

Reasoned Reality of Good And Reasoned Reality of Power

by Aurel Ionica

1st revised online edition, published February 1, 2018

If I had to use a single word to describe the fundamental difference between how ancient readers understood a creation story and how modern Western readers read it is the verb “to be.” In other words, modern readers – regardless whether they read Genesis, Greek mythology, Babylonian mythology, modern theories about Big Bang, and so on – they would always say that such accounts describe how the world *was*, that is, how the world *was* sometime in a distant past called *beginning*. If modern readers were asked why they are interested in such stories, they would say that they want to know how the world *was* when it first emerged. By contrast, if ancient readers were asked why they read the same stories, they would say that creation accounts helped them understand how the world *is* and why the world *is the way it is*. If they were asked how they understood the world to have been in the *beginning*, most likely they would not understand what we mean by a *beginning* because they would find it hard to imagine why the way the world is today must be different from some *beginning*, no matter when that beginning was, and why is it so important to know when that beginning was and how it was as long as it has no relationship to how that world is today. Therefore, they would say that Genesis and similar stories helped them understand how the world is *today*, that is, at the time when they lived no matter when and where they lived.

Because of this difference, ancient and modern readers disagree widely about when a creation story ends. Since modern readers understand creation as being a *beginning*, they conclude that a creation story ends when they isolate some details in the story that they call *beginning*, while ancient readers understood that a creation story ended when the story satisfactorily explained the world as they experienced it at the time when they lived. As a result, modern readers have a tunnel vision and they can see in creation stories only a point that they call *beginning* and nothing else. Moreover, not only nothing else that follows matters, but the more disconnected is that *beginning* from everything else that followed, the more genuine that *beginning* is and the more accurately it has been isolated. By contrast, because ancient readers were interested in the end of the process and not the beginning, they would conclude that a creation story ends when they noticed that the world as described in the story matched the world as they knew at the time when they lived, and they concluded that the creation story

ended when they could verify that whatever they knew about the world had been adequately explained by the story.

This contrast between ancient and modern readers in reading creation stories because of differences in their mindset can be seen regardless whether those stories are religious or so called *scientific*. Because in the minds of modern Western readers there is a chasm between the beginning of the world and the way the world is today, they not only read ancient stories that way, but the bigger the chasm between the beginning and the world, the more *scientific* it is. Probably no theory illustrates this better than the so-called Big Bang. As the name implies, the universe started with a big explosion and everything happened very fast. Although the universe came into being within a few short minutes, the actual beginning took place during the first

1/10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000

of a second when no one can tell what happened. All scientists can tell is that everything was infinitely compressed and infinitely hot and how that was possible they call a *singularity*, which is a fancy way of saying don't ask, don't tell. Another important moment during the first second occurred after

1/100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000

of that second when the universe was ionized plasma. When the universe *aged* to 1/100 second, protons and electrons started to combine with other particles. When the universe celebrated its first second anniversary – or rather, its first *second*versary – things are starting to get boring because the temperature drops to mere one billion degrees and ordinary matter begins to form. When the universe celebrated its third *minute*versary the *beginning* was over, the universe was so old that the decaying process started, decay that culminated with some strange combinations of particles called humans that are so destructive that eventually will obliterate first the earth, then the universe that was created during those three minutes that we call *beginning*. What that *beginning* has to do with some creatures that kill each other on a little blob of dirt that moves around a star in the Milky Way is just the most stupid question an idiot can ask. Beginnings are just that, *beginnings*, and they are beginnings precisely because they have no relationship to what happened long after.

This pattern can be seen even in the way modern scholars read ancient creation stories such as Genesis. The *beginning* must be the first chapter because that is where the whole thing started and even humans are mentioned – and if mentioned, they must have been created already – and if in the next chapter we find a description of how humans were created, scholars conclude that this must be another creation story and therefore another *beginning*, and since there cannot be two *beginnings*, there must be two different stories about the same beginning which proves how stupid ancient people were to be told two completely different stories about the same thing without realizing the

stupidity. And if we read that God next placed humans in a garden and forbade them to eat from a tree of knowledge, modern readers would understand that these are just weird stories about beginnings that have nothing to do with helping us understand anything about the world in which we live, and if we read them, it is only because we like *entertainment*, that is, stories that take us from the real world and place us in some imaginary reality like this fantastic garden.

For ancient readers, however, stories were not primarily entertainment but main sources of learning and understanding and therefore they judged stories like Genesis primarily from the point of view of whether they could verify that what the story taught them matched the world as they experienced it. In other words, stories like Genesis were exactly the opposite of *entertainment*, that is, they brought readers *in touch* with the real world. If Genesis claimed to explain how the world came into being, by the *world* they did not mean some beginning in some distant past that had no relationship with the world in which they lived, but by *world* they meant the world in which they lived and against which they could check to see whether what Genesis said was true and they could verify by experience. Therefore, when they read the first chapter about how God created the plants, the animals, the atmosphere, and so on, they looked at all those things around them to see whether they were as they had been described in the story, and when they observed that the things described in the story were exactly the way those things were in the world at the time when they lived, they concluded that the story was *true* not only in some distant past called *beginning*, but at any time no matter when one lived, even in some distant future. When, however, ancient readers could see in the world things which they could not find described in the first chapter such as houses, tools, cultivation of fields, cities, and so on, they could not take the first chapter as a *creation story* because that chapter clearly did not describe the world as they knew it and kept reading because they knew that a creation story must be longer. Then in the next chapter they read about the creation of humans, why they were created as pairs, then they looked around and saw men and women living together as husband and wife and they concluded that that must be part of the same story because they could see that that part of the story was also part of the world as they experienced *today*, but at the same time they noticed that humans did not live in a garden eating from trees and concluded that even the first two chapters could not be an explanation of how the world was created because they did not see humans living in gardens and eating from trees *today*, therefore they concluded that more explanations were necessary therefore the story must be longer, and kept reading. And after they read how Adam and Eve ate from the tree of knowledge, how they developed shame, how they started to multiply and cultivate fields, how they made covers for their bodies, and so on, they understood that that must be still part of the creation story because those were also things that they could observe in the world all around them and concluded that that

part of the story was also true and an adequate explanation of their world *today*. Then they read about how Cain killed his brother Abel, how he built a city, and how one of his descendants, Lamech, boasted: “I have killed a man for wounding me, a young man for striking me. If Cain is avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy sevenfold” (Gen 4:23-24). Killing for no reason, then killing for wounding, then killing for killing, and more killing to kill the killers. Eventually everyone is obsessed with killing until ends up being killed. At this point, an ancient reader would have said: “Welcome to reality.” It was only now that an ancient reader would have concluded that the description of the creation of the world ends because it was only at this point that ancient readers would have noticed that an accurate description of the world as they knew it had been provided.

That the end of chapter four concludes the creation story is indicated by the author of Genesis through what scholars have called *chiastic structure* – a literary device that ties the end of a story to its beginning: “This is the list of the descendants of Adam. When God created humankind, he made them in the likeness of God. Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them ‘Humankind’ when they were created” (Gen 5:1–2). The phrase “male and female” clearly points back to Genesis 1:26–27 when the creation of humans had been planned in the image of God and the beginning of chapter five recognizes that humans were now exactly as God had planned them, that is, in his image, that is, endowed with the ability to distinguish between good and evil. This statement that humans were in the “likeness of God” after they ate from the tree of knowledge and were driven out of the garden of Eden is further proof that eating from the tree was no *fall*, otherwise God could not have declared that *fallen* human beings were in his image. Just as after each act of creation in the first chapter God looks back at what had been created and concluded that it was as he had planned it, that is, very good, so also at the end of the fourth chapter God looks back at the creation of humans and concludes that they are as he had planned them in the first chapter, that is, in his own image. There is one difference, though: although after the creation of Adam God did say that it was not good for men to be without wives, at the end of chapter four God does acknowledge that humans are now in the image of God endowed with the knowledge to create and distinguish between good and evil, but the formula “and they were very good” is missing. We know now why. Since the things that belong to the natural world can only be the way they had been created and they were created “very good,” they can only be “very good” no matter when one evaluates them: past, present, or future. Although at the end of chapter four Genesis declares that God “made” humans in his own image, that was true just as it was true that God drove humans out of the garden of Eden – that is, what happened had been anticipated by God and God expected. Just as God did not need to drive humans out of the garden of Eden because the serpent could do a much better job since

it could not tolerate humans who developed knowledge, so also God could not impose creativity and knowledge – that is, his image – upon humans because humans had to choose that image and be willing to pay the price. Therefore, that God *made* humans in his image was true in the sense that God created only humans with that possibility and no any other animal, but at the same time, humans *made themselves* in the image of God because they became what God had intended only after they chose to use their rationality and rise above animals. Just as God could not choose for humans to have knowledge about good and evil, so also God could not choose for them to do only good and reject evil, and therefore God could not qualify humans to be *very good* just because they were created as he did with the natural world. Whether humans are *very good* or *very evil* depends on how they choose to use their creativity and their knowledge. And what chapter five explains is precisely how both *good* people and *evil* people developed in the world in which readers live, no matter when they live. We already saw how with Cain a reasoned reality of power and evil developed. Fortunately, Cain was not the only descendant of Adam after Abel was killed, because Genesis continues:

When Adam had lived one hundred thirty years, he became the father of a son in his likeness, according to his image, and named him Seth. The days of Adam after he became the father of Seth were eight hundred years; and he had other sons and daughters. Thus all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred thirty years; and he died (Gen 5:3–5).

And at this point I can see that scholars start to roll their eyes about what an idiot this writer must be who could not even count years and realize that in ancient times it was extremely rare for someone to reach sixty or even eighty years let alone almost a thousand which is unthinkable even by modern standards. Well, again, it is this huge stupidity of the one who wrote Genesis that makes me suspicious that when we see so much stupidity in those who wrote the Bible it might be because our own stupidity prevents us to see how smart they were. What is their supposed inability to count years may have nothing to do with arithmetic but rather with the fact that they had a different understanding of what time was and they used counting to help intelligent people understand how they viewed time.

And at this point I expect again scholars to roll their eyes so confident that ancient people could not have understood what time was since such a notion was only understood by the Geeks as a result of their superior thinking that laid the foundation for *scientific* thinking which scholars inherited and of which they are so proud today. Scholars believe that ancient people, due to their confused minds, could not have understood what only the Greeks could understand thanks to their philosophers that time is something that flows continuously from past to present into the future so that all events can be organized by placing them on a timeline based on the sequence in which they occurred so that all events make what we call history. Had those who wrote

Genesis been able to keep track of events, they would have realized that humans rarely, if ever, reached one hundred years, let alone anything close to one thousand. Poor idiots, what can anyone expect from people with such *mythical* and confused minds?

That the author of Genesis was an idiot I do not know but that this linear understanding of time as something that flows continuously from past to future is idiotic or *paradoxical* was understood by the Church father Augustine who was among the prominent Christian writers and theologians who became intoxicated with the Greek thinking and philosophy and helped detour Christianity from its biblical base to Greek philosophy. What Augustine realized was that, based on Greek thinking, time cannot exist. His reasoning is quite simple so that even an idiot can understand. He says that since according to Greek thinking only things that exist are real, time cannot be real and therefore cannot exist. He noticed that if we imagine time to flow from past to present into the future, the only moment when time exists and is real is only in the present, but time cannot exist in the present because the present is only a moment and by the time the present has arrived, it has already disappeared into the past and that is true no matter how short we imagine that present moment to be. Therefore, time cannot exist in the present. On the other hand, time cannot exist in the past either because whatever is in the past, no longer exists. Similarly, time cannot exist in the future because something that exists in the future has never occurred yet and something that has never occurred cannot be real and cannot exist either. Consequently, if time cannot exist in the present, cannot exist in the past, and cannot exist in the future, then time cannot exist at all. And if time cannot exist, then history cannot exist because whatever one builds on an understanding of time that is a paradox is just fantasy. Moreover, if this *scientific* understanding of time goes out of the window, then out of the window goes the supposed scientific history that is based on that understanding of time and of which modern scholars are so proud.

At this point scholars may grant that Augustine may be right and linear time may be problematic for history, but the Greek understanding of linear time – which they have inherited – is still a revolution in thinking because it enabled the development of what we call *sciences* as a result of understanding the cause-and-effect relationship. We may not be able to prove that time is real but at least this linear time helps us establish the succession of events so that we can tell which event occurred first and which event followed later and that enables us to discover causal relationships and establish laws because we know that a cause always precedes its effect(s). If I jump from a building and moments later I crush to the ground, since jumping from the building preceded the crushing, I can make the connection that there is a relationship between the jumping and the crushing in the sense that jumping was the cause of the crushing so that I can formulate a law that anytime there is a jumping from something, there must be a

crushing that follows. It was because biblical writers could not grasp this linear understanding of time that prevented them from understanding causal relationships, formulating laws, and developing what we call *scientific* thinking. Instead, they had what scholars call *mythical* thinking, which is a nice way of saying that they were really stupid and could not see even the most obvious causal relationships in the world, such as, if the light was created on the first day and the sun on the fourth, the sun was the cause of the light and the cause had to be created first and not days after its effects. Poor idiots!

Just as the fact that the reality of a linear time is an illusion was proved by a devotee of the Greek philosophy like Augustine, so also the illusion of causal relationships based on the notion of linear time was exposed by ... surprise, surprise ... another philosopher, David Hume. He started from the very commonsense observation that just because one event follows after another does not necessarily mean that there is a causal relationship between them in the sense that the one that occurred first is the cause of the one that followed. Just because a black cat crossed the path of someone immediately before had a heart attack, it does not mean that the black cat was the cause of the heart attack. We may drop a stone and the next moment may notice that the stone falls to the ground and we may think that the dropping of the stone was the cause of its fall and may even postulate that there must be a law of nature that causes something to fall independent of what we think so that we can always tell what a stone would do when it is dropped. Hume argues that such causal relationships and laws are the result of experience, that is, of the fact that we have observed some events often enough and that enables us to make such connections, and they are not necessarily decided by the time sequence or by some objective causal connections. Hume argues that if someone who had never had any experience – such as Adam immediately after he was created – were asked what would be the outcome of an event or cause, would have no idea what to say. For instance, if someone who had never seen any stone fall were asked what would happen if the stone were left to fall, would have no idea whether the stone would go down, would go up, would start spinning, or would simply remain in place motionless hanging in the air. We may think that there must be a law that governs the movement of the sun so that when the sun sets in the west, it will necessarily rise the next morning in the east, but that connection is the result of the fact that we have experienced so many times this succession of events that we can predict with maximum confidence what is going to happen. If someone had to see the sun for the first time and were asked after the sun sets in the west what might happen next, would have no idea whether that globe of light has disappeared forever, whether it might rise again in the same place where it went down after several minutes, or whether it would rise again in the opposite direction after several hours, and so on. Indeed, if an aboriginal from a tropical forest who had never been at the north pole watched the sun set the last time before the

polar winter starts were told that the sun would not be seen again for several months would find it quite unbelievable. If our minds can discover causal relationships and make inferences from cause to effects, the mind does not base those reasonings on the time relationship between cause and effects but on *experience*.

If Hume is right, however, that all our reasoning by which we discover all kinds of causal relationships and formulate all kinds of laws is based on experience and not on the supposed relationship in time as the result of the fact that the mind places the two events one next to the other on the timeline inherited from the Greek thinking, then our reasoning which we call *scientific thinking* has nothing to do with the Greek concept of time but rather with *experience* which has been available to all human beings regardless of their way of thinking or the culture in which they lived. If a scientist in the 21st century A.D. has to discover by observation and experience that if the sun sets in the west the next morning will rise in the east and when a stone is dropped it will fall and that these are some kind of laws that enable us to predict what will happen next, then there is nothing that would have prevented someone who lived in the stone age to have the same experiences, to make the same observations, and to draw the same inferences as the most *scientific* mind would do. Indeed, one could argue that someone from the stone age would have had an understanding of stones and their behaviors better than a modern scientist does.

Although Hume is no doubt right that our reasoning about causal relationships is not based on the time sequence of events but rather on experience, he clearly did not realize that experience itself is not totally unrelated to time, although it has nothing to do with the concept of linear time that we inherited from the Greek thinking. And I expect the readers to roll their eyes in ridicule that there might be a different kind of time than the linear one just as they did when I said that there might be a different kind of reality besides the objective reality that we inherited from the same great Greek thinking when I introduced the concept of reasoned reality. The different kind of time than the linear time is the *circular* time. And after the readers have a good laugh about how ridiculous this idea is that instead of a *line* time might be a *circle*, I invite them to look for the first time at their clock and discover that it is ... surprise, surprise ... round. Hume may have realized that causal reasoning has nothing to do with linear time but rather with experience, but what he did not realize was that experience itself is defined precisely by circular time. When he concluded that causal relationships were based on experience, what he meant by *experience* was *repeated experiences*, and that is precisely what circular time is; repetition. In other words, we discover experience not when we see events that follow one another on a timeline, but when we see repetitions of the same thing over and over again. Causal relationships and laws have to do with what is constant and permanent and that is the idea that circular time conveys, that is, that of permanence

and continuity, unlike the concept of linear time, which conveys the idea of uniqueness, accidental, and transitoryness. Therefore, according to the concept of circular time, history would not be a succession of events placed on a timeline like underwear hanged on a cloth line to dry, but events that follow rules so that their occurrence and relationships is both repeatable and predictable. And this is precisely the concept of time that Genesis uses. We noticed this with the creation of the sun and the moon. Unlike modern readers who find ridiculous the idea that the sun was not created on the first day in order to be used to count one day after the other in a linear sequence, the biblical writer placed it on the fourth day after the creation of the vegetation because its role is to regulate the circular time in the form of days and seasons, that is, the *cycles* on which the life of the vegetation is based and ensures its continuity and permanence. Before there was any life form to perpetuate itself through cycles, there was no need for a sun or a moon to regulate those cycles and there was no reason for God to create the sun and the moon before the third day. While in Greek mythology time is a thread that is spun by the fates and on which they place all kinds of events as they pleased – even the birth and death of each individual – in Genesis time is a circle that recycles everything and ensures that everything repeats so that it remains the same. That Genesis uses this concept of circular time can be seen in the way in which the creation of the natural world is summarized: “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 the heavens” (Gen 2:4, emphasis mine). The word translated “generations” is the Hebrew word תולדות which usually is translated “history” and is the same word used in chapter five to describe the genealogies of humans and translated “list of descendants”: “This is *the list of the descendants* [תולדות] of Adam. When God created humankind, he made them in the likeness of God” (Gen 5:1, emphasis mine). In other words, both verses could be very well translated “this is the history of the heavens and the earth” and “this is the history of Adam/humans” or, to put it differently, “this is the natural history” and “this is the human history.” There are, therefore, two “histories,” one that ends after the first chapter and includes only the “heavens and the earth,” that is, the natural world and no humans because that was what was created in that chapter, and another history that ends after the fourth chapter and includes only humans and no part of the natural world because that is what is described after the natural world was created. But if Genesis uses the same word to describe human genealogy as well as the creation of heaven and earth, what do heaven, earth, mountains, oceans, and so on, have to do with human descendants and therefore with *genealogy*? Since *genealogy* has to do with *birth*, that humans give birth to children and then die and their children do the same is understandable, but what does *birth* have to do with the natural world such as the heavens and the earth? Although in modern understanding of genealogy the main idea is that of *birth* – that is, the *beginning of someone* – in the biblical understanding the main idea conveyed by *genealogy* is that of *continuity* and *permanence*. In other words, whether

continuity and permanence are achieved through birth or some other means such as circular movement is unimportant because *genealogy* does not mean primarily *birth/beginning* but rather *continuity* and *permanence*. Since the biblical concept of genealogy/תולדות means permanence and continuity through cycles, whether those cycles are natural or through procreation is irrelevant because both processes achieve continuity and permanence and can be described with the same word. With reference to humans, however, this idea of permanence and continuity is conveyed through the cycle of birth and death, but in other areas in which birth is not involved – such as the natural world and history – continuity and permanence and therefore, laws, are discovered by identifying *cycles* or details that occur again and again. Therefore, history as genealogy does not consist in strange and unique events such as the elopement of Helen of Sparta with Paris from Troy or the terrorist attacks on the American skyscrapers, but of events that are related so that their relatedness can be discerned through their repetition over and over again such as attacking of wealthy cities like Troy in order to plunder them or the killing of kings by their sons and their marriage to their mothers in order to seize the power. As Hume noticed, it is only after someone experiences similar events over and over again is in the position to discover causal relationships even in history and anticipate with a high degree of probability what might happen next. Therefore, it is placing events on cycles called *experiences* and not on a straight line that enables one to infer relationships between causes and their effects. If one made causal connections based on a linear time sequence, one could easily draw the naive conclusion that because Helen's elopement with Paris happened first and the Trojan War occurred later, the elopement was the *cause* of the war and the war was the *effect*, but one could make any other connections. For instance, given the choice to live an obscure life and die of old age or die young but famous, Achilles chose to die young glorified as one of the greatest heroes, therefore one can conclude that Achilles' choice to die as the greatest hero was the cause of the Trojan War because without that war, his choice could not have been fulfilled, and once he made that choice, the war could not have been avoided since the oracle could not have remained unfulfilled. Or, one could conclude that the cause of the Trojan War was the sacrifice of Iphigenia by her father Agamemnon because without that sacrifice, the Greek ships would not have been able to sail to Troy and the war would not have been possible. Or, one could conclude that the conquest of Troy was caused by the death of Patroclus because, had Patroclus not died, Achilles would not have returned to the battle and the Greeks would have been defeated. The fascination of scholars with this linear time inherited from the Greek thinking is no doubt due to the fact that it enables them to make any causal relationships between events and write any history they fancy, and whatever they write is necessarily *scientific*. At closer analysis, however, that linear time enables one to identify causes and effects and establish their relationship is the most stupid idea. It was for this reason that the biblical genius used the concept of genealogy to better convey

the idea of experience as events that follow a circular timeline and enable one to distinguish what events have in common and identify which ones are causes and which ones are effects so that history as genealogy helps one understand not only what happened and why, but also what is going to happen next and predict why. Although biblical writers did have the notion of linear time and therefore could distinguish between past from future events just like ancient Greeks and modern scholars do, they realized that from the epistemological point of view, linear time is meaningless and therefore in biblical Hebrew there is no present tense, no doubt because they understood what Augustine realized much later, that is, that a present time is just a fiction and to refer to it is meaningless.

This circular understanding of time enables the biblical writer to apply the concept of genealogy to the natural world as well as to human ancestry, but what is very strange is that Genesis claims that Adam, instead of being struck dead instantly by an angry deity as soon as he *disobeyed* the commandant as traditional interpretations claim, actually lived no less than nine hundred and thirty years. If for his disobedience God intended to *curse* Adam and inflict a sudden death, he must have been terribly confused because it seems that he cursed him with a very long life instead. So, how was it possible for Adam to live that long when we know that even in modern times, with the best medical care, rarely humans live to reach one hundred years? I know, I know, the smart eyes of our scholars start to roll again tired of these ancient people who did not have our scientific minds that can observe reality so that they could not tell when someone stopped breathing and died and kept counting years long after someone disappeared without them noticing. Idiots! That idiots can live very well today and can even get jobs and academic degrees I would not doubt but that such idiots would have been able to survive in ancient times even for relatively short periods I seriously doubt. So, to what do these long periods refer? This is where the distinction between objective reality and reasoned reality becomes important again. Since for humans there is both an objective reality and a reasoned reality and those long periods of time cannot possibly refer to how long a human body can physically stay alive, commonsense would have enabled ancient readers to understand that through these genealogies Genesis refers to reasoned reality and not to the physical life of individuals. As I explained when I introduced the concept of reasoned reality, humans do not live by innate instincts and impulses, but by rules that they adopt according to some reasons that provide consistency to human actions and behaviors. Although those actions and behaviors are real and can be objectively observed, they belong to the reasoned reality and not to objective reality because humans chose those rules based on various reasons so that humans can shape the reasoned reality in which they live in endless ways. Although all the rules that make up the reasoned reality were started out by some individual who came up with the idea such as the idea of shame in the garden of Eden, all the rules that make up the reasoned

reality are not decided by each individual in the community but rather each individual is expected to comply with the established rules and be punished when breaking them. Because individuals in a community are born and die gradually and not all at the same time, the reasoned reality adopted by the community is passed over to a younger generation as children are brought up to learn and comply with those rules as the only reasoned reality conceivable, usually justified as having been handed down and established by the deity. It is for this reason that all the rules that make up the reasoned reality in which individuals live transcend those individuals in the sense that rules existed long before the individuals were born and will continue long after their physical or objective life as individuals ends. Just as the natural world moves in circles so that its life remains the same, so also human ies move in circles from one generation to the next so that the rules of the community remain the same. The reasoned reality does not disappear with every individual just as the sun does not cease to exist with every sunset. While in nature, however, the laws that govern it are the same everywhere and at any time, the rules that make up reasoned reality by which humans live are different from one community to another. Since the laws of nature are the same, the concept of genealogy is not so important to understand nature but is extremely important to understand human societies because only by placing a community within genealogies the life of that community can be understood. The reason the Bible places individuals within genealogies is not to present the physical connections between individuals and biographical trivia, but in order to describe the system of beliefs and ideas which those individuals inherited and by which they lived. In other words, genealogies were not used to provide anecdotic information about individuals – who *begat* whom – but to describe the kind of life that those individuals lived. Although for modern people bits of information such as that someone was born from some parents and that gave birth to some children seems the most meaningless pieces of information one can think of, for ancient people such information was the most important description of someone because the genealogy described the reasoned reality by which that individual lived and one knew how to relate to that individual whom had never met before just as someone would know what language to use when talking to a German even if he had never met that person before. By contrast, because modern people lack the concept of reasoned reality, they are handicapped intellectually due to the fact that they are indoctrinated that whatever they say and do is the result of their complete free choice without realizing that this belief is simply ridiculous and no human society would be possible to exist with such individuals. Ancient people, however, knew that whatever skills, knowledge, beliefs, practices, customs, etc., individuals had, they inherited almost entirely from their parents and would pass them over to their descendants virtually unaltered. In other words, although the objective life of individuals was relatively short – and in ancient times for men to reach forty years was a long life – the reasoned reality by which individuals lived spanned way before they were born and

continued long after they died. Because children inherited from their parents the reasoned reality and it was the most important asset that they had, they indicated this by including the name of the father as part of their name using various patterns. The most common in the Bible was to add the word *ben* – which means “son” – to the name of the father so that “ben x” simply meant “the son of x.”¹ Another pattern used was “avi x” which means “my father is/was x,” and in Arabic has become “abu x,” that is, “my father is/was x.” In the Greek language, names such as Antipater simply mean “in place/stead of the father,” that is, “the one who took the place of the father.” That descendants were identified by the reference to their ancestors can be discerned even in modern family names such as Johnson, Davidson, Smithson, and so on, which simply mean “the son of John,” “the son of David,” “the son of the smith.” As the last example shows, descendants did not inherit from the parents just a word, but everything they knew and even the skills and the knowledge that previous ancestors had developed and perfected. A son of a farmer, or of a potter, or of a smith, or of a doctor, was not only expected to be a farmer, a potter, a smith, or a doctor, but was expected to master the crafts at the same level of expertise as those from whom they inherited their craft. Because the contribution of individuals to the reasoned reality of the community extended way beyond the life span of each individual craftsman, the community did not have to worry that it was deprived of those services after the parents died as long as their children carried on a similar life and activity so that the reasoned reality of the community was not disrupted in the slightest degree by the death of the old generation.

We noticed, however, that Genesis distinguished between two kinds of reasoned reality: one based on knowledge that promotes good and rejects evil, and one based on power, and uses genealogies to describe both kinds because both knowledge and power are passed on from one generation to the next within a genealogy. The way in which knowledge and power are transmitted and perpetuated through genealogy, however, is quite different. Let us suppose that a human community is at the level of using sticks to soften the ground to plant seeds to cultivate a field and someone develops the knowledge to make a wooden plow pulled by animals for the same purpose but with much less effort and much better results. No one would have to take the decision in that community that plows must be used and that there should be carpenters who know how to make plows for the whole community so that no one uses sticks anymore. Commonsense would be enough to help people decide to use wooden plows instead of sticks to cultivate fields. Now let us suppose that someone develops the knowledge to

¹ In the Arabic languages – which are part of the Semitic family of languages although due to political reasons they cannot be considered Semites although they have the same father as the only Semites that exist today and anti-Semitic laws cannot apply to them – the word “ben” has become “bin” so that Bin Laden simply means “The Son of Laden,” whoever that Laden was when he lived, probably hundreds of years ago.

make bronze and replace the wooden blade of the plow with one made of bronze. Again, no one would have to decide that there should be carpenters to make the plow and smiths to make the bronze blades so that no one would use wooden plows anymore because commonsense would enable the whole community to come to that common understanding. Moreover, who can make plows and bronze blades does not need to be decided by someone because everyone who uses those products can decide who is a better craftsman and who is not so that those who manufacture lousy products go out of business. When it comes to power, however – that is, who should have the authority to regulate and control the whole community – things are no longer so simple and the commonsense of everyone no longer plays any role. Power is something that everyone can use – even the most stupid – and how the one who has the power is using it is not for everyone to judge, indeed, power is craved so much particularly by worthless individuals precisely because it places them above the criticism of everyone else. Now, let us suppose that someone comes up with the idea that cultivating fields involves a lot of hard work and it would be much better if someone had the power to decide that the bronze could be much better used to make swords, that the males who are most physically fit should not use their energy in learning how to use plows and cultivate fields but rather in how to use swords to crack open human skulls and rip open their bellies, and after the neighboring communities harvest their fields, attack them with a gang of bandits called *national heroes* to massacre the poor farmers and bring home all their produce without cultivating one square inch of land. This would be a true garden of Eden where no one would need to work and produce anything because everything would be brought in by the sword and defended by the sword from *foreigners* who might want to come in because are interested in free lunches to which only the *citizens* are entitled. Although the great majority in that community would find the idea exciting, the decision that the smith should no longer make plow blades but rather sword blades and who should be the brutes revered as heroes who actually go and crush skulls and rip open bellies, who should order and direct the fight while watching it from a safe distance, who should appropriate all the plunder, what to keep and how each brute or hero should be rewarded with based on how good had been at cracking skulls and ripping open bellies, cannot be left to everyone to decide because there would be too many candidates. If there were a need for more plows, more people would decide to learn the craft and supply the need and if there were too many craftsmen, the poor ones would stop their craft because no one needs their products so that the community can self-regulate itself without any need for someone to decide who should do what. If human communities can coordinate their activities without a boss in order to produce their own food or whatever else they need, crushing human skulls and ripping open human bellies involves a level of coordination that cannot be achieved without a boss. And the boss does not need to have any special knowledge or skill, not even that of how to make swords or how to crush skulls, indeed, does not need to be

even male because females can be just as good. Strange as it may sound, if in the reasoned reality based on knowledge not everyone can replace a farmer, or a potter, or a smith, in the reasoned reality of power anyone can replace the boss because anyone can tell others to kill and anyone can use the spoil to organize more killing and get even more spoil. Since reasoned reality needs to achieve permanence in order to be reality, the reasoned reality of power cannot be left to the commonsense of the whole community to decide who should take all the decisions for everyone and be boss, therefore, once assuming the power, whoever becomes boss must take all the precautions that no one replaces him and therefore would use some of the best brutes not to kill just the poor farmers from other communities, but to kill those from his own community who are suspected of craving power themselves. And as long as the position of the boss is secure, the whole life of the community is stable in the sense that individuals do not need to worry as long as the boss and the brutes would supply them with anything they need so that all they have to do is to consume and find ways in which they can spend enjoyably their plenty of leisure time. While in the reasoned reality of knowledge the whole community depends on those who are skilled, in the reasoned reality of power the whole community depends on the one who has the power and on the gang of brutes of whom is surrounded and are expected to supply the garden of Eden with all the goodies by taking them from others since goodies do not grow on trees like fruit. Unlike the reasoned reality based on knowledge, the reasoned reality based on power can never achieve the same level of stability because its continuity depends on the physical presence of the boss so that, when the boss dies either of old age or is killed, because the power structure is built on one individual, the whole power structure collapses and the whole community ends up in chaos. While knowledge is passed from one generation to the next smoothly and gradually as the old generation retires and the new generation takes over, the transmission of power is experienced as a major disruption with any sudden replacement of the boss, often with different factions vying for power and proving their right to seize the power by crushing as many skulls and ripping open as many bellies as possible, this time not from other communities, but from their own.

Because of this inherent risk and weakness in how the reasoned reality of power is perpetuated, some rules have been adopted for how power is transferred in order to achieve continuity and permanence, and the most important one is that power must remain within the family of the one who has the power. In other words, power is based on genealogy, which in this case is called dynasty. Just as the reasoned reality of knowledge perpetuates itself by passing naturally from parents to children, it was decided that the power should also be passed from father to son, although no special knowledge or skills are need to be actually transmitted since the use of power does not require any. By adopting this rule, rulers have drastically limited the access to power of

the other members of the community and increased their own security as a ruler. Just as in a genealogy the life and the knowledge are transmitted over many generations and far surpass the physical life of individuals, so also the power in a dynasty is transmitted over many generations and exceeds by far the lives of individual rulers within the dynasty. Because the qualification to hold and use power does not involve any knowledge or skill, in order to justify why only those who belonged to a dynasty qualify to hold power, the concept of *blood* or *royal blood* was developed. Since the qualification to use power cannot be proved like the skill of a craftsman, it was claimed that the blood of the ruler was different from the blood of ordinary individuals and only those who *inherited* that blood within the genealogy were qualified to use the power. Although a ruler could be replaced only by a descendant, it was further decided that the ruler could be replaced only at his death so that power was guaranteed to the ruler for the whole life because the security of the community was dependent on the security of the ruler. This security, however, could not exceed the physical life of the ruler.

Although the concept of dynasty significantly improved the stability of the reasoned reality based on power guaranteeing it for the whole life of the ruler, it did not eliminate the risk of disruptions and upheavals when the power was eventually transferred from one ruler to its descendants at death. One of the problems was that a ruler could have more than one descendant and since it could not be claimed that only one of them received the special blood to rule and the others did not, further rules were developed. The most important was that it was the oldest sibling who was qualified to take the place of the father. This rule was intended to remove the risk of fighting between different siblings to seize the throne and the oldest child was expected to establish his authority over younger siblings without being challenged. It was for the same reason that it was decided that a male descendant should have precedence over a female because males are better at fighting than females. Things could get complicated, however, when the ruler did not have any children and an heir had to be selected from among the closest relatives who could include individuals from either his side or the side of his wife or wives. In order to eliminate infighting, further rules for the order of succession were developed so that all the relatives and descendants were placed in a hierarchy based on closeness of the relationship to the ruler. In order to keep the circle of potential candidates to power as strictly limited to a small circle of the family, while for ordinary people marriages among close relatives were regularly prohibited, for those in power the rule was changed so that they could marry even their closest relatives, such as their sisters and even their mothers. Because of the high inbreeding that was so common in dynasties, often children of rulers were born with major deformities some of which involved the heart condition that caused poor oxygenation of the blood which made the blood look darker in color rather than bright red, condition

that was used to provide support for the idea that royal blood was *blue* and therefore special, as the veins with poorly oxygenated blood looked darker.

In spite of carefully designed rules for succession, the fascination of power motivated not just the legitimate heirs to the throne to kill the ruler who seemed to outlive the patience of the descendants, but also outsiders who, after seizing the power, would kill all the line of the descendants and establish a new dynasty. Because of this risk, even the closest officers of the rulers were selected from among the closest relatives. Consequently, power was substantially confined within the family of the ruler.

To reinforce the security of the ruler further, the concept was developed that not only the power, but the ruler himself was of divine origin. Since deities were beyond the reach of ordinary people, the association of rulers with deities was a powerful way of making sure that the ruler enjoyed the power unchallenged as any challenge of the ruler implied a challenge of the deity, which was considered one of the greatest crimes in all communities. While the special blood was inherited by rulers in a dynasty through natural birth, the divine relationship of the ruler with the deity was established through religion, which has been in all societies one of the most powerful instruments to ensure the security of the ruler. This was accomplished in several ways. In probably the oldest forms, the ruler was at the same time the priest so that his relationship with the deity was proclaimed as part of performing religious duties. The coronation of the ruler was actually called the coronation of the deity and the coronation of the deity was repeated annually through the coronation of the ruler to reinforce in the mind of the people the identification of the ruler with the deity. But even when the ruler himself was not a priest so that someone else had to perform the religious duties in order to spare the ruler of such chores, the position of priest became also a position of power that reinforced the power of the ruler, therefore the position of the priest had to be provided with the same safeguards as that of the ruler so that the two sources of power would always work together and reinforce each other rather than undermine each other. Just as the concept of political power was safeguarded by the concept of dynasty with dynastic rules of succession, so also the religious office was safeguarded through the concept of dynasty in which the rules of succession were almost identical: the religious office was guaranteed for life and could only be inherited by the oldest son. Just as dynasties were established by an original ruler, so also priestly lineages were established by an original religious leader like Moses, Mohamed, Buddha, Billy Graham, and so on, and all the subsequent religious leaders had to provide proof of their descent from that leader. Moreover, the replacement of the high priest had to be done just as the replacement of a ruler, that is, at his death. Because it is the religion that establishes all the rules and laws of the society as instituted by the deity and anoints the ruler as the only legitimate holder of power, the religious leader becomes the main

upholder of the reasoned reality based on power and that is the reason the office of the religious leaders was provided with the same safeguards as that of the ruler itself. In other words, in order for the reasoned reality to be stable and unchangeable, the office of the religious leader who is the key figure in teaching, upholding, and enforcing the rules of the reasoned reality, must be secure and free of any threats. For this reason, the concept of ordination was developed. Although ordination presupposes some basic training and instruction in performing the religious duties, since anyone can perform those duties just as anyone can use political power, no special talents or abilities are required to be a religious leader. While the religious training for performing religious duties is relatively short, the ordination period is much longer during which the loyalty and the compliance of the candidate for ordination with the guidance and directives received from a superior are closely monitored. For a religious leader, even the slightest signs of initiative, creativity, originality, personal opinion, asking questions, or thinking aloud are major clues of a potential troublemaker, and the process of ordination is extended until the *character* of the candidate for ordination has been carefully scrutinized and nothing unusual has been detected. The reason the character of the candidate for ordination is carefully scrutinized before ordination is because after ordination the priest is guaranteed the position as a priest, taking into account that ordination cannot be revoked just as the coronation of the ruler is not revocable. The difference is that the priest is always subordinated to the ruler and never vice-versa. As the name makes clear, the *ordination* of a religious leader is a public recognition that the religious leader is just that, *ordinary*, that is, an ordinary, regular, or standard individual who would uphold the established reasoned reality through the religious instruction without deviating from it in any way. In other words, during the ordination process, not the knowledge and the skills in performing duties is evaluated, but the extent to which the individual can be trusted and be accepted as part of the system to uphold the power structure. While through the ordination, the examination of the individual is carefully and extensively done before is allowed as part of the system, ordination guarantees that once in the system, always in the system, so that the primary vested interested of the religious leader is to uphold the system by which is upheld at its turn. Therefore, for a religious leader, the main achievement of the career is achieving *ordination*. While in other human activities such as pottery, making just ordinary pots guarantee failure because sooner or later other potters introduce some innovation that makes their pots stand out either in quality or functionality and eventually the ordinary pots no one wants to buy anymore so that an ordinary potter would worry all the time that a better craftsman could drive him out of business, for ordained religious leaders, it is precisely the ability to adhere to whatever had been learned and rehearsed during the ordination process that guarantees not only a job for life with a substantial income and security, but the key to advancing in the hierarchy so that the more the career of a religious leader is free of any suspicions of originality, initiative, creativity, and

controversy, the more likely is to be promoted up to the highest level in the religious hierarchy.

At this point, I suspect that modern readers start to deride me for not being aware that what was true about ancient societies is no longer true about modern western democracies in which power is no longer restricted to families and is no longer inherited along family lines such as dynasties. Not only power is no longer the monopoly of one individual for life, but is split among several centers of power with individuals holding office only for a limited time so that government officials no longer use the power for themselves but rather to serve those over whom they exercise their power and for this reason they are called public *servants*. While there may be even today societies like North Korea where the power of the deceased ruler is passed down to a descendant within the dynasty, it is claimed that the concept of dynasty would be unthinkable in countries which are champions of democracy like the United States of America. Although it may be true that even some western countries like the Great Britain may still have monarchy, it is claimed that the monarch has really no power because the power is used by democratically elected leaders. If I were not such a political illiterate I would know that in a model democracy like the American one, the power is split between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches, and that those who fill the offices of different branches are elected from among candidates of different parties who have to persuade the people about what they intend to do when they are in office, and even the office with the greatest power – that is, that of the president – is limited by constitution to maximum two terms in office if the incumbent president manages to get reelected after the first four years. As far as religion is concerned, however, it is completely separated from the government so that it has no say in politics just as the government has absolutely no influence over what religious institutions teach. Therefore, these western societies are really *open* so that everyone has access to power and whoever has power can only use it to implement only what people who elect them decide and want.

Although this may be a popular creed in western countries, it only obscures the fact that dynastic power remains the best guarantee for the stability of the society even in the so-called *open* western societies. This is the reason monarchy is not abolished in countries like Great Britain, Sweden, Denmark, Canada, Australia, and so on, although monarchies are extremely expensive and have become favorite topics for tabloids while power is publicly exercised by elected individuals. Nevertheless, even in countries that have rejected monarchy like the United States of America, dynastic succession is still the best guarantee that some charismatic leader does not emerge and radically upsets the well-established society, particularly of the well-to-do. Being a descendant of a Kennedy, or of a Bush, or of a Clinton, and so on, would automatically guarantee

election to any position of power within the government in the United States of America. Probably no American will ever be able to indicate one single skill or qualification that a Kennedy has, but most Americans would never question that a Kennedy would be a top-notch politician just by being born a Kennedy. Being the wife of the president, it was just a formality for Hillary Clinton to be elected as senator, and when she was promoted as Secretary of State and her position as a senator had to be filled by someone else, the person considered was ... surprise, surprise ... a descendant of Kennedy who not only did not have any qualifications, but was not even able to speak as an educated person:

Ms Kennedy, 51, was widely criticised for her appearance in a series of interviews, in which she came across as unknowledgeable on key policy areas, unable to articulate why she was seeking public office for the first time – and even for possessing a verbal tic. In one 30-minute interview she used the phrase “you know” more than 200 times. Critics also questioned whether Ms Kennedy, who had not voted in a number of recent elections, was being given the seat simply because of her family connections.²

And when the same Americans had to choose between Al Gore – who had proved his political acumen for eight years as a vice-president without committing any gaffe – and the descendant of the former president George W. Bush, the Americans had no difficulty to choose the son of the former president although he could hardly open the mouth without making a gaffe that came to be known as “bushisms” that eventually made up a book. Although the United States of America may be a big country with everyone having the *right* to enjoy power, there is still no better guarantee that things in the society remain the same when power changes hands in democracies than when the power is handed down within families and confined within dynasties.

Although admittedly in western societies power is not so strictly restricted to a limited number of people within a family as in ancient times, there are other ways in which the society tries to groom the descendants of politicians to develop relationships similar to those within a family – even when they do not biologically come from the same family – to guarantee that they preserve the society just as their parents had done. One of them is special schools in which the children of rulers are placed in order to develop ties that would enable them to cooperate in sharing the power. Although such schools are rarely called *political* schools, admittance is not based on any knowledge or qualifications but rather simply on parental relationships. People may see the political candidates as bitter rivals but what most people do not realize is that political candidates who pretend to be bitter rivals when competing for power had been school fellows in their youth at the

² “Caroline Kennedy Withdraws Name,” (BBC: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/7843951.stm>, accessed January 25, 2012). Although she failed to be appointed as senator, a year later she was appointed ambassador to Japan.

same schools even if they were affiliated with different political parties with supposedly different ideologies. For instance, in the presidential election of 2004 Americans had to choose between the Republican candidate who was the incumbent president George W. Bush and the Democrat challenger who was John Kerry. Although Americans may have thought that the two were bitter enemies and fought passionately for important and different ideologies so that a lot was at stake and a lot of money was spent to stage the election, a look into the background of the two contenders would have revealed that they had been schoolfellows at the same university, Yale, and even received similar grades; mostly D's. According to the American letter grading system, the highest grade is A followed by B, C, and the lowest passing grade D, with F as failing grade. This is how John Kerry explained to his parents the meaning of his barely passing grades: "I always told my dad that D stood for distinction."³ How much education his father had is not difficult to guess since he did not even know the grading system used in schools. Just as in the United States of America, in England and France the descendants of powerful people go to special schools such as Eaton where future leaders are groomed. For instance, the current French president, Nicolas Sarkozy, not only attended such a political school in France, but was such a mediocre student that failed to graduate at different levels. Descendants of powerful people not only can get in the supposedly highest schools regardless of how poor students they might be, but are automatically voted by the population into the highest offices without anyone questioning their qualifications even if the poverty of their intellectual abilities is plain for anyone to see. That political leaders are groomed since young in special schools where they forge relationships and solidarity in order to use the power seems to be true for Great Britain as well as other western countries.⁴

Besides schools, other social events are used for the children of politicians to develop close relationships in order to use the power when they take it over from their parents. As it has been widely reported, the Norwegian Anders Behring Breivik killed 77 people and injured 151 at a summer camp, most of them youth. Although he has been declared insane, an important detail about the killing proves that he was not just a smart planner, but a quite clear thinker as well.⁵ Although it is believed that he attacked that group of people by chance just because he was obsessed with killing, that camp was carefully chosen because it belonged to the political party in power and the youth who were present there were the children of the politicians of the party in power. As he made

³ "Kerry Grades Near Bush's While at Yale," (The Associated Press: <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/06/08/politics/08kerry.html>, June 8, 2005, accessed January 25, 2012).

⁴ "Does a Narrow Social Elite Run the Country?" (BBC: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-12282505>), accessed January 25, 2012.

⁵ Later, however, similar experts declared him sane, which calls into question this very *science* of psychology.

clear, the reason he decided to kill was because he sincerely believed what western governments and mass media advocate that foreigners are the sources of all evils in their societies who are destroying their countries and if elected they would purge the country of foreigners, of course, as proof that western countries are *open* as Popper claimed. Since the youth camp was intended to prepare the next generation of politicians to take over the power from their parents and continue the same game of castigating foreigners and promise to cleanse the country of them only to get the votes and do nothing about them after assuming the power, Breivik reasoned that the only way to break this cycle of hypocrisy was to kill the next generation of politicians which were the children of the current government officials gathered at a camp meeting to socialize and develop a kind of family bond necessary to share the power. Although Norway is supposed to be one of the most democratic countries in which the population elect from among citizens those who are best qualified to use the power, in reality voting is just a mockery because the candidates are selected beforehand from among those who had offered guarantees that they would preserve the power structure and the special interests, and the genealogical links to former politicians is the best guarantee. It was this fact that enabled Breivik – when he decided to kill the future politicians for destroying the future of his country by not purging the country of those without pure Viking blood like his – to figure out who would be the future politicians and where he could find them; all he had to do was to look for the children of current politicians and he did not had to hunt for them all over the country because he knew that he could find them all gathered together on a resort island as a family. This killing was shocking not only because of the number of people killed, but particularly because it involved the killing of special people who were supposed to inherit the power and therefore the whole country dubbed this killing as “the lost generation.”⁶ Although democracy and voting is used to rubberstamp those who have the power, the transfer of power is still done along family lines as in *good* old days. As far as the United States of America is concerned, although the highest office – that is, that of the president – does have a term limit to eight years on condition that the incumbent president is reelected after the first four years in office, that only obscures the fact that there is no term limit for any of the other government officials, and even those who have to be reelected periodically, there is no limit as to how many times they can be reelected. Indeed, some politicians have been in Washington their whole lives, and Ted Kennedy did not give up his position even after he was diagnosed with terminal cancer so that he died in office just as the Popes usually do. Actually, most Americans think his seat belonged to his family and as we saw earlier, a member of the family was considered for a seat in the Senate just for being a descendant of a Kennedy even if she could not speak

⁶ Kate Forbes, “Remembering Norway’s ‘Lost Generation’” (BBC: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-14350366>, accessed February 23, 2012).

intelligently. Although politicians may belong to different parties to create the illusion that power is used based on some ideologies over which the population has some control, behind the scenes the politicians know that they all belonged to the larger family of power and they represent not the interests of those who naively vote for them, but of those who control the wealth and the whole population through them.

As far as the judiciary power in the United States of America is concerned, it simply has nothing to do with any democracy because none of the nine supreme justices is ever elected so that they are all appointed, and are appointed by ... surprise, surprise ... the president. So much for the separation! And they are not just appointed, but they are appointed for life, just like the Pope, although ironically, the Pope is somehow elected and not just appointed. Consequently, the nine supreme judges who supervise the enforcement of the laws that structure the reasoned reality in the country can only be replaced when one of them dies in office so that their job is secured for life. Therefore, an American chief justice dies in office just as Ted Kennedy and the Popes have done.⁷ Since the reasoned reality that shapes the life of a country is manly coded in laws, those who ensure the continuity and the stability of the reasoned reality must be free of any worry that they might lose their position and power until they die just as in ancient societies and in religious institutions. I mentioned that the Pope, just like the high priest in the Old Testament and the supreme religious leaders in other religions, keeps his position until he dies no matter how sick he may be. A strange situation developed as a previous Pope, John Paul II, had a long life and due to best medical care, he became gradually weaker and unable to perform even his exclusive duties such as celebrating mass at special public occasions. Eventually he was not able to stand so that he had to celebrate it from the seated position. As he got weaker, he was not able even to sit on a chair and it was arranged for him to say just the words from his bed at an open window, but he had gotten so weak that he was not even able to speak. What I found surprising was that he was highly praised by the media for his *bravery* of trying to perform his duty even when he could no longer speak as long as he was still technically alive. I have never had power but I never understood what is so good about it that people not only would do anything to have it, but would not find life meaningful or bearable even a day, a week, or more to lose it by retiring. Since what powerful people do is something that anyone can do, what is the justification for them to keep doing something when they are no longer able even to function as a normal human being, let alone perform their duty? And why do people praise them so much for dying in power and not show rather pity for such individuals? If a dog that wins competitions were forced to continue to perform in competitions long after has become old, sick, and

⁷ Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia, s.v. "William Rehnquist" (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Rehnquist, accessed March 24, 2012).

barely able to move, let alone to perform, people would be outraged and would call it animal cruelty, but when humans are made to do the same, not only they do not feel any pity, but are filled with admiration. And if someone is tempted to think that the idea of appointment for life is found only in the American justice system and the Catholic church, I would remind them that even in Protestant denominations such as The United Methodist Church, the ordination and the appointment of the bishops – who are the highest religious leaders in that church – is also done for life although after a certain age they are spared of their regular responsibilities, although they continue to receive their full salary for the rest of their lives no matter how long they may live because they are ordained for life and technically they never retire.

At this point someone may object that although the political power is not as *divided* as officially claimed and it does resemble the religious system both through dynastic succession and appointment for life, the two systems are separated so that they do not reinforce each other as in primitive or totalitarian societies because politics in western civilized countries no longer need religious institutions to uphold and reinforce the ideology on which the reasoned reality is based. And I admit that this claim to a large extent is true, but the supposed separation is not quite true. While it is true that religion no longer influences politics, the opposite is not really true. Western societies have developed other institutions through which it establishes the ideology on which the reasoned reality is based, an ideology that is eventually imposed even upon religion itself, and these institutions are primarily schools and universities, mass media, and entertainment. In western countries the myth has been developed that the society does not need individuals who have a way of thinking that is uniform over the whole society and that the ideal individual is one who develops *critical* thinking so that is able to question the way in which traditionally the members of the society think as a result of traditions and primarily of religious beliefs and teaching. This ability to throw away the way in which traditionally the society thinks in order to develop ideas independent of the whole rest of the society is presented as *liberation*, something that is an ideal for each individual. While in ancient societies the ideal was to create uniform individuals who follow in their thinking the established rules so that the society can be kept under control by the power structure and eliminate all individuals who show any sign of independence in thinking and behavior that could disrupt the power structure, in modern societies it is claimed that the opposite is the case, that is, the individuals with traditional thinking and behavior – and who are the most predictable – are actually undesirable because they hold the society back while individuals with independent thinking and *critical* about traditional beliefs of the society – called *liberated* – are claimed to be the ideal because a society is ideal only when it is made up by such individuals. While in traditional societies predictability was the ideal, in modern western societies it is claimed that unpredictability through original and independent

thinking is the ideal, and this new kind of thinking and individual is created not through religious institutions which established and perpetuated the reasoned reality of the society in the traditional societies, but through new institutions that modern western societies have developed to establish the new reasoned reality: schools, mass media, and entertainment. While in traditional societies the schools were primarily religious schools in which individuals learned the rules of the reasoned reality on which the whole power structure and the life of the whole community was based, in modern western societies the claimed purpose of the schools and universities is precisely to destroy the traditional way of thinking inherited for the reasoned reality and to enable individuals to develop a way of thinking that is actually *critical* of whatever has been inherited traditionally and develop a way of thinking that is not only unrelated to any tradition, but is *independent* so that it is unrelated to other individuals who are also *liberated* and therefore *independent* thinkers. This supposed purpose of the modern schools to teach individuals to develop *critical* thinking is also described as *thinking out of the box*. According to this image, traditional societies with their power structure and rules to create uniform and controlled communities resemble a box in which all individuals are confined, but in modern western societies, individuals are not expected to have any rules about how they think, how they behave, and how they interact, and therefore they are *liberated* from the traditional box and therefore they think and live *out of the box*. This new concept of reasoned reality that is supposed to be the ideal for the modern western societies was articulated philosophically by Karl Popper under the concept of *open society*. Unlike traditional societies in which any deviation from the accepted reasoned reality is drastically punished, in these *open societies* any traditional belief and behavior is frowned upon and any new idea and behavior is claimed to be applauded no matter how strange it might be.

Whether western societies are as open as it is claimed will be discussed later but whether an *open society* is even theoretically possible neither Karl Popper nor other western thinkers seem to have considered. A *society* is by definition a group of individuals whose thinking and behavior is governed by certain pre-established rules so that their interaction is both predictable and consistent, and as long as an *open society* is by definition a society without any rules in which each individual does whatever crosses his mind, an *open society* is a contradiction of terms. Societies are defined precisely by their rules that make up the reasoned reality and different societies are distinguished precisely by some rules that are different. Let us suppose that in a community all individuals with beards wear a wrapping around their heads while in another all individuals who grow beards have their beards shaved. Even if one does not know anything about the two groups of people, would realize that they must form two different societies because this uniformity in each group cannot be attributed to chance. Therefore, a *society* of individuals who have truly *independent* thinking in the sense that

not only does not follow any rules, but is *critical* and defies any established rules not only would not make a *society*, but would not qualify even as jungle, because even the jungle is not completely free of rules and consistency in behavior. When a lion and a wildebeest meet, they know exactly what each one would do so that their interaction is not unpredictable. A jungle in which a lion that encounters a wildebeest would decide to be *critical* about all the other lions that traditionally chase wildebeests because they are slave to tradition and unable to use *independent* and *liberating* thinking so that they only run after wildebeests instead of running away from them; and a wildebeest that would decide to be *critical* about all the other wildebeests that traditionally run away from lions without realizing that they are enslaved by tradition instead of being *critical* about it and show *independent* and *liberating* thinking by not running away from lions but rather chase after the running lions, such a situation would not turn the jungle into an *open jungle* but rather into chaos. It is for this reason that the idea that modern western societies are *open* and the power is structured differently from the traditional societies is just a myth, although a modern one. And like any myth, it only obscures the reality. Therefore, in modern western societies, the name of the institutions that control the power structure has changed, but the rules by which the power is restricted to a small circle with family relations or family-like relations are the same.

One important characteristic of genealogies – weather they are about knowledge or about power – is that they supersede by far the individual lifespans and within them individuals are virtually insignificant because individuals bring virtually no changes to what had been done before or, if there are any changes, they are virtually irrelevant or insignificant. This continuity is conveyed by the listing of individuals within the dynasty, and the listing of a new name is not meant to suggest that that individual represented a change in some way, but precisely the opposite, that there was a continuity so that life went on virtually unchanged. Potential changes were marked not by an individual name within the dynasty, but rather with a new dynasty, although even new dynasties did not necessarily imply any changes in the power structure except the names of the individuals involved. It is because individuals have little influence over the way the reasoned reality – both of knowledge and power – is structured, human societies are extremely stable over long periods of time and extremely resilient to changes. Therefore, the extremely long lives mentioned about individuals within a genealogy do not refer to the physical life of each individual, but rather to the length of the reasoned reality represented by that genealogy. A human society in which life remains virtually unchanged for about one thousand years may seem exaggerated by modern sensibilities, but the life of ancient societies was extremely stable and remained virtually unchanged for centuries. Even in modern times, in spite of the influx of new ideas and dramatic revolutions, changes in societies are extremely slow. In spite of being bombarded by western propaganda, communist societies were

extremely resilient to changes so that some have survived – and even became competitive instead of collapsing – but even those that did *collapse*, that supposed collapse was more in theory because the power changed within the inner circle of the former elite and even the rules of the society have remained the same so that the supposed *capitalism* is just a label. If even in modern revolutionary societies reasoned reality seems to survive and remain virtually unchanged for hundreds of years, it must have seemed even more so in ancient times. It is for this reason that life within genealogies is counted in hundreds of years and some are close to one thousand. In other words, this extremely long life should not be understood as the actual life of the individual that gave the name to a genealogy, but rather as length of life of a family. It is for this reason that a thousand years becomes a round figure with special significance in the Bible as well as in history. This may explain a strange detail about biblical Hebrew where the word for “thousand” (אַלֶּף) means also “family/clan”: “He [Gedeon] responded, ‘But sir, how can I deliver Israel? My clan [אַלְפַי] is the weakest in Manasseh, and I am the least in my family [בְּבֵית אָבִי]” (Judg 6:15). Sometimes the word אֶלֶף is translated “thousand” although it clearly does not refer to an exact number of people but rather to larger families that make up a tribe: “But you have this day rejected your God, who saves you from all your calamities and your distresses; and you have said, ‘No! but set a king over us.’ Now therefore present yourselves before the LORD by your tribes and by your thousands [וּלְאַלְפֵיכֶם]” (1 Sam 10:19). Sometimes it is so clear that the word אֶלֶף has no numerical value but rather refers to a large group of people connected by family relationships that it is not translated as “thousand”: “And with him ten chiefs, one from each of the tribal families of Israel, every one of them the head of a family among the clans [לְאַלְפֵי] of Israel” (Josh 22:14). So, what could be the connection between the number of “one thousand” and “family”? I know, I know, those who wrote the Bible and read it were just idiots and for idiots, words and their meaning do not need to have any relationship. I grant that ancient people may have found it hard to imagine an electric or magnetic field just as it is hard for us to imagine their notions of *spirit* or *soul*, but to believe that they thought that an individual could live for a thousand years because could not count years and therefore could not tell the difference between a child and an old man and did not understand the aging process or that they could not count the members of their family and did not realize that a family could not reach hundreds of individuals, let alone thousands, is quite hard to imagine. Unlike modern mentality in which individuals are singled out and the larger picture of which that individual is part of is lost sight of just as looking at individual trees blinds one from seeing the forest, ancient people focused on the larger picture and saw individuals as virtually insignificant for the larger picture just as individual trees are insignificant for a forest. According to this analogy, the extreme long life in the Bible and the large numbers used to describe families did not refer to individuals, but rather to larger groups of people related within a family just as the life of a forest by far exceeds the life

of individual trees. Although just one name is given for the descendant of someone within a genealogy, the text makes clear that that was not the only child and there were many other sons and daughters born within that family: "Seth lived after the birth of Enosh eight hundred seven years, and had *other sons and daughters*" (Gen 5:7, emphasis mine). This repeated mentioning of "other sons and daughters" is no doubt intended to alert the readers that these genealogies have nothing to do with specific individuals, what was their actual name on the birth certificate, how long they actually lived, and how many they were. That kind of information is typical for modern ancestries which seem to be a modern concept that is becoming more and more popular, but in ancient times would not only have been considered meaningless, but even impossible because keeping accurate records of what was considered *trivia* even by modern standards was simply not possible and practical. Therefore, the life of an ancestor and the number of people that made up a family did not refer to the specific life span of an individual and to the number of people who lived together in a compound at a specific time, but to a group of people who lived over a long period of time and were identified and distinguished by some specific characteristics that shaped their life, united them, and at the same time distinguished them from other groups of people even if they looked the same, spoke the same language, and even dressed the same. This *counting* of people who made up a thousand/family/clan did not necessarily include only individuals who were alive at a certain time, but even individuals who had lived long before and long after. Unlike the Greek thinking where at death an individual is survived by an immortal entity called *soul* that continues to live in an underground area called Hades,⁸ in the biblical thought there is nothing that survives an individual after death. In spite of that, when some individual dies, a typical phrase used to describe it is "and was added to his people": "Abraham breathed his last and died in a good old age, an old man and full of years, and was *gathered [added] to his people.*" ... "This is the length of the life of Ishmael, one hundred thirty-seven years; he breathed his last and died, and was *gathered [added] to his people*" (Gen 25:8, 17, emphasis mine). People who died were still *counted* as being part of the people who had lived a similar life before they were born and continued to live a similar life after they died. They were *counted* as being part of the people although there was no entity that survived death as it was the belief in the Greek polytheism, a belief that Christians themselves inherited as the Bible was displaced by the Greek thought in Christianity.

If it is true that the genealogies and the names included in these genealogies in Genesis have nothing to do with describing specific individuals but rather aspects of the reasoned reality that shaped the life of different kinds of people that populated the

⁸ The meaning of "underground," "heaven," "ocean," etc., in mythology will be discussed in a future article.

earth, then we need to look into these genealogies not for biographic details about individuals, but rather for ideas that shaped the thinking and the life of communities or of groups of people. And what we find in Genesis is actually two genealogies, which imply that human societies have been shaped primarily by two kinds of mentalities in spite of various differences among them as far as details is concerned. One genealogy is started by Cain and concludes the fourth chapter of Genesis, while the other is started by the new child of Adam and Eve and is introduced in chapter five. Usually genealogies are regarded as just meaningless lists of names, which can only prove the legendary character of these materials. Why would a biblical writer who is so economical and careful with words suddenly becomes so wasteful that throws out all kinds of names with repetitive phrases that do not make any sense at all? Modern readers and particularly scholars can easily dismiss these materials since they assume a dumb writer, but for ancient readers such an assumption would have been ridiculous. Therefore, ancient readers would have tried to understand what clues these genealogies provided in order to understand these two categories of people that populated the earth.

One significant detail is that one genealogy was developed from Cain, the first son of Adam, and the other was developed from Seth, a son which Adam had after Abel was killed, and the mention is made that Seth was born in Adam's likeness just as Adam was created in God's likeness: "This is the list of the descendants of Adam. When God created humankind, *he made them in the likeness of God*" (Gen 5:1, emphasis mine). Let us notice that this is said *after* Adam and Eve ate from the tree of knowledge, and therefore after that supposed *fall*. That with Seth we contemplate a kind of people who are associated with God the text makes emphatically clear: "To Seth also a son was born, and he named him Enosh. At that time people began to invoke the name of the LORD" (Gen 4:26). The kind of people described in what follows must be in contrast with the kind of people that precedes the list with the descendants of Cain about whom it is explicitly stated that had no relationship with God: "Then Cain *went away from the presence* of the LORD, and settled in the land of Nod, east of Eden" (Gen 4:16, emphasis mine). That the two genealogies must be viewed in contrast is indicated by some key names that occur in both genealogies. For instance, the son of Cain is called Enoch, and there is also an Enoch in the genealogy of Seth (Gen 4:17; 5:18-19). Similarly, the genealogy of Cain ends with a Lamech who is his killer, and the genealogy of Seth also ends with a Lamech who is the father of Noah who ensures the survival of the human race after the flood. While modern readers see in a text only what they already have in their minds, ancient readers were too intelligent to miss such details or regard them as mere coincidences.

We know about Cain that he was the killer of his brother and that he lived in a constant fear of being killed himself. As a violent man, he resorted to violence whenever he had a dispute with anyone and violence eventually led to his own demise. Is there any wonder that he built a city and named it after his son Enoch (Gen 4:17)? Building cities has always been viewed as necessary because of the violence of others against whom the builders of the city had to defend themselves, but building cities has nothing to do with reading the minds of others, but rather with projecting on others the kind of thinking the builders themselves had; they would resort to violence at every opportunity they have in order to take advantage of others when unprotected, and they assume that everyone else would do the same with them if they were not protected by city walls. As it is well known, a city was distinguished in ancient times by a huge outside wall that controlled who could enter and come out of the city. Such walls were extremely costly in terms of materials, labor, as well as human resources involved in order to maintain and particularly to guard all the time, day and night, against potential attackers. All those resources and labor that could have been used to build houses, to improve the infrastructure, or create other commodities, and so on, were basically wasted because city walls served no other useful purpose. Walls not only did not serve any useful purpose, but also restricted the freedom and the living space of those who dwelled within the city walls. In modern societies, it is criminals – particularly dangerous murderers – who are placed in cramped compounds called prisons surrounded by walls and tall fences and watched around the clock by guardians. We are not told that Cain was ever placed in a prison for his crime but it is hard to miss the irony of the biblical writer who says that eventually Cain built himself a prison for himself when he built the first city and appointed guardians to watch the enclosure. There was, however, another motivation for Cain's desire to build a city, and this idea is suggested by the biblical writer through the meaning of the name Cain. As it is explained by Eve, the name means "to acquire" (Gen 4:1). The root also means "reed" or "stalk," but also "spear," probably because spears were the first weapons and originally were made from stalks of reeds. The connotation of "spear" suggests again the violent nature of Cain, but the meaning "to acquire" – which Eve clearly intended – suggests Cain's preoccupation not with *producing* things, but with *acquiring* them, and because things do not grow on trees, whatever you can *acquire* must have been produced by others. The walls of a city were not meant only to protect the lives of the city dwellers, but primarily to protect their possessions that they had acquired by violence and on which they thought that their lives and happiness depended. Actually, cities were attacked not primarily to kill people, but in order to loot them of whatever was found valuable, and because city walls made it virtually impossible for attackers to loot a city without killing the people first, cities made killing the people a necessity. Archaeologists can accurately establish when ancient cities were conquered by thick layers of ashes that prove that virtually nothing survived such conquests. City walls

were built in the hope that they would protect the people and their possessions, but the only thing that they could guarantee was the complete destruction of both people and their possessions when eventually the city was conquered, and so far, no city has escaped destruction. This underscores the irrationality of those who invested in building defenses in order to protect themselves and particularly their valuables: cities linked the lives of its inhabitants to their possessions and made their killing a necessity and virtually guaranteed. Although history is full of killed people, it has never recorded such carnage as when cities were conquered and destroyed. Although conquering open communities that lived outside city walls did involve bloodshed, it never came close to the carnage that conquered cities experienced.

Killers and conquerors are constantly afraid of being killed and therefore are obsessed with security and survival. Since their lives have no meaning and no purpose, they identify themselves with the things that they *acquire* and had been produced by others. We would have expected Cain to see in his son something that would transcend his own death, but he gave the city he built the same name as his son which makes abundantly clear that he considered the city to be his future and his true offspring.

Another detail about the reasoned reality created by Cain is the land where he lived: Nod (Gen 4:16). The word means "aimlessness," "restlessness," "wandering," "uncertainty." The key ideas involved in reasoned reality are those of continuity, consistency, and predictability, but the only continuity, permanence, and predictability that the reasoned reality created by power and violence has is that of uncertainty. In order for humans to embark on larger projects, they need purpose, continuity, and stability, that is, the opposite of what the country Nod suggests.

We see in the genealogy of Cain that violence directed human creativity into establishing a structured reality that focused human inventiveness upon killing. As a result, Cain and his descendants adopted cities as human habitats surrounded by enclosures and defenses. Although a violent culture is obsessed with security and defenses, it is also obsessed with weaponry. The slogan used from immemorial times is that the best defense is always the offense, that is, the attack. It is no surprise, therefore, that another invention that the descendants of Cain are credited with is weaponry: "Zillah bore Tubal-cain, who made all kinds of bronze and iron tools" (Gen 4:22). We are not told what kind of "tools" Tubal-cain made out of bronze and iron but archaeology proves abundantly that bronze and iron was used in ancient times overwhelmingly to make swords and weapons. The root idea of the word Tubal means either "to lead," implying that Tubal-cain was a powerful leader or ruler, or that of "world" so that Tubal-cain means "the world of cain," that is, "the culture of Cain" or the "culture of acquiring," to use a modern terminology. Genesis credits the

descendants of Cain with the invention of metallurgy and therefore of technology which is seen as a great achievement in human history. Archaeologists and historians have labeled different periods in human history based on technological achievements: the stone age, the bronze age, the iron age, the atomic age, the space age, and so on. Although the biblical writer recognizes that technology is an important achievement of human creativity, notices also that technological discoveries have primarily military purposes. Although bronze and iron have been used to make *tools*, their primary use has been to make weapons. This was not true only in ancient times, but particularly today. Although scientific research is presented as having the purpose to make discoveries for the sake of discoveries and to make the lives of ordinary people better, their military purposes are too transparent for intelligent people to be fooled. Although western countries are cash strapped and heavily indebted, there was no shortage of money to create by far the most expensive machine known as CERN. The declared purpose of this staggering investment was to discover a certain particle called *boson*. Why is this particle so important to justify such an expense taking into account that it is not certain that such a particle even exists? Well, the way in which this particle was dubbed by the scientists may provide a clue: the god-particle. What does a particle have to do with gods since scientists typically do not believe in any? Well, this particle is supposed to have created the *big-bang* that brought the whole universe into existence during the first short minutes and therefore this particle is the real god that created the whole universe. And why is it so important to discover this particle since the universe already exists and there is no need for this particle to create anything? Well, if this particle could produce such an explosion that brought the whole universe into existence, it is a no-brainer to realize that it could also be used to create explosions that can destroy everything, and whoever manages to harness this particle becomes god. It is true that western countries have the most powerful nuclear bombs, but there are too many countries now who have them so that they are obsolete therefore those who want to rule the world as gods need to discover this god-particle. In the reasoned reality of power, knowledge and technology serve not primarily to make the life of ordinary people better and easier, but to increase the killing power of the ruler and the ability to control the society. Because the Bible uses genealogies and not mythology to describe human society, it places the technology within the genealogy of power and violence while in mythologies technology is the monopoly of a god who is subordinated to the main deity such as Hephaestus in the Greek mythology or Vulcan in the Roman. Even in Egyptian mythology, the god of war is identified with Seth, the killer of his brother Osiris.

Within the reasoned reality of power and violence, control of technology is one of the main instruments to control populations. Once a territory is conquered, one of the most important commodities that is seized by the conquerors is the skilled craftsmen,

particularly the smiths. We find this situation described in the Bible when the Philistines, after conquering Israel, seized all the smiths to make sure that the Israelites could not manufacture weapons so that the population had to go to the Philistines to have their agricultural tools sharpened: "Now there was no smith to be found throughout all the land of Israel; for the Philistines said, 'The Hebrews must not make swords or spears for themselves'; so all the Israelites went down to the Philistines to sharpen their plowshare, mattocks, axes, or sickles" (1 Sam 13:19–20). That this thinking has not changed in history can be seen in the fact that the situation described in this text between the Israelis and the Palestinians is still there, except it has been reversed. Although the conquerors were interested in exploiting the conquered population and extort as much as they could of what they produced, by depriving them of craftsmen, conquerors decreased significantly the productivity of the population under their control and the amount of produce they could extort from their subjects, but that was considered a small price to pay taking into account that lack of technology greatly incapacitated the subjugated population and reduced its ability to mount any resistance. While in the reasoned reality of knowledge technology means more food, in the reasoned reality of power and violence technology means primarily more control. In biblical language, *iron* has become synonym with weapon and to "strike with iron" means to kill (Num 35:16). Even today, some of the most important technological achievements such as aviation, nuclear energy, submarines, space travel, internet, and so on, have been developed for military purposes and only applications that became obsolete for the military were made available for civilian use. Even some inventions, which originally were developed for civilian applications such as tanks, eventually their main application was in the military. As the name makes clear, tanks were just that, steel containers that were filled with water and moved on caterpillar belts so that the weight of the tank did not sink into the soft soil of the fields making possible to move water off roads in order to water the fields. It was soon realized that the humble watering machine could be put to much better use by reinforcing the container with thick plates of steel, equip it with guns and cannons, and use it to carry soldiers on battlefields. Since technology has the potential to be used for military purposes, it has been a monopoly carefully guarded by those who claim the right to rule and dominate others. Although history is full of examples, probably there is no better one than the contemporary attempt of western countries to prevent Iran from developing and using nuclear energy. Since there is no clear line between civilian and military uses of technology, the only way in which a country can be kept under the control of those who claim the right to rule the world is to prevent that country from having technology or nuclear energy at all. And in order to force Iran to submit to the current world rulers, they have dictated that no country has the right to buy Iranian oil although the countries that use most oil and has to pay the highest prices for the shortage of oil created as a result of the embargo are precisely the countries who rule the world and

dictated the embargo. Rulers may end up depriving themselves of the commodities they take from their subjects by depriving them of technology, but that is a small price to pay compared to having complete control over their subjects. It is because in human history technology has had primarily military function that the biblical writer places the development of technology within the genealogy of power and violence developed by Cain and his descendants.

As if technology were not enough, we learn about another important achievement of the descendants of Cain: "His brother's [Tubal-cain] name was Jubal; he was the father of all those who play the lyre and pipe" (Gen 4:21). The stepbrother of Tubal-cain – who invented technology – invented entertainment. The words Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal, they all come from the same root and means "to lead," therefore the names mean leaders, with Tubal suggesting the word "world" and therefore "world leader." Jubal realized that those who do not get busy with cultivating fields and other productive activities but only show up with their swords at the time of harvest to receive it ready harvested have plenty of leisure time all the year round so that they do not know how to fill it. People who spent the whole day working in a field would prefer to use any spare time to rest rather than to dance and listen to music. It is the people who have power and therefore never get their hands dirty who have plenty of spare time and do not know how to make it pass more enjoyably. This is the reason power, violence, and entertainment always go hand in hand. Therefore, it is no coincidence that the industries of technology and entertainment were developed by two brothers. Not only are the two industries related, but they reinforce each other: violence loves entertainment and entertainment loves violence. One does not need to be an anthropologist to recognize that dance and music were used primarily to prepare warriors for battle. The oldest dances and songs are battle songs. Movements of the body and of the hands and legs in dances – sometimes with clubs or spears in hand – do not imitate household activities such as tilling, hoeing, harvesting, milking, kneading, weaving, and so on, but the quick movements when facing an enemy and striking to kill. Taking into account, however, that women often play a role in dance, music, and entertainment, what do they have to do with battle since they traditionally do not fight? Well, sex and sexual arousal plays a major role in preparation for battle. Dancing plays on an instinct which all animals have, that is, a female with its enticing movement of availability causes arousal in males and with it their urge to fight and eliminate the other males in order experience sexual gratification. Dancing females function as a promise that killers will be rewarded sexually if they succeed in battle and killed as many enemies as possible. And indeed, one of the favorite rewards for warriors has traditionally been the females of the conquered and killed enemies. This is still the pattern for the entertainment industry even today, whether it is movies, shows, sports, and so on. The most popular sports are made of teams that represent enemies who clash

physically to defeat the opposite team athletically. The typical gesture of an athlete after scoring or winning is to throw a blow with the fist in the air as if providing a final blow to an enemy. And what is equally significant is that at the end of the field where each team has to score, there is a group of young women summarily clad called *cheerleaders* who spring into a frantic dance of lewd movements as if offering themselves to the players as rewards for their performance whenever they manage to score. A *good* movie without guns, sex, and killing is almost unthinkable. The difference is that in most entertainment today the killing is enjoyed by mimicking it; in ancient times it was almost all the time for real.

Another interesting detail about the genealogy of Cain is that Lamech – the super killer who eventually killed Cain – had two wives (Gen 4:19, 23). When God created Adam, he created only one wife for him and all the descendants of Adam so far have had only one wife. Although feminists love to explain that polygamy originated from male desire to dominate women and use as many for their sexual gratification – which consists in sexual abuse of which men never have enough – the biblical writer suggests a different motivation: polygamy is the result of war and a violent culture. When Lamech confessed his murder, he made the following prediction: “I have slain a man for wounding me, a young man for striking me. If Cain is avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy sevenfold” (Gen 4:23–24). The detail that Cain was still young when he was killed points out to the reality of wars and violent cultures in which it is always young men who die since they are in the best physical shape to fight. Because warriors are always young, their wives are also young and therefore fertile. Such cultures end up with an abundance of females and a shortage of males, both of them young. Moreover, the high mortality of young men in a violent culture makes the population vulnerable to enemy attacks since women, children, and old men cannot fight. It is for this reason that violent cultures place a high premium on children, particularly boys, since boys can provide the *values* of the culture, that is, the ability to kill, plunder, consume, and have fun through entertainment. Therefore, violent cultures place a high pressure on women to give birth to as many children as possible so that boys become cannon fodder while the girls become livestock to produce more cannon fodder. We are not told how Lamech acquired his wives but it is abundantly documented that in all cultures a hero would appropriate the wife(ves) – and even the daughters – of the killed foes. In order to exploit to the maximum the reproductive ability of all fertile females in the society, they are distributed as wives to all the available males. This is the spiral of killing that Lamech referred to when he said that his murder of Cain would be avenged seventy-sevenfold. More killings produce more widows, which become available to give birth to more children who will grow to do more killing in order to avenge the killings that had taken place before them and will trigger even more killings as a result of their killings. While animals kill for food, humans kill for the sake of killing. That polygamy is

directly related to the high mortality of men in violent cultures and not to the supposed obsession of males to abuse sexually females – as feminists claim – can be proved even today. As it is well known, one of the recent wars of the United States of America and its western European allies has been against Iraq, a war claimed to have had purely *liberating* purposes. Besides *liberating* the country from a dictator, one of the main *liberating* goals claimed by the West was to liberate women from the tyranny of men who not only had many wives for their sexual gratification and whom they abused sexually as much as they liked, but also forced them to wear dresses that covered their whole body in public. Even an idiot would not fail to recognize in this widely used justification for war the feminist thinking and agenda that has become the true religion of the academia in the western countries. Whether this war has brought any liberation to the Iraqis they do not seem to be terribly convinced, but what even western propaganda which is called *media* can see is that the war has brought back polygamy in a country where apparently had been in decline before the war. This is how western propaganda called *media* describes the kind of liberation that feminists brought to the women of Iraq: “Years of conflict in Iraq have left the country with more than one million war widows and a shortage of young unmarried men – pressures that may be bringing about the return of polygamy.”⁹ How an ancient idiot with *mythical* thinking could understand what even our smart feminist liberators cannot understand even when is happening right under their nose and is right there in the newspapers I leave it to scholars to explain.

The genealogy of Cain ends with his killing by Lamech who sets in motion that spiral of violence which any ancient or modern reader could see everywhere around and it is for this reason that no more names are included in the genealogy of power and violence after the sons of Lamech because any reader could provide as many names and examples wants from personal experience no matter when one lived, in ancient or in modern times. After the line of Cain ends with the sons of Lamech, we learn that Adam and Eve had another son who replaced the line of Abel who had been killed by Cain and who established a new genealogy based on a different kind of reasoned reality: “Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son and named him Seth, for she said, ‘God has appointed for me another child instead of Abel, because Cain killed him’” (Gen 4:25). Again, Eve recognizes that experiencing another childbirth meant experiencing a gift of God and not a curse from God, otherwise she would not have welcomed the event. Moreover, the word used “appointed” indicates that Eve recognizes that God is involved not just in the procreation of the child, but in his whole life as well. Apparently, the word Seth comes from a root that means “foundation,” and clearly, Eve

⁹ “Iraq Toys with Polygamy as Solution for War Widows” (BBC: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-12266986> , accessed April 4, 2012).

understands that through this child God intends to place a new foundation for humanity to replace the one that had been destroyed by the violence of Cain. Moreover, since Seth means “replacement” as Eve explains, in Seth and his descendants we must see what Abel would have become had Cain not killed him. In the genealogy of Cain, no reference is ever made to God when his descendants are presented except that Cain “went away from the presence of the LORD” (Gen 4:16), although belief in the deity was available as the names of two of Cain’s descendants indicate: Mehujael and Methushael (Gen 4:18). The root meaning of Mehujael means “to destroy” and the name means “destroyed by God,” indicating that violence was used and done in the name of God. As far as Methushael is concerned, the root can refer either to מָה meaning “man of combat” or מוֹת meaning “death,” “corpse,” and therefore the name means “death by God” or “corpse of God,” again, indicating killing and death in the name of God. Taking into account that Methushael is the father of Lamech, other more benign explanations of the name seem unlikely. That the new genealogy started by Seth was closely related to God is further emphasized when Seth’s child is introduced: “To Seth also a son was born, and he named him Enosh. At that time people began to invoke the name of the LORD” (Gen 4:26). The word Enosh occurs as a proper name only in this passage because it simply means “humans,” both male and female, and it is not really appropriate for a proper name just as Adam means “man” – sometimes including females – and is used as a proper name only for the first human being created by God. With Enosh not only we are told that we have a group of people who specifically and openly related to God under the name Yahweh who shaped Adam, but the reference back to Adam is introduced in the genealogy at this point to make unmistakably clear that the similarity of names between Enosh and Adam is not mere coincidence: “This is the list of the descendants of Adam (אָדָם, *’ādām*). When God created humankind (אָדָם, *’ādām*) he made them in the likeness (בְּדְמוּת, *bidmût*) of God. Male and female he created them, and he blessed them and named them ‘Humankind’ (אָדָם, *’ādām*) when they were created” (Gen 5:1–2). Let us point out that the Hebrew word for “likeness” here is the same one used when God planned to create humans in the first chapter: “Let us make humankind (אָדָם, *’ādām*) in our image (בְּצַלְמֵנוּ, *běšalmēnû*), according to our likeness (בְּדְמוּתֵנוּ, *kidmûtēnû*)” (Gen 1:26). This is another clear example of chiasmic structure or *flashback*, the literary device used by the biblical writer to alert the reader that what is being said must be connected with something that had been related earlier. In other words, we need to see this Enosh as connected to Adam, a connection that is explained in the next verse, and the connection is ... surprise, surprise, ... the image of God: “When Adam had lived one hundred thirty years, he became the father of a son *in his likeness*, according to *his image* (בְּדְמוּתוֹ כְּצַלְמוֹ, *(bidmûtô kěšalmô)*, and named him Seth” (Gen 5:3, emphasis mine). We know that Adam received the image of God by eating from the tree of knowledge and now we are told that he passed on that image to his son Seth whose son is another Adam implying that he is also in the image of God. Moreover, since with him we see a

group of people who are worshipping God, we need to infer that all the descendants included in this genealogy received and passed down to their descendants the same image of God without this detail to be specifically mentioned after each descendant.

Besides a different relationship to the deity, there is also a striking difference between the two genealogies in the way in which they are structured. While the genealogy of Cain just reiterates what child each parent had and what was the achievement of each child, the genealogy of Seth follows a different pattern: After a son was born, we are told (1) how old the parent was when he had a son, (2) the name of the son, (3) how long the parent lived after the son was born, and (4) that the parent had other sons and daughters.

The name of the son of Enosh is Kenan, a word from the same root as Cain, which is a strong indication that the names in this genealogy must be compared and contrasted with the ones in the previous genealogy. We have, therefore, another Cain, but one who does not become a killer and he himself died of natural death without being killed by anyone. By contrast, in Cain's genealogy we are not told how long each descendant lived or that any of them died of natural death. We know that Cain died young and of violent death, which may suggest that that was the rule for the descendants of Cain. Kenan is not the only name in Seth's genealogy that matches and contrasts a name in Cain's genealogy. The son of Kenan was Mahalalel, a name that uses the same root in the word "hallelujah" and means "praise of God." It is hard to miss the phonetic resemblance between this Mahalalel and Mehujael and Methushael from Cain's genealogy, one referring to God in order to praise and the others in order to kill. The son of Mahalalel was Jared, whose root means "to go down," "to descend," and again, it is hard to miss the resemblance of this name with Irad, the son of Enoch who was the son of Cain. And the son of Jared was ... surprise, surprise ... also an Enoch. A very strange way of *descending*! One is descending from Enoch, the other is descending to Enoch! In one genealogy things go down from Enoch, while in the other they go up to Enoch. The real contrast, however, is between the two Enoch's. For the first one only the name survived because his name was given by his father to the city he built. The second did not build any city but something very strange happened to him: "Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him" (Gen 5:24). "Walking" is used in the Bible to refer to all activities that an individual engages in and a phrase like "going in and going out" refers to everything that an individual does. Therefore, by walking with God, the biblical writer indicates that Enoch used God's thinking in everything he did or, to use the technical term used by Genesis, he lived according to the "image of God." This vagueness about what happened to Enoch by a writer who uses words with amazing precision cannot be due to carelessness. Whether he died or what exactly happened we do not know but one thing is certain, that is, that his life did

not end and that was because of the way he lived and because God claimed him and his life for himself. We find again this idea that for those who claim the image of God – like Eve and Jesus – death does not exist anymore even if their body may decompose at some time. The contrast between the two Enoch's cannot be greater. While one Enoch surrounded himself with walls, never feeling safer than when he was alone, the other one walked freely enjoying the company of others with an awareness of God's existence and presence all the time. While one was obsessed with his safety and lived in constant fear of death, the other lived his life without any fear and eventually ended up beyond the reach of death altogether.

The son of Enoch was Methuselah and the name has the same root as Methushael from the genealogy of Cain, only the ending is different. And in case someone doubts that these names are related, the names of their sons were ... surprise, surprise ... both Lamech. And the contrast, again, cannot be greater: While Methuselah lived the longest life and was the father of Lamech who gave birth to Noah who remained the only righteous person on the earth to save humanity from the flood, Methushael was the father of Lamech who killed Cain while Cain was still young.

I hope it is abundantly clear by now that after humans were created and they chose to use their minds to develop knowledge, through the two genealogies Genesis presents two different reasoned realities that humanity has followed in using knowledge to structure human life: one based on power and violence in which the notions of good and evil are indistinguishable and has complete disregard for the image of God as creator, and one that uses knowledge to promote what is good and to avoid evil and in doing so to imitate God described as creator in the first chapter. That the key difference is the image of God the writer specifically makes clear by emphasizing that in the second genealogy, Adam passed down to Seth the image of God that he had received from God, about which the text is unambiguous that Adam received as a result of eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. That the two genealogies must be seen as parallel is indicated by using similar names, sometimes identical, for key figures. The similarities, however, are intended only to alert the reader about the contrasts, which consist in several crescendos. The most obvious contrast is that between the length of life and violence. While in the first genealogy people are obsessed with security building the first city, there is a spiral of violence and killing described in exponential terms from seven to seventy-seven. As a result, about none of the names included in the list is mentioned that died of natural death and how long they lived, while about Cain, the one who started the genealogy, the text specifically states that he was killed while still young in spite of God's disapproval about the killing, implying that dying young for men was the rule and God had nothing to do with such killing. By contrast, in the second genealogy not only no one dies or kills violently, but about each

individual the author indicates that he had died of natural death, how long he lived, and that the length of life gradually increased so that one of the last names in the list lived the longest, almost a thousand years, even longer than Adam, while his father, Enoch, apparently avoided death altogether. This striking contrast must be seen as a result of the relationship with God. In the first genealogy, there is obvious disregard for God. About Cain, who started the genealogy, the text makes clear that God came to him to dissuade him from killing his brother, and after Cain voices his fears that he might be killed himself, God specifically states that he does not endorse the spiral of killing and therefore when his killing did occur, God cannot be suspected of having anything to do with it. Moreover, about Cain the text specifically states that he “went away” from God, therefore this genealogy describes a reasoned reality in which God has no place except later when killing is justified as having been done in the name of God and therefore God is used as part of names. By contrast, in the second genealogy, not only each individual is related to God, but also there is a crescendo in the relationship. About Adam and his son Seth, the text mentions that they had received the image of God. Beginning with Adam’s namesake Enosh, descendants go beyond just having the image of God, and they begin to “invoke” the name of the LORD. This suggests a progression from passive contemplation to active conversation. The Hebrew phrase *לְקַרְא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה* (Gen 4:26) means literally “to speak in the name of Yahweh” and the preposition *בְּ* translated regularly by “in” has many meanings including “like,” “with the authority of,” and so on. To speak in the name of someone means to speak or to act on behalf of that person, and this clearly refers to the creation story when God is described as creating everything “very good” by speaking. Taking into account that the basis for reasoned reality is rationality that can be conveyed through language, it is obvious that this new line of humanity started to create the reasoned reality that God expected humans to develop. The culmination of this genealogy is clearly Enoch, whose son, Methuselah, lived the longest, and Enoch’s relationship with God is described as “walking with” and not “away from” God as Cain did, implying that all observed behavior and actions were in tune with God. The crescendo is hard to miss: from looking like, to talking like, to acting like.

Another obvious contrast is how both genealogies end. Although both end with a person having the same name, Lamech, there cannot be a greater contrast between them. While one killed Cain who started the genealogy and we are no longer told who are his descendants after his sons, the other became the father of Noah who saved humanity from the flood and ensured a future for humanity as we know today – including the author of Genesis, his ancient readers, and ourselves. Unfortunately, the word Lamech does not come from the root of one Hebrew word and scholars have not been able to figure out its meaning because the only possibility is to treat the first letter as a preposition to a word that means “lowering” or “humiliation” so that the meaning

would be “for lowering,” “for humiliation,” or “for downfall,” therefore scholars do not find it conceivable that anyone would give a child such a name, let alone to two of them. What they do not realize is that the author of Genesis does not use names to describe objective reality, that is, specific individuals who actually had those names, but the *names* are intended to convey ideas and beliefs shared in common by many individuals who made up large groups of people. Therefore, in genealogies there is no problem to use any name no matter how unlikely it would be for actual parents to give to their real children. Consequently, there is no problem to use the name Lamech in order to describe a human society that is going down and becomes bankrupt. Not only it is not a problem, but it seems to be the commonsense conclusion for a genealogy like Cain’s in which the spiral of violence and revenge decimates the society to the last individual. What seems to defy commonsense, however, is that the second genealogy ends with the same name, Lamech. Since the second genealogy follows a crescendo, how come that it ends in the same bankruptcy?

In order to answer this question, we need to look closer at these genealogies and notice not so much what is in there, but what is missing: they are made of males and no females. And at this point I expect feminists like Mieke Bal and Alice Bach to put on a big smile and argue that they have long noticed that and have explained that these biblical texts have nothing to do with knowledge, gods, reason, good, and so on, but are just the product of men who are obsessed with sex, raping, and abusing women, and through these texts and religion have managed to establish a patriarchal society in which men have all the power over women so that their power cannot be challenged and overturned as having been established by the deity himself who is male and cannot be resisted. According to them, this is the reason females are absent from this patriarchal record and even when women are present, like Eve, they are included only to be made responsible for evil and therefore their abuse by men becomes just punishment while whenever something good happens, it is always men who do it and receive the credit. This cheap trick used by the biblical writers to use religion and religious texts to impose their power over women may have fooled ignorant people for millennia but cannot fool feminists and modern scholars in western countries who have developed *critical* thinking and use theological studies and biblical interpretation not to endorse what these texts say, but rather to expose and denounce their oppressive nature in order to liberate people, particularly women, by relegating these texts and their religion to where they belong; to the garbage dump of history.

I do not know what bibles and texts scholars read, but in all the bibles that I have found available publicly I could not find any evidence that Eve is discredited with having done anything wrong; quite the opposite, she is presented as having been the first to reach out for knowledge and become like God, knowing good and evil, something

acknowledged by God himself. As far as evil is concerned, the first person who is credited by the *patriarch* who wrote Genesis to have committed the first sin is not a woman, but a man. Although I have made public my interpretation on the internet and in the most widely accessible language long ago in this classroom which is as open to anyone as it can be, not even the slightest objection to this interpretation has been presented up to this date by anyone, scholars or non-scholars.¹⁰ As far as the absence of female names in genealogies is concerned, I find that they are not only included, but are mentioned ... surprise, surprise ... in the very genealogy of power and violence, and no abuse or violence, sexual or otherwise, is committed against any of them: "Lamech took two wives; the name of the one was Adah, and the name of the other Zillah. Adah bore Jabal; he was the ancestor of those who live in tents and have livestock. His brother's name was Jubal; he was the ancestor of all those who play the lyre and pipe" (Gen 4:19–21). Not only are the names of the matriarchs mentioned, but the descendants of Lamech are listed as the sons of his wives and not of him. It is true that in the genealogy of Seth Eve is not mentioned and the genealogy starts by indicating that Seth received the image of God from Adam, but Genesis had dedicated a whole chapter to Eve to explain not only how Eve was the first to acquire the image of God by reaching out for knowledge, but that Adam received it only at her initiative and mediation. Therefore, although in the genealogy of Seth no female is named and females are mentioned as "daughters," a reader is expected to have enough memory to remember that the image of God – that is the defining feature of the whole genealogy – originated with a female whose name is already known. If the author of Genesis was a misogynist who wanted to blame women for all evils as is the dogma in Christian theological schools today, one would have expected the killing of Abel to be inspired or initiated by a woman, but when the first sin or crime is committed, apparently Cain not only was not married, but no daughter had been born to Adam and Eve, and therefore no other female was around except Eve who had nothing to do with the murder. Since women, however, were excluded from the first murder, does not mean that the patriarchal author of Genesis excludes women from the *liberation* that power and violence bring, liberation and power that are so dear to feminists. It is for this reason that the biblical writer specifically included women in the genealogy of power and violence, and introduces them not as wives of insignificant characters, but as wives of the very super-killer who eventually killed Cain himself. It is true that the biblical writer does not say that the wives were involved in the killing, but does tell us that the killer reports his murder to his wives which suggests that, even if the wives had not decided or encouraged the killing, the killer expected his wives to appreciate the news and possibly reward him for what he had done. And what is the greatest reward for a hero and a killer than sexual gratification? Women may not use muscles to kill but they have known that the power

¹⁰ December, 2017.

to kill does not have to do necessarily with muscles because they have known from all times that power can be better used employing what celebrated pioneer feminist Phyllis Tribble called “the rhetoric of sexuality.”¹¹ Although no one can deny that men have used their muscles and power to abuse and rape women, history is full of examples of women who have used their “rhetoric of sexuality” to kill both men and women or to reward those who did it.

And now we come to the explanation of why the genealogy of Seth ended up with a Lamech and a downfall even if it was not based on power and violence:

When people began to multiply on the face of the ground, and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw that they were fair; and they took wives for themselves of all that they chose. Then the LORD said, “My spirit shall not abide in mortals forever, for they are flesh; their days shall be one hundred twenty years.” The Nephilim were on the earth in those days – and also afterward – when the sons of God went in to the daughters of humans, who bore children to them. These were the heroes that were of old, warriors of renown. The LORD saw that the wickedness of humankind was great in the earth, and that every inclination of the thoughts of their hearts was only evil continually (Gen 6:1–5).

As it is familiar by now, scholars fantasize that these “sons of God” are some mythical creatures whom the idiot who wrote Genesis pulls out of the blue without noticing that they have no relationship with the context just as in the first chapters included two different creation stories without realizing that they had no relationship with one another. According to these scholarly interpretations produced by the smartest minds that ever existed, these mythical and supernatural creatures called “sons of God” had intercourse with ordinary women and the offspring that resulted were some kind of monsters of huge sizes called Nephilim. This is further proof that the one who wrote Genesis had no sense of reality since no gigantic skeletons have been found in the Middle East. Whether ancient people had such lunatics who saw monsters when only ordinary people were around them or scholars have trained their minds to read in texts what has nothing to do with them I do not know, but an ordinary reader, using plain commonsense, would have concluded that the “sons of God” must be descendants from the genealogy of Seth about whom the text explicitly states that had received the image of God from Adam, and sons who descend from Adam to whom he passed down the same “image of God” are ultimately quite accurately identified and described as “son of God.” As far as the “daughters of people” with whom these supposed mythical creatures had intercourse is concerned, they must be descendants of the people from the genealogy of Cain who were just as ordinary people as the descendants of Seth except they had no relationship or were in direct opposition to God, and therefore they could only be described as women who are born of ordinary people but without having

¹¹ Phyllis Tribble, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978).

anything to do with God. These women called “daughters of humans” are the only ones left from the genealogy of Cain because in a violent culture in which males eliminate each other through the cycle of killing and revenge, only females are left. A reader with a modicum of commonsense would have noticed that the writer, after presenting the two genealogies one after the other and apparently without any relationship, eventually the two groups of people became mixed through intermarriages. That those involved in these intermarriages were from among the two groups of people described through those genealogies is made abundantly clear because the writer mentions that these mixed marriages occurred as people “multiplied,” which can only mean that these mixed families were made of “sons” and “daughters” of people who “multiplied” by giving birth to these “sons” and “daughters” and therefore they were people who already existed and populated the earth and not some monsters who came out of the blue. Plain commonsense would help even an idiot to understand that as the two groups of people described through the two genealogies developed and multiplied independently, eventually they multiplied and spread enough that they came into contact with one another so that they started to intermarry. That these daughters were from among the people who belonged to the genealogy of Cain characterized by power and violence the author emphatically makes clear by stating that the children who were born within these mixed marriages were violent people, that is, warriors or heroes.

These mixed marriages confronted humans with the problem of people with different reasoned realities who try to live together and form on single reality. A very fitting illustration would be people who speak different languages but try to live together. As I had explained earlier, a reasoned reality is the system of ideas, beliefs, and rules that structure human behavior to make it consistent, predictable, and coherent. Can societies and smaller units such as institutions and families live using different reasoned realities? Can a society function if some members of the society believe that driving should be done on the right side of the road while others think that it should be on the left? Alternatively, is driving possible if some drivers think that it is quite all right to drink and drive while others think that that is wrong? Of course, members of a community do not need to have identical beliefs, ideas, and rules in order to live together on condition that in the areas where they are different keep separate and avoid any contact. Therefore, it is quite possible for a group in the community to worship one deity on Sunday while others worship a different deity on Saturday or Friday, on condition that they do not try to worship together and are careful to keep all their religious activities separate. When it comes to family, however, things become more complicated because to be part of a family means primarily to be together with others while to be separated from a family defeats the very purpose of being part of the family. Can spouses live together while one thinks it is quite all right to use violence while the other does not, or one thinks that it is all right to have extramarital affairs while the

other does not, or one worships one deity at one place of worship on a certain day while the other worships a different deity at a different place and on a different day? Of course, that is possible and history is full of examples, but that is not the recipe for happy people and functional families. Even if that is possible for parents, however, such situations present a very difficult problem for their children. Parents may choose conflicting reasoned realities and make accommodations to tolerate conflicting situations, but children cannot live by both realities at the same time. The most they can do to minimize conflict is to choose one of the two realities of the parents and not a third one, at least as long as they live with the parents. This is a universal problem that the author of Genesis addresses when discusses the mixed marriages of people from the two genealogies who lived by different reasoned realities. The children had to choose between the reasoned reality developed within the genealogy of Seth and used by the father, or the reasoned reality developed within the genealogy of Cain and inherited by the mother. In other words, the children had to choose to follow the father or to follow the mother. Here, however, I anticipate that feminists start to roll their eyes and mumble that children had no real choice to follow the mother since this was a patriarchal society in which the father had all the power and ruled with an iron fist while the mother had no power and had to suffer all the abuses. But, according to this champion of patriarchal mentality who wrote Genesis, the children followed ... surprise, surprise, ... the mother and not the father. Apparently, this champion of male power over women who wrote Genesis was not quite as smart a writer as feminists claim. So, why did the children inherit the reasoned reality from the mother and not from the father? That may be hard to understand for feminist scholars but ordinary people would have found the answer quite obvious: children are born, nursed, fed, dressed, taught, and educated by their mothers and not by their fathers therefore, not just their food, but everything they knew, came from their mothers and not from their fathers. And since the reasoned reality has to do with what a person thinks and believes, this is inherited by children overwhelmingly from their mothers and not from their fathers, even in modern societies, but even more so in ancient times. Strange as it may sound, although the reasoned reality of knowledge about promoting good and rejecting evil was initiated by a woman and the reasoned reality of power and violence was initiated by a man, eventually the reasoned reality of power and violence was taken over by women so that even the men who grew up in the reasoned reality initiated by Eve succumbed to the ideology of their wives. Ironically, according to the *patriarchal* mentality of the biblical writer, human history has not been driven by men – as the current creed taught in universities and theological schools claims – but by women. Yes, men have overwhelmingly provided the muscles, the weapons, and the cannon fodder, but the brains have always been provided by women. The world became full of violence when women became fascinated with it and the culture of great warriors and killers called Nephilim that resulted is credited to their mothers who gave birth to them and

raised them, and not to their fathers. And when it comes to explaining this word “Nephilim,” our smart scholars, whose imagination otherwise is extremely rich, suddenly becomes completely opaque and claim again that they have no idea what they might be and postulate that they must be some strange mythical monsters of gigantic size that existed in the confused minds of ancient people but have nothing to do with reality. Actually, the meaning of the word is quite plain for anyone who knows elementary Hebrew because it is a plural form of the verb נָפַל (*nāpal*) which simply means “to fall” or to “bring down,” that is, “to bring down.” Again, it is not a name but a word coined by the biblical writer according to a practice that is familiar by now to describe people. And since the text makes clear that these Nephilim were great warriors or killers, no word can describe more graphically these people than the word נָפַל because that is the only thing that these great warriors can do and are good at; to “bring down” or make others “fall” until they themselves are “brought down” so that the whole human race is brought down to Lamech. The two genealogies did go into different directions when viewed separately, but when humans multiplied and different groups of people got in contact with one another and started to mingle, slowly and gradually, in the long run, the mentality of power and violence became dominant and universal.

This slow and long process may explain the puzzle of these extremely long lives of individuals included in the genealogy of Seth. First, we need to keep in mind that these *names*, although they refer to real people, they do not refer to any specific individual who had that name, as some names do not seem to be names that people would give to their children. What is, however, an unmistakably clear reality blocker is the extreme long life that these individuals supposedly lived, close to one thousand years. Another interesting detail in this genealogy is the extremely old age when all these *patriarchs* had their supposedly first child; from 65 years, the youngest (Mahalalel and Enoch), to 187 years, the oldest (Methuselah). These seem to be the limits of human life rather than the time when men become fertile. Although about each *patriarch* is said that had other “sons and daughters,” we are not told at what age those other children were born. Typically, when the biblical writers list the descendants of a bible character, they single out the first born among the other siblings, and although scholars assume that the “sons” listed in the genealogy are the firstborns and the other “sons and daughters” were born later, about none of those included in the genealogy the author specifies that was the “firstborn.” Actually, the concept of “firstborn” is extrapolated on this passage from other Genesis stories – which will be discussed in later articles – just as the concept of *original sin* is extrapolated from Paul’s disputes with his fellow Jews over the garden of Eden story. Unlike modern readings of the Bible in which the less sense it makes and the greater absurdities result the more *scholarly* the reading is, ancient readers would have tried to make sense of these details because their assumption was precisely that

the writer intended to convey a specific message and the only way readers hoped to identify that meaning was by making sure that the way they read the text made sense and did not involve any absurdities. And if there were obvious absurdities, they assumed that they had been introduced in the text by the author as reality blockers precisely in order to alert them that the author was not talking about the things described by those absurdities, but about something else. In order to solve this puzzle about this slow male sexual maturity, ancient readers would have used a small detail well known about genealogies, that is, that a name of a descendant was included in a genealogy when the ancestor died and not when he had the first child so that the number of years mentioned referred to how long the person named lived or how old he was when he died and not how old was when he had the first child. If these extremely long lifespans were eliminated and the age at which each son is born is read as the age when the ancestor died and was replaced by a descendant, this genealogy looks like a regular dynasty in which the individuals listed lived extremely long lives because all died of natural deaths, which is the exception rather than the rule for regular monarchic genealogies that are based on violence. So, why confusing things with these extreme long periods? In order to understand this, we need to keep in mind all the time that through these genealogies the biblical writer does not intend to provide biographical information about individual people, but wants to offer תולדות, that is, something that describes how human life is structured so that it has continuity and permanence just as the heavens and the earth are structured so that they have continuity and permanence. It is precisely because the author wants to emphasize that whatever is found at one time in human life it did not end with the individual or individuals who lived at that time but continued long after that, the author uses these very long periods. Since for humans there is both a biological and a reasoned reality, the biological life of an individual cannot exceed the biological cycle of birth and death, while the reasoned reality goes far beyond that cycle. Yes, the biological life of various individuals ended after a number of decades but the kind of life they lived continued for many generations after them and this is what we need to look for in these genealogies. Cain's physical body died and disappeared not long after he was killed, but his killing mentality not only did not die with him, but also became stronger and more widespread long after he physically disappeared. It is precisely because the author of Genesis wants to help readers see these names in these genealogies not as independent individuals but rather as people participating in something that was shared by many individuals who lived both at the same time as well as at great distances in time, that these extremely long periods of time are used. In order to emphasize the continuity of the kind of life that the ancestor lived, instead of the death of the individual, it is the birth of a descendant that is mentioned to suggest the continuation of the same reasoned reality, so that the extremely long life refers to the kind of life lived by many generations and not the biological lifespan of individuals. While the biological circle of the human life is relatively short, the reasoned

structure of human societies is much longer so that changes in the thinking and the rules of the society occur very slowly and over extreme long periods of time. How long did it take for part of the world to ban slavery? Indeed, in many parts of the world it is still unthinkable. This period of one thousand years is used as an extremely long time that exceeds by far the lifespan of individuals and is used to convey the stability of beliefs, mentalities, and laws that govern human societies because radical changes in societies take extremely long time, but it should not be concluded that thousands of years represented actual biological lives of individuals or that changes in the society took place at exactly one thousand years or at any of the number of years mentioned in this genealogy. As the example with slavery shows, it has taken much longer to ban it in western countries while replacing males with females in positions of power in the same countries has taken much shorter. That human societies are not static and have changed over time is precisely the point that Genesis makes by showing that humanity has gone downhill, but such changes are discerned over a very long period of time and is virtually undetectable during the lives of individuals, particularly in ancient times when ideas, knowledge, and information were much more strictly controlled and restricted. One thousand years is used not as an exact figure – and, no doubt, it is for this reason that none of the names in the genealogy lives exactly one thousand years – but is used as an extremely long time that has special significance in the Bible as well as history because this obsession with *millennia* is not limited to the Bible, but is found in history as well as contemporary western psyche that has complete disdain for the Bible. As one may remember, with the turn of the millennium the West was overtaken by the paranoia known as *the millennium bug* which was supposed to bring the whole world to a standstill. Although traditionally a *thousand* has been used as a numeral referring to a number of years when great changes in history were expected to take place, in the Bible it is not used to indicate an objective period of time, but rather to describe the kind of life people lived, no matter whether what is described lasted exactly one thousand years, or more or less. In other words, while the Hebrew word מֵאָהָה as a noun can mean “family/clan” and as a numeral means “one thousand,” it is often used as a descriptive term like other numerals in the Bible and therefore often it has nothing to do with numbers and should not be translated as a number, and this is particularly the case with numbers in these two genealogies in Genesis. That the Bible uses numbers in other places to refer back to these genealogies was suggested to me by Virgil Ionica who noticed that the genealogy of Cain includes four generations and the Ten Commandments refers to Cain and his genealogy when using numbers such as *three or four* and not in order to punish descendants for what the parents have done:¹²

¹² Virgil Ionica, who is my brother, made this suggestion in a telephone conversation on April 9, 2012.

You shall not bow down to them or worship them; for I the LORD your God am a jealous God, punishing children for the iniquity of parents, *to the third and the fourth generation of those who reject me*, but showing steadfast love to the thousandth generation of those who love me and keep my commandments (Exod 20:5–6, emphasis mine).

According to translations and traditional interpretations, God is promising here never to punish parents for the evils that they do or reward parents for the good things that they do, but rather punish and reward their children, but even this punishing and rewarding is not proportional since it is reduced to just three or four generations when it comes to punishing evil but extended to one thousand generations when rewarding good things. And this discrepancy is explained by people with *critical thinking* as a result of the fact that God is *merciful*. Probably it is because this extreme *mercy* that this God is also terribly confused when describes himself as “jealous” while proclaiming his supposed *mercy*, taking into account that “jealous” means precisely scrupulous in punishing disobedience and therefore exactly the opposite of *mercy*. Not only is this God terribly confused by being both jealous and merciful at the same time, but is not even sure how many generations should punish children for the evils that their parents had committed; should he stop after the third generation, or should he go one more? When comes to showing his *mercy*, however, God is even more confused because the word used is לְאַלְפִים which – as anyone with even elementary knowledge of Hebrew can see – is the plural of אֶלֶף and therefore it means literally “to thousands” and not “to one thousand” or “to thousandth.” Therefore, if God has not made up his mind yet whether to stop punishing children for the evil committed by their parents for one full generation, when comes to showing his mercy by rewarding children regardless of what they do for thousands of generations, has not even made up his mind how many thousands he must do so. If that is the way God understands his “jealousy” in making sure that everyone obeys his commandments, he must be the biggest idiot in the whole universe.

If Virgil Ionica is right, however, that this “fourth generation” refers to Cain and his genealogy because there are only four generations mentioned in it – and I think he is right – then things begin to make sense. First we need to clarify who is the sinner and who is the victim against whom the sin is committed, and for this we need to look at the Hebrew text: פָּקַד עֵוֹן אָבוֹת עַל-בָּנִים עַל-שְׂלֵשִׁים־וְעַל-רִבְעִים. Translated literally the phrase reads “punishing the evil of fathers upon sons upon the third and upon the fourth.” The key detail that needs to be clarified in order to understand the phrase is whether the “evil of fathers” is evil committed *by* the fathers or is evil *suffered* by the fathers, that is, evil committed *against* them. Although Hebrew grammar allows for both meanings, since the verb “to punish” requires the preposition עַל- prefixed to the object of punishment, it must be the sons who had committed the evil and therefore the evil could not have been

committed by the fathers but rather the fathers must have suffered the evil committed by the sons, and this is exactly what we find in the genealogy of Cain, the murder of a father by a son. Taking into account that Hebrew does not use terms like grandson, great-grandson, etc., to refer to descendants or grandfather, great-grandfather, etc., to refer to ancestors, and uses “sons” and “fathers” regardless how distant they are from one another, the murder of Cain by a descendant is quite accurately described as the evil committed by a son against a father. But the clearest reference to Cain’s genealogy is this phrase “upon the third and upon the fourth.” The repetition of the preposition clearly indicates that the phrase must be seen not as a numeral but rather as a qualifier or a description of the noun qualified, in our case “sons.” Therefore, these sons must be identified by the genealogy characterized by three or four, and the genealogy of Cain has three or four generations, depending whether one includes Cain – who technically started it – or excludes him since he is killed and therefore eliminated. Consequently, numbers in these passages are used to describe two different categories of people with contrasting ways of thinking and behaviors towards whom God has contrasting attitudes; one is characterized by evil that can be traced back to the *original sin* which consisted of a fourth-generation son who killed a father or a forefather, and the other characterized by prosperous lives that can be traced through families/thousands with extremely long lives because no violence is committed against the parents as we see in the genealogy started by Seth.

This insight that numbers in this passage do not have any numerical value but rather descriptive in order to identify the people whom the passage refers to explains also the meaning of the other puzzling term, “thousands.” The word אֲלָף clearly is not a noun and cannot mean “family/clan” since it does not make any sense in this passage and it cannot be a numeral either counting the number of generations God is supposed to have mercy on as long as it does not say how many thousands there are. Since these people are characterized by the fact that they “love” God, live according to his commandments, and by “thousands,” all these characterizations make abundantly clear that these people live the kind of life described by the genealogy of Adam through Seth. Although the words “fathers” and “sons” do occur when those who commit evil are described, these words do not even occur when those who love God are described because the Hebrew text literally says: וַעֲשֵׂה חֶסֶד לְאַלְפִים לְאַהֲבֵי וּלְשֹׂמְרֵי מִצְוֹתַי The text is so straightforward that even someone with knowledge of elementary Hebrew can translate: “and doing grace to those who love me, those who keep my commandments.” First, God does not “show love” but offers grace/חֶסֶד because God is the subject of the verb וַעֲשֵׂה and those to whom God offers his grace/חֶסֶד are clearly marked by the prefix/preposition ל: “to thousands,” “to lovers of me,” and “to keepers of my commandments.” Therefore, those who benefit from God’s grace/חֶסֶד are characterized/identified by three qualifiers: “thousands,” “love for God,” and

“obedience to his commandments.” How scholars concluded that those who “love God” and “keep his commandments” are actually *fathers* whom God completely ignores and the “thousands” refers to descendants of those fathers who live up to exactly “one thousand” generations after those *fathers* but not one generation more I can only explain as a result of the *critical thinking* acquired by modern minds compared to the simple mindedness of the one who wrote Genesis. Probably because ancient readers lacked *critical thinking* and therefore had to use just plain commonsense that has nothing to do with *critical thinking*, they would have realized that these numbers are not meant to describe such absurd situations in which God is punishing children and not the parents for what they do, but to describe two kinds of people with opposing attitudes towards God: one hating him while the other loving him; different attitudes towards God’s commandments, one disregarding them while the other abiding by them; and contrasting attitudes towards their parents or ancestors, one killing them while the others honoring them and following in their footsteps. That this idea that evil has to do with the attitude of the children towards their parents is further emphasized by the fact that one of the commandments specifically demands: “Honor your father and your mother, so that your days may be long in the land that the LORD your God is giving you” (Exod 20:12). Although the word “thousands” is no longer used, the length of life is specifically mentioned indicating that the spiral of evil and violence can be reversed by children “honoring” their fathers, that is, not killing them even when they are evil, while when they are righteous, by following in their footsteps.

When talking about millennium as a symbolic period, no doubt the book of Revelation comes to mind because numbers are a prominent part of the symbolism used in this book. Although it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss this book, there is a passage that clearly has relevance to our subject:

Then I saw an angel coming down from heaven, holding in his hand the key to the bottomless pit and a great chain. He seized the dragon, that ancient serpent, who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and threw him into the pit, and locked and sealed it over him, so that he would deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years were ended. After that he must be let out for a little while (Rev 20:1–3).

What is of interest at this point is not when this event is supposed to happen, but the meaning of “binding.” That this is another reference to Genesis is made clear by the description of the Devil as Satan and as an “ancient serpent.” The reason Revelation does not explain here whom this “ancient serpent” managed to deceive is because the author expects the reader to know Genesis and to remember the reference earlier to Eve when she is described as having fled from the serpent in the wilderness where God protected her and the serpent tried to snatch her son, obviously because it failed to deceive and “snatch” her (Rev. 12:1–4). Although we are not told who this son is, he

became the bone of contention between God and Satan and we are told that he was supposed to “rule all the nations with a rod of iron” (12:5). Who fails to see in this a clear reference to Cain who dreamed of dominating everyone through power and violence and the mentality that his genealogy developed? That Satan did manage to deceive Cain to kill his brother, to build the first city, to raise his descendants with a passion for power and violence, and developed metallurgy to make weapons to “rule the world with a rod of iron,” for anyone familiar with Genesis the reference would be a no-brainer. Eventually Cain himself fell victim to his own mentality so that his descendant, Lamech, boasted that he would be avenged seventy-seven folds. Taking into account that humans do not live just by instincts but rather by what I called reasoned reality that presupposes that whatever humans do, they do it for a reason, to do something without any reason is irrational. Consequently, the reasoned reality of power and violence is also based on a *reason*, that is, there is a rational justification for it: some humans love to subordinate others because they have the freedom to do whatever they want so that the others are left with the only options to either submit unconditionally to those who have the power, or get killed. It is this fascination of power that Satan discovered and prompted him to start a war with God in order to bring everyone under his control, and managed to entice Cain and his descendants to pursue the same idea, that is, to kill in order to dominate. Although power and violence do have a reason or justification, in the long run it proves to be the ultimate irrationality: Killing makes others feel unsafe and therefore motivate them to kill the killer before they get killed by the killer, so that the killer kills more in order to instill more fear of being killed in others so that more killing makes the killer feel safer, but at the same, time more killing makes people more afraid of being killed as the killer is perceived as more dangerous and therefore motives more people to kill the killer in order to feel safe, and once the killer is killed, the others become even more unsafe and more afraid of the new killer whom they perceive as being even more dangerous since has proved to be a better killer than the killed killer, therefore they become even more motivated to eliminate the new killer before they get killed by the killer so that the new killer becomes even more motivated than the killed killer to kill more people to instill more fear in others in order to feel safe and this creates more desire in everyone else to become an expert killer to feel safe by being the first to kill before gets killed. The first killer had to kill only one because had only one brother at the time, but the next killer discovered that would have to kill seven in order to feel safe, and those seven will soon discover that would have to kill seventy-seven, and so on, until killers need to kill more people than they can find. As simple arithmetic suggests, eventually there are more killers than people to be killed. It is this spiral of self-destruction that the devil, Cain, and his descendants started that set humanity on a downhill course towards its final doom. Consequently, the reasoned reality of power and violence is based on the ultimate irrationality in the sense that those who kill in order to attain absolute safety

and absolute power, end up destroying everyone else because one can feel truly safe only when is the only one left alive in the whole world. The irrationality of power and violence has to do with the fact that the one who has power needs to have both absolute security and absolute control over the others at the same time, and in order to achieve both goals, one needs to have absolute power and be capable to use absolute violence with absolutely no regard for the life of others. Absolute safety, however, presupposes eliminating everyone else because one can never feel safe as long as there is someone else around and could pose a threat and become a killer, but by eliminating everyone else, power becomes meaningless and useless because there is no one else over whom to use that power. The absolute irrationality of power and violence consists in the fact that enjoying absolute power requires the existence of others over whom the power is exercised, but the existence of others makes impossible the enjoyment of absolute safety by the one who has the power. On the other hand, enjoying absolute safety presupposes using power to eliminate everyone else so that no threat is possible, but eliminating everyone else to achieve absolute safety makes the enjoyment of absolute power impossible because there is no enjoyment in power that cannot be used to control others. Having no way to use your power, just having it is no different than having your hands tied. It is this situation in which the Devil finds himself when he finally reaches his goal to attain absolute power over the whole world by killing everyone else that the Revelation refers to when describes the Devil as being “bound” like a prisoner. What the Devil and his followers have never understood is that the world of power and violence is the ultimate absurdity because is the ultimate prison. Whether criminals are caught and placed in a prison where their safety is secured so that no one can reach them, or they manage to get away and build the kind of world they dream of, eventually that world is no different from the ultimate prison. Whether the walls of the prison are built by others or are built by those who can amass power and wealth, whether they are called the walls of the Tower of London, Alcatraz, or Bastille, or are called city walls like the Chinese Wall, the Berlin Wall, the Iron Curtain, the Israeli Wall, the American fence and so on, they are all prisons. The only difference is in size: the petty criminals are placed in small prisons while the mass killers build for themselves gigantic prisons proportional to the magnitude of their brutality. And there is one more difference: the first are called “prisons” and are *reviled* in the media, while the others are called “civilizations” and are *revered* in the universities. A “border security” is no different from a “security prison” except in size; a “security prison” guarantees security to petty criminals while “border security” prisons contain those who commit mass killing at levels that accurate counts are simply impossible. The difference is that the petty criminals are put into prisons that they did not built themselves while the greatest killers in history place themselves in the very prisons that they themselves build because of their confused minds.

At this point, I imagine that irritated scholars would start to roll their eyes full of holly indignation that cities are demonized as the source of all evils and this proves what they have always documented that texts like Genesis and religion in general – particularly Christianity – are actually the sources of the darkest obscurantism and are responsible for keeping humanity in ignorance and bigotry for millennia. Not only Genesis and its god make knowledge the ultimate sin, but portray *cities* as the source of all evils while cities – as their name makes clear – have brought humanity *civilization* and should be credited with everything good that we enjoy today. The word *civil* comes from the word *city* and therefore it describes people who live in cities and are the nicest people imaginable: polite, kind, abiding by the laws, respecting the rights of others, educated, knowledgeable, and interested to promote knowledge among others. By contrast, knowledge has never been able to develop among tribal people because only the city could provide humans with the protection they needed to think, invent writing, develop new ideas, and make them available to others. Therefore, tribal life is not much different from the life of animals that live in caves. To idealize cave life and demonize city and civilized life even idiots would find outrageous. That cities were the sources of civilization and progress have been documented everywhere so that this is a truth that only aboriginals who have never seen a city might be ignorant of. Although in the ancient world cities were just isolated pockets of knowledge and learning, it was the Greeks who adopted the city as the ideal worldview that set humanity on an ascending course that led to the only *civilization* that has ever existed. First, they united these pockets of knowledge and learning which they called *city states* into a union of cities unified by the same vision of making all its members rise to the same high standards of conduct creating therefore the first *civilization*. Then, through their philosophers, they expanded this vision to the whole world so that, after the Greeks managed to raise all their citizens from the level of savage villagers to the level of *city dwellers*, they understood that they had a responsibility towards the whole world to share with others what they had achieved so that there would be no more savage people in the world. It was this vision of a whole world made up only of civilized people like themselves that moved them to conquer the world, not to subdue it, but to free it from all barbarisms and savagery. It is true that there had been cities before them that tried to conquer others in order to plunder, but the Greeks were the first who developed the idea of conquering others not in order to plunder them, but to *civilize* them, that is, to raise them from the level of tribal savagery in which they lived to their own level of *civilization*, that is, the nicest people. Instead of conquering tribal people to take from them whatever they had, the Greeks wanted to conquer them in order to turn tribal people into city dwellers. Can anyone imagine any loftier idea? Can anyone imagine that a tribesman like the one who no doubt wrote Genesis would be able to rise to such level of thinking and is there any wonder that it was the Greeks – with their philosophers whom their great cities produced – who developed the greatest revolution

in thinking that has ever existed? While other conquerors conquered only until they seized enough booty, Alexander the Great dreamed about conquering the whole world because he was not interested in taking booty from those whom he conquered but rather in giving them knowledge, that is, the knowledge of civilization. Is there any wonder that his mentor was Aristotle, the greatest philosopher who ever existed and laid the foundation for the kind of thinking that scientists are using today and has made possible for the most amazing advances in discoveries as well as the spread of civilization to other countries? It is true that in this noble pursuit Alexander had to crack open a handful of skulls and rip open a handful of bellies, but taking into account that these were skulls and bellies of bigots and idiots who not only would not let themselves be civilized but would kill indiscriminately any civilized person, this was a small price to pay if one considers the immense gain for the whole humanity. Although he himself died, his vision did not die with him but rather was taken over by the Romans who attempted the same conquest of the whole world, not in pursuit of any booty, but simply to bring the ignorant tribes of Europe from their savagery to civilization, and although the Romans had to crack open a handful of skulls and rip open a handful of bellies, this was again a small price to pay for Europe taking into account that it set Europe on the path of enlightenment so that those savage tribes became the Germans, the French, the British, the Spaniards of today who are truly the ones who built the only civilization that ever existed. These European tribes not only were able to become civilized, but eventually they became the greatest civilizers when – with the help of philosophy – they managed to set up universities in which they promote *critical thinking*, a kind of thinking that exposes all the stupidities found in the Bible and religion that had plunged the world in what is known as the Dark Ages. Europe has been able to come out of this dark age as a result of its own philosophers who were enlightened by the same Greek philosophy, which proves that this is the highest thinking that has ever existed and ever will. And if this wonderful civilization is hated and is in danger, is precisely because there are still tribal people with tribal mentality who hate civilization and still live in caves like the people who live in the Middle East. Their hatred of civilization is well known now from the fact that New York City was attacked by such people who are still living in caves. As its name makes clear, New York City is not just a *city*, but is the greatest and most advanced of all cities that have ever existed, and from this city, what was attacked was the World Trade Center. As its name makes clear, this was a place that had nothing to do with taking anything from anyone, but it was a philanthropic organization in disguise whose only purpose was – under the pretense of *trade* – to provide the whole world with food and all kinds of goodies that the western civilization has created, virtually for free. What these *civilized* people mean by *trade* is to give away everything and receive nothing in return. This proved what scholars with their minds enlightened by the same philosophy have always advocated, that religion is the source of obscurantism, intolerance, and all

kinds of evils in the world so that they have the mission to help not just its own citizens to arise above religious bigotry and become civilized, but to do the same with the whole world and fulfill the dream which ancient Greeks had and tried to accomplish through Alexander the Great. And this is exactly the war in which the West is engaged right now: to conquer the world not in order to plunder it, but to liberate it from savagery, religious bigotry, and obscurantism in order to bring it from life in caves to civilization. Scholars may grant that in this enterprise the modern champions of civilization may have to crack open – or hit them with bullets or laser guided bombs – a few skulls of those who may still lurk in some caves in the Middle East, but this is a small price to pay taking into account that overcoming religion and bigotry would be not just “one giant leap for mankind,” but the only and the truly giant leap.

I have no doubt that this sermon dogmatically preached in universities would be followed by enthusiastic *amens!* from applauding students with tears in their eyes – since I cannot imagine that a scholar would preach anywhere else but in a classroom – and no one can imagine that an idiot like the one who wrote Genesis might dare to open the mouth and question the truth of the history supported by the facts that no one can deny. Was it just coincidence that the Greeks had first philosophers and then they had Alexander the Great with all the greatness that he brought to Greece? Or was it just coincidence that the Romans discovered first the same philosophy and soon they achieved the same greatness? Or was it just coincidence that France had first great minds that steeped themselves in the same philosophy and then led their country and indeed, the whole world, to civilization and enlightenment? Or was it just coincidence that the Spaniards, the Germans, and the British had first great philosophers to bring their country to civilization and then spread that civilization over the whole world through their *civilizing* empires? These are such universally documented causal connections between the Greek philosophy as the source of greatness and civilization that to anyone who would dare to question these facts a scholar can only respond by just rolling the eyes and say with sigh *poor idiots!*

I do not think that ancient readers would question any of these beginnings and their immediate effects, but I imagine that they would argue that in order to evaluate something to see whether is true, good, great, or whatever, you cannot just look at the beginning, but you need to look at it over a very long period. In other words, in order to understand and evaluate something, you need to look at it through the concept of *genealogy*, that is, how things were perpetuated over generations or over hundreds or thousands of years. If you look at beginnings like Cain and Abel, taking into account that Cain means the *accumulator*, that he built a city, and that he had powerful descendants, while Abel means “vapor,” that is, “what is ephemeral” or “vanity,” that he had no descendants, that he simply vanished without a trace, then Cain looks like

the smartest and most successful person that ever existed, but in order to truly evaluate them, you need to look not just at Cain, but down to Lamech, that is, how they ended up down the road. It may be true that Abel vanished like a vapor and looks the loser while Cain looks the winner, but if we look down the road, we discover that Abel was followed by Seth, and as his name makes clear, he is a “replacement,” that is, another Abel, just as his son, Enosh, was another Adam. Yes, as a result of Cain’s sin there was a disruption so that for a short time Adam seemed not to have any descendant to whom to pass over the image of God that he had acquired as a result of eating from the tree of knowledge and for which he was *punished* with being driven out of the garden of Eden, but God provided a replacement for Abel because with God, death is never final so that, through Seth, Adam got another Abel so that he got another son in his image which was the image that he had received from God and to whom he passed on that same image. Yes, if we look just at Abel with his disregard for his *safety* and *violence* he may seem like a loser, but taking into account that he was replaced by someone who shared his mentality and way of life, eventually Adam is rediscovered as Enosh and as the son of the new Abel. And just as Cain’s genealogy ends with a Lamech, so also Abel’s genealogy – or rather Adam’s genealogy through Seth – ends with a Lamech. It is because scholars have a tunnel vision seeing only Cain while being completely blind to Lamech that they are fascinated with these Cains the Great or Alexanders the Great and how they trod under their feet a lot of Abels, but the author of Genesis would want to look at the Lamechs in these *scholarly histories* in order to evaluate them. While scholars may be mesmerized by Alexander the Great and what he did, the author of Genesis would want to have a look at Greece not just at the time of Alexander the Great to see how great that country was, but how great it is today, and he would discover that Greece is today ... surprise, surprise ... the first bankrupt country in history. And I am sure that scholars would argue that there is no causal connection between being first in philosophy and being first in bankruptcy because this would be just the exception that proves the rule that a great beginning always leads to a great civilization and a bright future. And the author of Genesis would want to follow the rule and would want to look at Italy to see how great that country is today no matter how great it was *in the beginning* when it took over its ideas from the Greeks, and they would discover that Italy is ... surprise, surprise ... the next most indebted country and the next on the list of bankruptcy. And the author of Genesis would discover that the next countries that built great empires, Spain and Portugal, are also the next most indebted countries and next on the list of becoming bankrupt. As far as France is concerned, its credit as a country has been just downgraded for not being able to pay its debts so that the exception to the rule still holds, that is, the country that followed its predecessors in philosophy and building great empires is following them in bankruptcy as well. As far as the British and the Americans are concerned, they are just at the *beginning* when they have discovered this great mission that Alexander the Great received from Aristotle –

that is, to *civilize* the whole world with their laser guided bombs and drones – so that they are not bankrupt yet but just have such huge national debts and are so busy crushing skulls and ripping open bellies in order to civilize the world through their brutality that they do not care about those debts. Therefore, the exception that was supposed to confirm the rule seems to be the rule without an exception. And probably here scholars would point to Germany as the exception in the sense that it had great philosophers but has no debts and is in no danger of going bankrupt. Although that is true, it is also true that as a result of those philosophers Germany also had a great desire to civilize the world with bullets and bombs, but its two attempts to accomplish the dream of Alexander the Great failed and that may explain why they have no debts; they failed to establish any empire. Although it is true that they did not end up bankrupt, it is also true that they did not *enjoy* a great beginning like the other empires but rather their *beginnings* were both failures. So why are the Greeks bankrupt while Germans are not since Germany followed the same great thinking that the Greeks invented? Are the Greeks lazy and the Germans hard workers? A recent study asked these questions and the conclusion was ... surprise, surprise ... exactly the opposite, that is, the Greeks are the hardest workers and the Germans are the laziest:

Figures from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) show that the average Greek worker toils away for 2,017 hours per year which is more than any other European country.

...

On the other hand, the average German worker – normally thought of as the very epitome of industriousness – only manages 1,408 hours a year. Germany is 33rd out of 34 on the OECD list (or 24th out of 25 looking at the European countries alone).¹³

Therefore, we have a real puzzle: these Greeks who are revered in universities as having invented the greatest thinking that enabled humanity to establish its only civilization – who managed to conquer the world and have had thousands of years to benefit from this *most advanced thinking* before others discovered it and benefited from it by becoming civilized – are now bankrupt, and the Germans, who are among the latest to discover this most advanced thinking and had little time to benefit from it, are the most prosperous in Europe although they work far less, and not only failed to establish any empire, but were handicapped in their recent history by paying war damages and had their country divided for the second half of the last century. Although this may seem a great puzzle for economists and scholars, the author of Genesis would have found the answer to this puzzle a matter of commonsense. He would have noticed that the kind of thinking that the Greeks discovered and made them think that they had the right to conquer the world was the kind of thinking that even Genghis Khan had and

¹³ Charlotte McDonald, “Are Greeks the Hardest Workers in Europe?” (BBC: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-17155304>), accessed April 14, 2012.

Genesis describes through the story about the garden of Eden. Just like Genghis Khan, the Greeks discovered the fascination with handling a flaming sword that turns in every direction and became master killers so that they turned their country into a garden of Eden in which they did not need to produce anything because everything was brought by the sword so that all they had to do was to consume. It is true that such *revolutions in thinking* that you can live in a garden of Eden where everything is brought in by the sword and defended by the sword are very sweet in the *beginning* just as Samson's parents discovered that the honey that he brought home from the young carcasses of those whom he killed was very sweet, but after a while when the parents receive home the carcasses of their own young lion, the honey stops coming. We do not know how young Samson was when he turned into a carcass, but history tells that Alexander the Great was quite a young lion when he became Alexander the Great Carcass. But once your stomach gets so *civilized* that is used to plenty of honey that no longer flows because it does not grow on trees and there are no more carcasses from which to come, what can you do? Borrow, right? Or – as an American politician put it – live on credit cards. Of course, you have to show to work in order to receive your ratio of honey from the government, but you do not need to worry about what you do at work because, as a civilized citizen, it is your *right* to have plenty of honey and it is the responsibility of your government to provide it. It is true that the Germans were among the latest to discover this highest Greek thinking that even Genghis Khan knew quite well, and they themselves became fascinated with the flaming sword and used technology to build the most advanced weapons, but the problem was that their Hitler the Great became a carcass before he was able to conquer the world. Since there was no *beginning*, there was no empire, and as a result, the Germans, instead of being revered by historians and the academia today as the most civilized people in history, they are now labeled the greatest villains of history. Without a *beginning*, there was no honey, and without an empire, there are no credit cards either. So, what was the option for the Germans? Well, they had to get their hands dirty and use technology in order to produce their own food and therefore they became the biggest producers of the best products in Europe. They may have had their country divided and half of it ruined by communism for almost half a century, but eventually, if you work hard and use knowledge you have much more than you can consume. Because Germans failed in their Cain attempt, they failed to end up with a *downfall* or a Lamech, while the Greeks and all their modern descendants who managed to succeed in their Cain attempt, they all ended up with a *downfall* or Lamech. Because that is what a Lamech means, *downfall*. Of course, scholars and the media do not call it *downfall* and by no means do they call it Lamech, but the word they use is *crisis*. What they mean by this is some kind of bump in the road that somehow slows down a bit this triumphant march from a great beginning to the glorious future and this *crisis* is not really a problem which civilized countries have or are responsible for, but rather it is caused by the other countries because they resist civilization and they slow

down the noble endeavor of the civilized countries to bring the whole world to their level and accomplish that bright future. It is for this reason that the *crisis* is not a crisis of the civilized countries, but it is rather a *world crisis*, that is, is created by the rest of the world in order to prevent their civilization, but the western countries will eventually overcome the crisis and civilization will eventually cover the whole world. Eventually, the goodness of civilization will triumph.

At this point, the author of Genesis probably would point out that the only countries that are in *crisis* are precisely the *civilized* ones, and the more *civilized* and the older the civilization, the bigger the crisis, while the rest of the world is in no crisis at all. Actually, the rest of the world not only does not seem to be in any crisis at all, but seems to be doing quite well. Indeed, some of the fastest growing countries are precisely those that can hardly be called *civilized*, such as India, China, Brazil, Argentina, and so on. This crisis of the *civilized* countries is a *world crisis* because the western countries are *the world*, and if they are in crisis or they have become a Lamech, of course, the whole world is in trouble because everything revolves around them. And what does this Lamech and the *crisis* has to do with his wives? Well, this Alexandrian enterprise of conquering the world with civilization by the West with laser guided bombs is not really a conquest but rather *liberation*, a creed known in western academia as *feminism* and which has had as its main advocates ... surprise, surprise ... females. The idea is that *liberation* means *power*, and since in traditional societies power has been reserved to males, in the feminist creed, power and its liberating effects must be enjoyed by females as well and therefore males should be replaced in positions of power by females so that they can prove that they can use power at the same level as their male counterparts, if not better. While Great Britain had already proved to have Iron Ladies, France and the United States of America barely missed to elect an Iron Lady as presidents, while Germany has succeeded. But even if the United States of America has failed to elect an Iron Lady as president, it does not mean is in shortage of them. Actually, the most powerful position in the US government after that of the president is Secretary of State, because the Secretary of State is in charge of foreign policy and therefore exercises the role of world leadership while the president deals more with domestic affairs. And if one looks at those who held this position for the last decades would discover that they were all ... surprise, surprise ... women with one exception, Collin Powel, who was not just male but the general who led the first Iraq war as a general. When the second Iraq war started, however, he was Secretary of State but this time he was judged to be a weakling to conduct the war and was replaced by Condoleezza Rice, a truly hawkish leader fit to *liberate* the Iraqis taking into account that she was not just a *liberated* woman, but was also a descendant of the former liberated slaves. While feminists are busy to prove that females can make better warriors or Nephilims and can be better Alexanders and Hitlers, the author of Genesis seems to have known long ago that there

is always more iron in women than in men. In spite of that, he was not fascinated with iron, but rather with “vapor,” with “vanity,” with “Abels,” or with “Abel of Abels” or “vanity of vanities” as Ecclesiastes later put it. And I can see a reason why the ancient author was rather fascinated with vapor/vanity and not with iron: no matter how strong iron may be, not after many generations eventually turns into rust that turns into dust, while the vapor gets replaced by God and can survive for “thousands.” Whether that means “generations,” “years,” or “families” or all of the above, Genesis leaves it open. While the author of Genesis knew what would happen to Alexander the Great and his enterprise long before he was born, modern scholars are so fascinated with him and the supposed Greek *culture* that he promoted that are unable to see what is happening right under their nose.

INDEX

Abel, 4–5, 29, 36–37, 42, 56–57, 61
Abraham, 28
absurdity(ies), 46–47
Achilles, 10
Adam, 3–5, 7, 9, 11, 29, 35–37, 39–40, 42–43, 50, 57
Agamemnon, 10
Al Gore, *see* Gore, Al
Alexander the Great, 55–59, 61
Alice Bach, *see* Bach, Alice
American(s), 10, 19–24, 53, 57, 59
ancestor(s), 13, 28, 42, 47, 50–51
Anders Behring Breivik, *see* Breivik, Anders Behring
animal(s), 3, 5, 13, 24, 34–35, 54
archaeology, 31
Aristotle, 55, 57
Augustine, 6–7, 11
Bach, Alice, 41
bankruptcy, 41, 57–58
battle, 10, 33–34
beginning, 1–4, 9–10, 40, 56–59
belief(s), 12, 24–25, 28, 37, 41, 44, 48
Bible, 5, 12–13, 27–28, 32, 38, 41, 46, 48, 55
Big Bang, 1–2, 32
bigotry, 54, 56
binding, 51
birth, 9–10, 12, 17, 28, 35–36, 39, 44–45, 47
bishops, 24
blood, 16–17, 22, 31
bomb(s), 32, 56–58, 60
book, 20, 51
boson, 32
boss, 14–15
Breivik, Anders Behring, 21–22

British, 55–57
bronze, 14, 31–32
 age, 32
brute(s), 14–15
Bush, George W., 19–21
Cain, 4–5, 29–31, 34–45, 47–48, 50, 52, 56–57, 59
carcass(es), 59
cause, 6–8, 10
chaos, 15, 26
character, 18, 26, 29, 42, 46
cheerleaders, 35
chiastic structure, 4, 37
child(ren), 9, 12–13, 15–16, 20–22, 27–29, 35–38, 41, 43–47, 49, 51
Christian(s)/Christianity, 6, 28, 42, 54
citizen(s), 14, 22, 54, 56, 59
city, 4, 31, 38–39, 52–56
civilization(s), 53–60
civilized, 24, 54–56, 58–60
clan(s), 27–28, 48, 50
Clinton, 19–20
Collin Powel, *see* Powel, Collin
commonsense, 7, 11, 13–15, 41, 43–44, 51, 58
community(ise), 12–17, 25, 29, 31, 44
Condoleezza Rice, *see* Rice, Condoleezza
coronation, 17–18
count(ed), 5, 9, 11, 27–28, 50, 53
crafts(man), 13–14, 16, 18, 32–33
creation, 1–4, 9, 40, 43
creativity, 5, 18, 31–32
crisis, 59–60
critical, 24–26
 thinking, 24–25, 41, 49, 51, 55
culture(s), 8, 31, 35, 44–45, 61
curse(d), 11, 36
cycle(s), 9–10, 22, 44, 47
Dark Ages, 55
daughter(s), 5, 28, 35, 38, 42–44, 46
David Hume, *see* Hume, David
day(s), 5, 7, 9, 22–23, 27, 30, 34, 43–45, 51

death, 9–11, 13, 16–17, 28, 31, 37–40, 47, 57
deity(ies), 11–12, 17, 32, 37–38, 41, 44–45
democracy(ies), 19–20, 22–23
Democrat, 21
descendant(s), 4, –5, 9, 12–13, 16–17, 19–22, 27, 29, 31, 34–35, 37–38, 40, 42–43, 46–48, 50–52, 56–57, 59–60
devil, 51–53
dragon, 51
downfall, 40, 43, 59
dynasty, 15–17, 19–20, 24, 26, 47
earth, 2, 9, 28–29, 39, 43–44, 47
Eaton, 21
Eden, 4, 11, 14–16, 19, 29, 46, 57, 59
effect(s), 6–8, 10–11, 56, 60
Egyptian, 32
election(s), 19–21
end, 1, 4, 35, 38, 40, 47
enemy(ies), 19, 34–35
England, 21
enlightenment, 55–56
Enoch, 29–30, 38–40, 46
Enosh, 28–29, 37–38, 40, 57
entertainment, 3, 24–25, 34–35
epistemological, 11
Europe/European, 36, 55, 58–59
Eve, 3, 29–30, 36–37, 39, 41–42, 45, 51
event(s), 5–11, 21, 36, 51
evil(s), 4–5, 13, 22, 39, 41–43, 45, 49–51, 54, 56
experience(d), 1, 3, 7–8, 10–11, 15, 31, 34, 36
fall, 4, 7–8, 29, 46
family(ies), 13, 15–17, 19–20, 22–23, 26–28, 43–46, 48, 50, 52, 61
fates, 9
father(s), 5–6, 10, 12, 15–16, 21, 29, 34, 37–40, 45, 49–51
female(s), 4, 15, 16, 34–35, 37, 41–42, 44, 48, 60
feminist(s), 35–36, 41–43, 45, 60
fight(ing), 14, 16, 34–35
firstborn, 46
flood, 29, 39–40
food, 14, 33, 35, 45, 55, 59

foreigner(s), 14, 22
France/French, 21, 56–57, 60
fruit, 15
garden(s), 3
 of Eden, *see* Eden
Geeks, 5
genealogy(ies), 9–13, 15–16, 22, 26–29, 31–32, 34–50, 52, 56–57
generation(s), 9, 12–13, 15–16, 22, 47–51, 56, 61
Genesis, 1–6, 9, 11, 13, 28–29, 31, 38–43, 45–48, 51–52, 54, 56–60
Genghis Khan, 58–59
George W. Bush, *see* Bush, George W.
German(s)/ Germany, 12, 55–56, 58–60
god(s), 32, 41, 54
God, 3–5, 9, 11, 27, 29, 35–43, 49–52, 57, 61
good, 5, 41
goodies, 15, 55
Gore, Al, 20
government(s), 19–20, 22, 59–60
grace, 50
grade(s), 21
Great Britain, 19, 21, 60
Greek(s), 1, 5–11, 13, 28, 32, 54–59, 61
Hades, 28
heaven(s), 9, 47, 51
Hebrew(s), 9, 11, 27, 33, 37, 40, 46, 48–50
Helen, 10
Hephaestus, 32
hero(es), 10–11, 14, 35, 42–44
hierarchy, 16, 18–19
historian(s), 31, 59
history, 5–6, 9–11, 27, 31–34, 41, 43–45, 48, 53, 56–59
Hitler, 59–60
honey, 59
human(s)/ humanity/humankind, 2–6, 8–14, 18, 23–24, 26, 29–32, 34–37, 39–41, 43–48, 52, 54–55, 58
Hume, David, 7–8, 10
husband, 3
idiot(s), 2, 5–7, 11, 27, 36, 43–44, 49, 54–56
image, 4, 39, 44

immortal, 28
inferences, 8
instinct(s), 11, 34, 52
intermarriages, 44
interpretation(s), 11, 41–43, 49
Iphigenia, 10
Irak, 38
Iran(ian), 33
Iraq, 36, 60
iron, 3, 32–33, 45, 61
 age, 32
 Curtain, 53
 Lady(ies), 60–61
irrational(ity), 31, 52–53
Ishmael, 28
Israel(i)/Israelite(s), 27, 32–33, 53
Italy, 57
Jabal, 34, 42
Jared, 38
Jesus, 39
Jews, 46
John Kerry, *see* Kerry, John
John Paul II, 23
Jubal, 34, 42
judg(ed/s), 3, 14, 23, 60
jungle, 26
justice(s), 23–24
Karl Popper, *see* Popper, Karl
Kenan, 38
Kennedy, 19–20, 22–23
 Ted, 22–23
Kerry, John, 21
kill(er), 2, 4–5, 10, 15, 17, 21–22, 29–40, 42–47, 50–53, 55, 59
killings, 4, 10, 15, 21–22, 30–32, 35–37, 39–40, 42, 44, 47, 51–53
knowledge, 3–5, 12–16, 18, 20, 26, 29, 32–33, 37, 39, 41–42, 45, 48–50, 54–55, 57, 59
Lamech, 4, 29, 35–37, 39–43, 46, 52, 57, 59–60
language, 12–13, 28, 33, 40, 42, 44
law(s), 6–8, 10, 12, 17, 23, 48, 54
liberation, 24, 36, 42, 60

likeness, 4–5, 9, 29, 37
lion(s), 26, 59
LORD, 9, 27, 29, 37, 40, 43, 49, 51
male(s), 4, 14–16, 34–35, 37, 41–42, 44–45, 47–48, 60
man/men, 3–4, 12, 27–28, 35–36, 39, 41, 43, 45–46
marriage(s), 10, 16, 44–45
mass, 23
mass media, 23–25, 36, 53, 59
Mehujael, 37–38
Methuselah, 39–40, 46
Methushael, 37–39
Middle East, 43, 55–56
Mieke Bal, 41
millennium, 48, 51
mind(s), 2, 5–8, 11, 17, 29–30, 39, 43, 46–47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 56
monarchy, 19
moon, 9
myth(ical)/mythology, 1, 6–7, 9, 24, 26, 32, 36, 43, 46
name(s), 2, 4–5, 13, 18, 26–31, 33–34, 36–42, 46–47–48, 54–55, 57
natural world, 4–5, 9–12
nature, 7, 12, 30, 41
Nephilim, 43, 45–46, 60
New York City, 55
Nicolas Sarkozy, *see* Sarkozy, Nicolas
Noah, 29, 39–40
Nod, 29, 31
North Korea, 19
Norway, 22
nuclear, 32–33
number, 20, 22, 27–28, 47–48, 50–51
objective reality, *see* reality, objective
obscurantism, 54–56
office(r), 17–19, 20–23
Old Testament, 23
open society, 25
ordination, 14, 18, 24
original sin, *see* sin, original
Osiris, 32
paradox(ical), 6

parent(s), 12–13, 15, 20–22, 32, 36, 38, 40–42, 44–45, 48–51, 59
Paris, 10
particle(s), 2, 32
party(ies), 19–22
past, 1, 3–6, 11
patriarch(al), 41–42, 45–46
Patroclus, 10
Paul, 46
Paul II, Pope John, 23
permanence, 8–10, 15, 31, 47
philanthropic, 55
Philistines, 32–33
philosopher(s)/philosophy, 5–7, 25, 54–58
Phyllis Tribble, 43
plant(s), 3, 13
politician(s), 20–23, 59
polygamy, 35–36
Pope(s), 22–23
Popper, Karl, 22, 25
Portugal, 57
Powel, Collin, 60
power, 5, 13–27, 31–34, 36, 39, 41–46, 48, 52–53, 60
present, 4–6, 11–12, 41, 45
president, 19–23, 60
priest(ly), 17–18, 23
prison(s), 30, 53
rape, 43
rationality, 5, 40
reader(s), 1–5, 8–9, 11, 19, 28–29, 36–37, 39–40, 42–44, 46–47, 51, 56
reality, 3–4, 7–8, 11–12, 15, 22, 26, 31, 35, 43–44, 46
 blocker(s), 46–47
 objective, 8, 11, 41
 reasoned, 5, 8, 11–13, 15–16, 18, 23–28, 31–33, 36, 40, 44–45, 47, 52
reason, 9–10, 12, 16, 18–10, 21, 26–27, 34–36, 41–42, 48, 51–52, 60–61
reasoning(s), 6, 8
religion, 17, 19, 23–24, 36, 41, 54–56
Republican, 21
Revelation, 51, 53
rhetoric of sexuality, 43

Rice, Condoleezza, 60
Romans, 55–56
royal blood, 16–17
ruler(s), 15–20, 31–33
sacrifice, 10
safety, 39, 52–53, 57
Samson, 59
Sarkozy, Nicolas, 21
Satan, 51–52
scholar(s), 2, 4–7, 10–11, 29, 36, 40–43, 45–46, 51, 54–59, 61
school(s), 20–21, 24–25, 42, 45
sciences, 6
scientific, 2, 6, 8, 10–11, 32
 thinking, 5, 8–11
scientist(s), 2, 8, 32, 55
seasons, 9
security, 16–18, 31, 39, 53
serpent, 4, 51
servants, 19
Seth, Egyptian god, 32
Seth, son of Adam, 5, 28–29, 36–40, 42–43, 45–46, 50, 57
sex(ual), 34–36, 41–43, 47
shame, 3, 11
sin, 42, 49, 57
 original, 46, 50, 57
singularity, 2
society(ies), 12, 17, 19–20, 22–27, 29–30, 32, 35, 41, 44–45, 47–48, 60
son(s), 5, 9–10, 13, 20, 28–31, 36–40, 42–43, 46–47, 49–51, 57
 of God, 43
songs, 34
soul, 27–28
Spain/Spaniards, 55–57
Sparta, 10
spoil, 15
sports, 34
stone age, 8, 32
story(ies), 1–4, 40, 43, 46, 59
stupid/stupidity, 2–3, 5, 7, 10, 14, 55
sun, 7–9, 12

sword(s), 14, 31, 33–34, 59
tabloids, 19
teaching, 18, 24
technology, 31–34, 59
Ted Kennedy, *see* Kennedy, Ted
text(s), 28–29, 33, 39–41, 43, 46–47, 49–50, 54
theologians, 6
thinking, 5–8, 10, 18, 24–26, 28–30, 33, 36, 38, 41, 47, 49–51, 54–55, 58–59
thousand, 5–6, 26–28, 40, 46, 48–51, 56, 58, 61
time(s), 1, 3, 5–9, 11–12, 15, 17–20, 22, 26–32, 34–37, 39, 43, 45–49, 52–53, 57–58, 60
 circular, 8–9, 11
 liniar, 7–11
timeline, 5, 8–9, 11
tools, 3, 31–33
trade, 55
traditional(ly), 11, 24–26, 34, 48–49, 60
tree(s), 3, 15, 27, 29–36, 59
 of knowledge, 3–4, 37, 39, 57
tribe(s), 27, 55
Trojan War, 10
Troy, 10
Tubal-cain, 31, 34
United Methodist Church, 24
United States of America, 19–23, 36, 60
universe, 2, 32, 49
university(ies), 21, 24–25, 45, 53, 55–56, 58
violent/violence, 29–39, 41–47, 50–53, 57
Vulcan, 32
wall(s), 30–31, 39, 53
war(s), 10, 14, 32, 35, 53, 56, 58, 60
warrior(s), 34–35, 43–46
weapon(s), 30–33, 45, 52, 59
widows, 35–36
wife/wives, 3–4, 16, 20, 35–36, 42–43, 45, 60
wildebeest(s), 26
woman/women, 3, 34–36, 41–43, 45, 60–61
world, 1–5, 7, 9–12, 31–34, 45, 48, 52–56, 58–60
World Trade Center, 55
writer, 5–7, 9, 11, 29–30, 32, 34–35, 37–39, 41–42, 44–47

Yale, 21

youth, 20–22

Zillah, 31, 42

