

Origin of Sin; Edenic Theology, Satanic Commentary

QUESTION: Why was the tree called, “the knowledge of good and evil?”

When Jesus Christ created the souls of our original parents, their streams of consciousness were preprogrammed with all data necessary for adult function. However, their consciences remained “*tabulae rasae*,” blank slates, with no knowledge of either good or evil. Their consciences were hanging on the tree. In order to acquire a conscience each would have to make a willing volitional decision which would be in conscious violation of divine policy.

In His daily theology classes, Jesus Christ never taught the two about good or evil. He only made the issue clear about avoiding the tree's fruit as a source of food. Other than that, their environment of absolute perfection plus their perfect souls made the knowledge of good and evil superfluous.

There was nothing the couple could think, say, or do that was wrong. There is no wrong in a perfect environment. This perfection remained a constant as long as their souls had no desire to eat from the forbidden tree.

Once desire was inflamed, then it became decision time. Once they had the desire to eat the fruit, would they do it?

Once a conscious choice is made to eat from the tree then violation of divine policy occurs. Why was the volitional decision the origin of sin and not the actual ingestion of the fruit? Because once you knowingly decide to violate a divine policy there occurs a simultaneous recognition in the soul that you are committing a wrong. This creates a conscience: knowledge of good and evil. What immediately comes up from the emotional complex of the soul is the additional sin of guilt. This is immediately dealt with through human instinct since the conscience has not been developed with theological problem-solving devices.

Again, Jesus Christ purposefully did not teach them right from wrong because there was no need for them to know it. The volitional test was a challenge to stay away from a need to know it. Part of the trauma the Lord built into the test was the fact that if Adam and Ishah fell they would be unequipped to handle the ramifications since they were without a doctrinal conscience. It would have been incongruous for the Lord to have taught rebound to perfect people.

Secondly, rebound following the Fall would be ineffective since their imperfection would place them in need of salvation not restoration to fellowship. But the Lord also had no need to teach the couple about soteriology or Christology since that would have communicated to them the inevitability of the Fall. So, what categories of systematic theology did our Lord teach them?

1. He obviously taught theology: Doctrines pertaining to God in three Persons. This would have included divine essence, creation of the universe, and the mechanics of planetary restoration but not its cause.
2. Angelology: most likely there was information taught about the angelic creation but probably nothing about the Fall of Satan and the demons.
3. Anthropology: They learned about their own creation and perfection, both soul and body and about God's plan for them in the Garden. There was obviously a lot of instruction about free will.
4. Hamartiology: They were informed of the only divine prohibition through the negative mandate of Genesis 2:17 as well as the penalty clause attached to it. Although this was not taught as sin it was the test which if violated would produce the first sin.

That's it. From this corpus of knowledge, Adam and Ishah would be able to serve God, have complete happiness within a perfect marriage, and continue to live everlasting life in the Garden. The establishment of a conscience would mean that they had violated the mandate by choosing to eat from the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The free will choice to violate divine policy broke the status quo of perfection and caused the Fall.

A corrected and expanded translation of Genesis 3 for as far as we have gone:

Genesis 3:1 - Now the serpent [Satan; see Revelation 12:9 & Revelation 20:2] was more skillful, ingenious, intelligent than any creatures of the field which Adonai Elohim [Jesus Christ] has made. In addition, Satan said to the woman, “Has God indeed said, ‘You shall not eat of any tree of the garden?’”

Genesis 3:2 - So, the woman replied to the serpent, “From the fruit of any tree in the Garden we may eat;

Genesis 3:3 - but from the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the Garden, Elohim has said, ‘You shall not eat from it [except for the error in attribution, the quote, to this point, is accurate] or touch it [misquote #1] lest you die [misquote #2].’”

Having determined that the woman is confused about what is and isn't prohibited, confused about the penalty clause, and confused about Who actually issued the mandate, Satan then moves in for the kill.

Genesis 3:4 - And the serpent said to the woman, “You're positively not going to die.

Genesis 3:5 - “For God knows that in the day you eat, your eyes will be opened and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.”

Ishah's interest is peeked, doubt about the validity of what she has been taught by Jesus Christ enters her stream of consciousness, and curiosity about withheld data stimulates her desire to acquire instant access to the information. Satanic blasphemy has now entered into the arena of ideas. It's duplicity and deceit never cease to contort the thinking of the human soul. The implication is that God is deceitful. His desire is to keep the woman ignorant, barefoot, and a sex slave to Adam.

Ishah is about to transform from the most beautiful, submissive, and responsive woman ever into a Satan-influenced version of Molly Yard, Hillary Clinton, and Pat Schroeder all wrapped up into one. And the interesting thing about Satan's deception is that it is a classic “double entendre.” He establishes a certain agreement between the truth and the lie. He was right when he said that if Ishah ate the fruit she would acquire the knowledge of good and evil. He was right when he said that by so doing Ishah would become like God in the sense of knowing good and evil. He was lying when he said that by eating the fruit she would not die. In essence he is suggesting that God will not back up His punishment clauses when violated. Further, all this business about not eating the fruit is just a rhetorical veil concealing a hidden agenda: God does not want her to know what He knows.