First Man

This project began with goal of trying to explain some of the “myths” and mysteries of the book of Genesis, dealing with each event as a separate story, and a separate project. The one basic assumption held throughout the book was that the book of Genesis is historically accurate, but that our traditional interpretations of the events described by it were not accurate. Above all I felt that I must retain the message of the book while still holding the book sacred. If we could only interpret it correctly, it would fit with what we know to be true according to scientific data.

As the narrative progressed, I sensed a feeling that instead of my determining the course of the book, the book was pulling me in a direction different from the path that I had originally selected. Separate, unrelated, events were coming together, and seemed to be pointing to a storyline that had previously gone unnoticed, and untold. The great events of Genesis were all coming together with a common theme that is not casually revealed but was definitely present in the beginning, in the garden.

Earlier Biblical scholars, who did not have the benefit of modern research, and new knowledge that has just recently come to light, had missed it. The act of writing about it was revealing details that would help explain some of those mysteries. Details such as the flood of Noah, a better understanding of why the world had to be destroyed, the possibility of using DNA to find out who the REAL Adam was, the unexplained explosion of technology around 2500 BC, and the central reason for everything that happened in the book of Genesis.

There seemed to be the undercurrent of a story that had remained hidden and untold until such a time when we were ready to accept and understand it. That time appears to be the present age. It seemed that the entire book of Genesis meant for our generation and was playing out on a much grander scale than had, at first, been imagined.

If someone said to you that every word of the book of Genesis in the Old Testament is an accurate description, historically, of what happened between 3000 and 6000 years ago, most likely you would say “It’s just not possible”. There would even be some people of faith who would agree. Some have already concluded that the stories were either exaggerated tales or were misunderstood by the human writers of the books. Yet many good people of faith feel that the book is inspired, and struggle to hold on to the idea that the stories of the flood and other fantastic tales that were told to them in Sunday school are true and accurate.

Those who accept the standard “intellectual” position on evolution would say that the truth lies in the archeology and abundant physical evidence that man began to emerge from the animal kingdom around 2 million years ago.

What if you were told that both groups are right and that there is a way to explain how both versions of man’s creation could be true without violating the truth of the Bible? Is it possible that there is an explanation that would satisfy anyone who is searching for the truth and has an open mind? Most likely you would have serious doubts about any hypothesis or explanation that tried to cover so much ground.

The basic premise of this book was always that every word in the Book of Genesis is both true and accurate, and sacred. Like others, this author had problems relating the incredible “stories” heard in Sunday school, to what had been taught in my studies of science and history in college. Instead of falling on one side of the fence or the other as

usually happens in an issue so divided, the decision was made to reserve final judgment until enough evidence could be gathered to reconcile the issue.

I realized early that neither side knew all that there was to know on the subject. It also seemed likely that the ingenuity of man would someday shed light on this and all other mysteries. Surely a way could be found to explain the book of Genesis without violating either the laws of God or the physical laws of the universe. It appeared that there was enough uncertainty in both arguments to allow for re-interpreting the “facts”.

This author gets very upset when someone of high academic or religious standing says, “The Bible is not to be used as a history book”. I believe that they have either given up too soon, or are in denial just because they can’t understand it. Contrary to the position that some authors have taken, that Genesis is simply a beautiful allegory, I don’t believe God wrote the book of Genesis just to make a beautiful, moral story. Either it is true and accurate or it is false. Truth does not belong exclusively to a category of science or religion. The truth, like water, will find its own level wherever it falls.

In the process of writing this book, which began as a collection of notes gathered from years of pondering the “mysteries” of the Old Testament, I stumbled, either accidentally or with some “outside help”, upon some insights, that we will cover in detail later, which could well explain these stories logically, and reconcile the differences between the “science” version of the creation of man and the Genesis version. I had always known that there were many things that I couldn’t explain, but I had faith that in time the truth would reveal itself, either through new discoveries or more informed insight.

It has to be understood by the reader that certain “interpretations” of the facts will have to be radically changed for this to work, because many very intelligent people have worked on this problem over the centuries and failed. The reason for this failure is three-fold. First, they didn’t have the courage to explore alternate interpretations of the Bible for fear of breaking tradition, lacked the imagination to see them, and last, did not have enough information on certain subjects to see the truth.

To accomplish this task, some of my most cherished ideas of religious tradition had to give way to new perspectives that have become possible only in the last 30 years. I reluctantly gave up on these views only when it was realized that the evidence was overwhelmingly against them and that it was possible that the traditional interpretation wasn’t what the original scriptures actually meant to say anyway.

Alternately, some of the most respected and accepted opinions of science had to be compromised to some extent to allow for a hypothesis that proposes what most scientists find objectionable, that the Bible really is a true and accurate record of history.

There is a familiar saying that, *“If you continue to do as you have always done, you can expect to get what you’ve always gotten.”*

Any explanation that would bring together such opposing views of man and his role in the universe as science and religion would naturally have to be something we have never imagined or tried before, else we would “get what we have always gotten”.

What happened next was unexpected. If my understanding of the story that was unfolding before me was true, it would dramatically change our perception of who we are and how “modern” man came to be. I have to confess that what I experienced internally was a certain amount of fear. *Fear that this story was bigger than my ability to tell it.*

Thus begins a story about God and His creation that, since writing it, has caused a strong feeling within me to emerge, that I have stumbled onto the REAL truth about what happened 6000 years ago when a new form of man appeared, almost overnight, out of the darkness of ignorance, on the threshold of a new age of civilization and reason.

Each of the following “insights” will be discussed in-depth in later chapters.

The first “breakthrough” or insight came while writing about the Garden of Eden and its relationship to the Creation and all subsequent events. This idea was only the beginning but is probably the one that set the tone for all others that follow.

*The first two chapters of Genesis describe two different Creation events, separated in time by billions of years.*

When the idea first occurred I re-examined my understanding of those events, and was suddenly stunned with a ‘What if ...’ type of thought process that demanded a closer look to see if the scriptures that followed supported this idea all along and maybe we just didn’t notice it.

Scholars have wondered for a long time why the creation story was repeated starting in Genesis 2:4 and have debated the reason for centuries. We have always assumed that the two chapters were the same event, but that the second account in chapter 2 was simply a closer look at the creation of man.

What if the events in Chapter 1 concerning the creation of the heavens and the Earth took place billions of years ago, and the events of Chapter 2 actually took place only 6000 years ago as a second “creation” event? If true, then Genesis 1 and parts of 2 seem to reflect the modern scientific view of creation while from Genesis 2:4 on, describes the traditional religious view. The science community insists that the universe is 14 billion years old and the Earth is 4.5 billion years old, while fundamentalist Christians say man and history only began 6000 years ago, according to the Bible. Interpreting chapters 1 and 2 this way seems to say that both are right!

If that is true, then Adam would truly be the first man by the Bible’s definition and still allow for the existence of all the creatures described in our science books as having evolved, *including a creature the science books call “early man”*.

Of course, the argument against this is that the Bible talks of the creation taking 6 days. There is a flood of irrefutable evidence that all of creation is billions of years old. The “days” mentioned in the Bible were spoken of as a time period before there was a “day” to measure it by on earth. We now define a day as the time it takes for the Earth to rotate once on its axis. What was the length of a day before man defined it this way? Using that as the standard, a day could have been any period of time before the Earth existed. Even the Bible supports this idea by declaring in several places that God’s time is not the same as man’s time, and that a day could be 1000 years.

There is a way that the 6 days can be true and still be compatible with science, as we know it.

At the moment of creation, scientists say that an event took place that they call “The Big Bang”. This explosion resulted in the universe being created by an enormous expansion of not only matter and energy, but also space itself, so that everything that we can observe today was begun by this event. Space is a dimension, such as length, width,

and height. It is hard to imagine space itself expanding but that is what they say happened.

If space is a dimension and expanded, why not time itself, which is also a dimension, a concept accepted by most scientists and mathematicians? Albert Einstein made clear in his Special Theory of Relativity that space and time are inextricably linked in such a way that they should be considered as one entity.

After 100 years of trying to prove him wrong, most scientists today accept that theory as fact and have been unable through hundreds of elaborate experiments, to prove even one tenet of his paper wrong. The idea of time expanding is one that I have not seen in any papers or research theories, yet it is logical, since science says that “everything” expanded at the moment of the Big Bang.

When we blow up a balloon, the first breath of air seems to inflate it more than any other because further inflation results in less noticeable increases, until at maximum size, another breath is hardly noticeable. If time expanded in this way, like space and matter, then time should have expanded much faster in the earlier period of the universe than the present. The result would be that time ran faster then and is gradually slowing down as the universe ages, like a balloon that slowly reaches its maximum size.

The Bible says that God’s time is different to man’s time, therefore the description of time in Genesis would be according to God’s “clock” until time is established by man on the earth. If time ran faster in the universe early on, than now, but God’s clock is consistent, then while 1 billion years were passing in moments just after the creation of the universe, perhaps only one day was passing on God’s “heavenly” clock.

As the universe, and creation, progressed further, this difference would diminish to where perhaps on the seventh day of God’s clock, only 1 million years of earth’s time passed. This would allow time for all the processes to take place that our science books say happened.

If science says that man began as a species on earth 2 million years ago, which was the 6<sup>th</sup> day on God’s clock, and then we should have no conflict between the two.

At this point I began to understand another important concept.

***There existed a primitive creature that the science community calls “man”, before Adam, that lived in great numbers around the world, outside of Eden.***

This thought-provoking proposal, and perhaps the most controversial to some, is the idea that there was a form of man that existed for millennia on this earth before Adam and that the man spoken of by the Bible in the Garden of Eden and afterward, was not the same creature as the man we read about in our science books of that time. They were two separate species and lived independently in different areas of the world.

It was at this point that I realized that the controversy about man’s origins really centered around the “DEFINITION” of MAN.

Science books refer to any creature that walked upright, was intelligent, and worked with tools, as “man”. A creature that fits that description has been on the earth for the past 2 million years. When did we start referring to that creature as “man”?

For the past 2000 years, society has taken the term “man” from the Bible because the book of Genesis calls the first “man” Adam. Only after science discovered similar creatures that lived in prehistoric times did we also refer to that creature as man. When

God created Adam, the term “man” could only be used to refer to someone who was a descendant of Adam.

Science took the term “man” from the Bible and applied it to all previous creatures that lived before 6000 years ago that looked similar to us and used tools.

Why do I make a distinction between the two? Because Adam was not the same creature that science says lived on the earth for the previous two million years before Eden. In fact, Adam was *very* different from even the modern creature we call “man”, when we consider his longevity, immunity to disease, and Eve’s childbearing characteristics.

After Adam was created, the term “Man” could only refer to someone who is a descendant of Adam. From that time forward, when the Bible speaks of “man” it can only be applied to a descendant of Adam.

Throughout the rest of this book, I will refer to the “first” man, the one that descended through evolutionary processes, as either “Primitive Man”, or “Homo sapiens”, and the “Man” of Eden and the garden, as Adam’s descendants, or just “man”. After the flood when Noah’s descendants mixed with the “primitive” man, the term “Man” became associated with, and was applied to everyone who was a product of that union, including us.

As the descendants of Noah proceeded to intermix with the various tribes and races of the earth, the pure “primitive”, or Homo sapiens, man ceased to exist. This is supported by a genetic study of the past 100,000 years of man’s DNA, showing that it has changed drastically in the last 5000 years when there was little change the previous 100,000 years. According to one study, it has changed 7% in just the last 5000 years.

*“In 2007, a team led by University of Wisconsin-Madison anthropologist John Hawks estimated that positive selection just in the past 5,000 years alone -dating back to the Stone Age - has occurred at a rate roughly 100 times higher than any other period of human evolution”*

If we read the Bible “literally”, man was created from the dust of Eden, not as a preexisting creature. Throughout our history we have taken the name for our species,” man”, from the Bible, and only in the last 150 years has the science community taken that term and applied it to a creature that did not originate in the Garden of Eden. Our science textbooks speak of man as the creature that was born out of evolutionary processes over two million years ago.

Is it possible that the two creatures may not be the same? Is it also possible that, since we don’t have all the characteristics that Adam had, “modern man” as we know him didn’t exist until around 5000 years ago when the descendants of Adam (and Noah) mixed with primitive “man” who was already here, and created a new species? That new species is *us*, or ***modern man***.

It is clear from the Bible that we are different from Adam, and I believe that we are also different from the species of man described in our classrooms as Homo sapiens, the man who dominated the Earth around 10,000 B. C. Could it be that the conflict between creationism and evolution is simply a matter of definitions, that the term “man” is used to apply to two different creatures and it depends on whose definition you accept?

We speak of “man” today as if everything that ever lived that walked upright and made tools was “man”. That is the modern scientific view. We have to realize that after the Garden of Eden, when the Bible speaks of “man” it is only referring to someone who

is a descendent of Adam. Biblical scholars have long talked of a “divine spark” that God put in Adam that is present in everyone who is a descendent of him. Genesis calls it the “Breath of Life”. It is very possible that the “divine spark” is a genetic signature that becomes a part of everyone that is a descendant of Adam, and that it will only be discovered when we are able to fully understand the entire genetic code of the human race?

If we take the view that the term “man” can apply to two different creatures that were very different from each other, but lived in the same period of time, all kinds of possibilities open up and some of the greatest mysteries of the Bible are “solved”

When Genesis 4: verses 16 and 17 state that Cain left Eden and took a wife, we now have an explanation for where she came from. The “man”, Cain, the Bible refers to, took a wife from among the creatures that our science books call “man” that lived in a colony east of Eden, in a land called Nod.

*“And Cain went out from the presence of the LORD, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden.”* Genesis 4:16.

These creatures looked very much like modern man but lacked the genetic “Breath of Life” that God implanted in Adam. The passage above is conspicuous by its lack of information as to where the wife came from and does not say that she was of Adam, perhaps by design.

The scriptures that follow support this theory. Genesis 4:20-24 gives in detail the contributions that Cain’s descendants make to later history, such as music, iron and metalworking, etc. If all of his descendants had perished in the flood, this would have been unimportant and meaningless, as their work would have perished with them. Why bother to include this as part of the narrative if it is irrelevant or untrue?

The truth is that after Cain left Eden to dwell among the “primitive” man of our science textbooks, his descendants were spared the catastrophe of the flood, which was confined to the area called Eden. As I will show in detail later this was “the world” that was destroyed and not the whole planet Earth. God did truly destroy “man whom I have created” because the creatures living outside of Eden were not the subject of the “last” creation, and were not destroyed.

The “other” men are the creatures referred to in Genesis 1:26 when God said “Let us make man in our image”. This announcement was the beginning of a plan by God to create a creature that would eventually become man as we know him, but was only the first step in the process of man’s creation. The final phase of this plan would take place when Adam’s descendants mixed their genes with those of this creature. Only then would “*Modern Man*” emerge and finally be present on the earth. Only then was the plan of Genesis 1:26 complete.

There was one other distinguishing feature that the man Adam had that the man of Genesis 1:26 did not have.

### The Breath of Life.

The "Breath of Life is first mentioned in Genesis 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". The “Breath of Life” was not given to the man of Genesis 1:26.

Most people think that the "Breath of Life" was only given to Adam, but the Bible tells us that certain of the animals also received it. This is indicated in Genesis 7:15, "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the BREATH OF LIFE."

If there were not living creatures *without* the Breath of Life, this statement would not be necessary. These passages suggest that there is more to the "Breath of Life" than just to make something "alive". It was not mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis at all when the creatures of the earth were created.

For it to be mentioned only in the few passages in succeeding chapters suggests that it is something "special" that God imparted to only certain creatures, including Adam and his descendants.

The question remains, what was the Breath of Life?

Adam was not a living "soul" until he received the gift of the Breath of Life. That suggests that it is a spirit that comes from God. This is supported by Ec. 12:7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return *UNTO GOD* who gave it."

It's clear that Adam was the first man to have the "Breath of Life". When the Bible says Adam was the first man, it is using God's definition of man as created in the garden, and is correct, *by definition*. By this standard, Adam didn't even have to look like us to be "man". When our children read about "early man" in their science books, and those books say that the first man began about two million years ago, they are accepting science's definition of "man", not God's. Who then was the "true" man if they were different? My argument is that both groups are right within their *definitions* of "man". *Modern Man* is neither of these creatures but the result of the mixing of their genes.

As we shall see later, they were two very different creatures, both of which had some of the features of modern man, but in some ways both were very different from man today.

We read about Adam and his immediate descendants and think of them as normal, like you and me. Read Genesis more carefully concerning their characteristics and you will see that they were not like you and me. Specifically, the race of man from Adam to Noah and his immediate descendants was a very unusual "man" by today's, or any period's standards, in his longevity, immunity to disease, his ability to communicate with God, and other characteristics we will go into later.

If we accept the premise that God had something special intended for the "primitive" man that existed outside the garden, then this era suddenly becomes tremendously important. The period between the end of the Flood and the beginning of civilization was starting to take on a complexity and character that could legitimately be called a blueprint for the future of man.

What happened then could not have succeeded without a great deal of coordination and forethought as to how it would be implemented. Its scope was to include every race and people on the planet.

The plan, at least in part, began when God said, "Let us create man in our image". At that time there was no creature that resembled modern man alive. Science tells us that a creature they call *Australopithecus* suddenly appeared, and through the process of evolution, and in the millennia of time, developed into a form that resembled modern man.

God's plan was to create a superior human being called Adam, instruct him to multiply and "replenish", or *repopulate*, the Earth. What did He mean by "repopulate" the earth? In time, Adam's descendants would mix with the inferior habitants of this world to produce a race of beings that would develop a technological society and arrive at the point we now know and enjoy as the modern world.

A secondary meaning for the word replenish is to "replace". The word replenish, as used here, was a command to re-populate the earth with a new kind of man that was to *replace* the previous primitive race that had descended from Australopithecus. Repopulate means that there was something here before Adam.

The reason for this plan, and the end result, would be to create a large enough population of this "*modern man*", as we now call him, from which to extract only those who are worthy to enter into what the Bible calls "The Kingdom of God".

Jesus consistently referred to this domain and emphasized that it required not only understanding, but also a sensitivity and grasp of morals that the primitive man could never have achieved. It would be hard to see how anyone could argue how His message of "Love thy neighbor, and even thy enemy" could have impacted the world of man 10,000 years ago, yet this simple phrase is still affecting man's thinking and is debated today. This was an idea that could not have come through evolution or the primitive man. This is proof that something in man had changed.

Misinterpretations of the message have admittedly resulted in some disastrously misguided efforts such as the Spanish inquisition, the Crusades, and the Salem witch trials. This is an indication that some of the primitive man who lacked understanding of the "love" message is still present in all of us.

This coordinated effort to introduce civilization and reason to the world of man will never appear in any school textbook because it would support the "religious" view of creation. The official position of the science community is still that civilization and progress all happened by accident through a few key developments in agriculture and a smooth transition from the stone age to the modern age. Historians traditionally don't like bumps in the road.

They admit that there are still puzzles, and are at a loss to explain the explosion of knowledge and language that took place just after the time of the flood, around 4500 years ago. During this period, man invented language, written alphabets, studied mathematics, learned to smelt iron, learned music, and constructed the first cities made of bricks. *All of this occurred within a space of only 300 years!*

When the "Eden" man mixed with "primitive man" after the flood, the very nature of man as a species was changed, as the genes of these "enhanced humans", direct descendants of Adam, were assimilated into the gene pool of the existing creatures that science calls 'man'. The result was a new form of man that was intelligent, artistic, and very creative. The bipedal hominid of our science books that had roamed the Earth for more than two million years was now changed to be a moral creature with the "divine spark", at least in theory, if not in practice.

As the first products of this union scattered across the earth, their enhanced abilities were recognized in all of the early civilizations and they were considered "Gods" in the eyes of the lesser inhabitants. These first descendants of Noah and primitive man were responsible for the legends we see as Greek, Egyptian, and Sumerian "myths".

At this point a realization set in for what was becoming clearer with each chapter. I developed a deeper appreciation of the fact that everyone walking around on the Earth today has some of the genes, and is a descendant of, a real person named Adam. And, since those genes came directly from God, we could even call ourselves “children of God”.

We will find out later that some individuals even assigned an element of “divinity” to that title. Also, as “Children of God” we acquired a “right of inheritance”. That right, as is true in all inheritances, is only valid if we claim it.

That right of inheritance makes us eligible for consideration to become members of the “Kingdom of God”. This helps to explain the verse in John 1: 12 and 13 in the New Testament concerning our right to be called “Sons of God”. It also confirms that every individual is special and is important to God because we all have his stamp, or seal of ownership, within us. *I believe that this stamp, or brand, of God is contained in our DNA.*

Is it possible that the writers of the New Testament had access to knowledge of this part of our history that we have not yet realized? There are several instances of the word “mystery” or “mysteries” being used in the New Testament to refer to knowledge that we will have at some point in the future.

The apostle Paul is very vague in a passage that has intrigued Bible scholars for centuries concerning the physical man and the spiritual man. This is contained in Corinthians 2:14,

***“For the natural man received not the things of the spirit of God for they are foolishness unto him...”***

This is followed up by even more specific references to *two* kinds of man in chapter 15:47,

***“The first man is from the earth, a man of dust. The second man is from heaven... Just as we have born the image of the man of dust, we will also bear the image of the man of heaven”***.

We could easily substitute the word “genes” for the word “image” in this statement, and retain the same meaning. This is a very powerful and timely statement from someone who had no knowledge of genetics. If the ideas presented in this manuscript are true then we all *do* bear the genetic image of both the primitive man of the science books as well as the image of the first man, Adam, who, because God *“breathed the spirit of life into him”*, is the only one who can legitimately be called a “man of heaven”.

There was at this time available to Paul, a library in Egypt, at Alexandria, which contained the sum of all knowledge then known in the ancient world. Perhaps Paul, being a very learned and literate person from that period, had read from texts that were stored in this library. Perhaps he acquired greater knowledge of man’s history after his conversion to Christianity. It is well known that all of the written documents concerning mankind’s history from the beginning of written language were stored in this library, which was later destroyed by the Romans.

What could we have learned about our early history if those documents had survived to this day? Would we have learned that the flood story in the Bible was true and

accurate? Would they tell of the origin of the “mythical” Gods who lifted the ancient civilizations, like Greece, out of the Stone Age? Would we now have a greater appreciation of the Old Testament accuracy if those texts could corroborate its authenticity?

I was now starting to comprehend the importance of the fact that all of the significant events that transformed man from a backward nomadic existence to a literate, cultured, citizen with an urban lifestyle, took place in a very small region of the world between 2200 and 2500 BC, a very short time period in which man and his world were re-invented and set on a course to become what it is today.

***The flood of Noah as described in the Bible was a local event, confined to a large area called EDEN. Throughout the book of Genesis before chapter 9, this area was referred to as “the world”***

As this document began to take shape, new evidence was just coming to light concerning the flood of Noah. This would later become a crucial piece in the puzzle. It led to a new perspective on that event that helped me to understand much better how and why it happened. I started to fully appreciate the tremendous effect it had on the Earth and the future of man. As it turned out, “the flood” was indeed a global event, but the “world” of Eden was the only place that was completely covered with water. A full explanation of this event is given in a later chapter.

Even more important to our present society and civilization, it was becoming clear for the first time the staggering importance of the period and the events that took place just after the flood of Noah. This was the period that cast the mold for modern civilization.

***The phrase “His way” as used in Genesis 6:12 should be taken to mean His plan, or blueprint for man’s development.***

Genesis 6:1-7 gives us one of the most puzzling passages in the entire book. It describes beings coming from Heaven who take wives of the daughters of man. This results in offspring that are described as “giants”, who are obviously very different from the race begun by Adam. Because of this genetic corruption of Adam’s line God declares in no uncertain terms “I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the Earth...for all flesh had corrupted *His WAY* on the face of the Earth”.

In reading the passage in Genesis 6:12 that said “God’s way was corrupted” I saw something else that had been passed over. The choosing of the word “way” for this passage is a little strange. When we “have our way” it usually means that we know where we are going. In other words, God had a preconceived plan that was being violated. God didn’t just create the world and put man in it just to see what would develop.

When I thought about that possibility, the events that followed made more sense than before, when we simply thought the word “way” meant His creation. ***God had a plan from the beginning.***

This significant use of the word “way” has never been truly recognized, but is extremely important here. The phrase “*His Way*” did not mean His “*Will*”, or His “*creation*”, as we usually interpret it, but was specifically referring to a *blueprint for*

*man's development.* The word “way” is derived from a word meaning a “road” or highway such as “The Apian Way”. All roads lead to somewhere that is predetermined. God’s *WAY* was the plan He had set in motion for man and the Earth, even before He began the Garden project. It became a statement that God had a plan for man that went beyond just creating him and populating the Earth.

It has generally been accepted that the reason God created man was that “He desired companionship”, or “He wanted our love”. While these arguments may be true, they are speculative because we cannot really determine from the Bible why God created the human race. It could also be that God had more specific plans for man that went well beyond anything we could have imagined.

What if man was created for a different reason that we have not yet realized? Until this age of information provided the tools, the knowledge, and the insight to discern it, it has remained hidden from our view. This makes the statement in Genesis that “His way was corrupted upon the Earth...” a much more powerful message than the traditional interpretation that He was just angry that His creation had been defiled. Not only was He angry concerning man’s sinful behavior but their actions were also tearing down the wonderfully complex plan He had begun to execute in the Garden, for the benefit of all Mankind.

With that in mind a story began to play out in my imagination as the book of Genesis started to take on a new life that made more sense in our modern world. I started to realize that a picture was forming of a very detailed and complete story about God’s purpose for man on the Earth that began long ago at the foundation of the world, and is still coming together in our present time. I began to see our present world as not being so separated from the world of 6000 years ago, as the events described in Genesis suddenly became very real.

It is hard today for us to relate to a backward society, like the one that existed at that time, when we are surrounded by creations of our own, the technology and culture that runs our society and our lives. I thought about the intelligence and technology that must have been involved in the creation of The Garden of Eden, and that maybe it still existed on Earth immediately before the flood of Noah. Could it be that the technology that we have today is not entirely the result of our genius, but was predestined to happen long ago, in the time when the future of man was being molded?

For some reason that we can only speculate about, God began, as the Bible states, at the “foundation of the world”, with his plan for mankind, a time when science tells us was about 4.5 billion years ago, when the earth was “gathered together” from the dust that circled a new sun. He made a deliberate and planned decision to return to a specific time in its development, 6000 years ago, to continue and complete its final phase.

Sometimes the best way to test a hypothesis is to try on the idea, like trying on a coat, and see if there is any contradictory evidence or something that doesn’t “fit”. Lacking this you then examine all the available remaining evidence to see if it supports and ‘reads’ as if your original assumption is true. If that test proves correct you sometimes find that what remains is an idea that fits your hypothesis like a glove. That was the case here.

This new hypothesis required accepting some basic assumptions that will be described later, assumptions that would go against centuries of tradition, and go against

what many had accepted as truth all their lives. The result is a story that is continuous and logical, and has a much more important message for our generation than we had realized.

When the basic form of the plan was first realized, I started to research the hypothesis, looking for supporting evidence. Pieces of the puzzle began to come together, faster than I had expected. With every chapter and idea would come new insight that explained scripture that had been a mystery since I was very young. There had to be a reason that the story was coming together so well.

***It was Noah's descendants who were responsible for the myths of "Gods" in all the great civilizations of the world.***

A study of the Gods of different cultures is a part of our history that has never been given the attention it deserved by biblical and historical scholars. Perhaps it is because all historians like to think that they investigate only those ideas that are acceptable to the establishment, and a research project to study "Gods" would border on religion and superstition. Biblical researchers consider such a study as pagan and irreverent.

The Bible clearly describes how the "nations" came to exist, and the role played by Noah's sons and descendants. Before there were "nations" there were only isolated colonies of nomads and people who could only struggle to hunt for or grow enough food to sustain them. Because of Noah's descendants these colonies of early humans gained knowledge and gifts of better crops, with more frequent and greater yields, and began to build cities. Historians and science scholars like to pretend that Noah and Genesis chapter 10 never happened.

Another reason that it has not been studied more carefully is for lack of information. To write this book required accepting ideas that would provoke controversy in both the academic and the religious camps. If we are to use all the information available concerning this period in time, we have to combine the knowledge that both groups have gathered concerning the history of man. One of the ideas that we never considered is that there might have been more than one species of man, an idea that has suddenly become acceptable in light of the discovery of the "Hobbits" race in Indonesia in 2004.

The first 3 or 4 generations of Noah's descendants still had some of the traits of the pure line from Adam to Noah. They lived extremely long lives, were highly intelligent, immune to disease, and knew how to construct things no human had ever constructed before. Considering that the "other" man had a short 30 to 40 year lifespan and limited abilities, how would such a visitor as one of Noah's grandsons seem to them? He would seem to be a God in their eyes.

It would not be hard to imagine that the Greek legends of human Gods, who were strong and had superhuman abilities such as Hercules, Atlas, Zeus, and others, long considered as part of Greek "mythology", were really stories about actual people who came to them as descendants of Noah. As these "super humans" inter-mixed with the primitive tribes, their offspring by mortal women would be accepted as Gods also, but only as  $\frac{1}{2}$  Gods, exactly as many accounts describe them, such as the epic of Gilgamesh in ancient Sumer. Gilgamesh was described in clay tablets as being only a  $\frac{2}{3}$  God. This led to many royal lines being looked on by the people as divine.

Am I the only one who questions why a ruler would only claim to be  $\frac{2}{3}$  God? Why would anyone choose to be less than "whole" God? This has to be evidence of a kernel of

truth in such stories. The truth is that they were descendants of a marriage between someone that they considered to be a “God” and a mortal mother, or some other combination as such.

This also explains the attempt of so many Egyptian rulers to keep the illusion alive of being divine and immortal long after these traits had been reduced through marriage and mixing with the original peoples, so as to be almost non-existent.

Had the events not taken place exactly as described here and later in this book, man today would probably still be a backward creature