

Happiness – where does it come from?

By Walter R. Dolen

Copyright (C) Walter R. Dolen 2022

In the Beginning God gave mankind a choice,¹ you can eat from any tree in the Garden of Eden, except one. That one forbidden tree was the *Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil*. Notice it was a tree of **knowledge**. Not just any knowledge, but the knowledge of at least two opposite things: good and evil. Mankind took and ate from that forbidden tree after Satan's subtle lie to the woman (Eve). First the woman ate from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, then the man (Adam). Consequently both Adam and Eve were not only going to learn about good and evil, but also die the death that Satan lied about — Satan became the first killer through his lie, and consequently mankind began to learn about death, pain and hard work. From this, the knowledge of unhappiness entered the world. Also because they ate the fruit of knowledge, they lost their access to the **Tree of Life**. The **tree of life** was taken away from them and right away they started manifesting the knowledge of evil — lying, hiding, blaming others, etc. The beginning of the knowledge of evil, death, pain, hard back-breaking work and unhappiness began for mankind and the world. See the scripture about this at the end of this paper:

Does mankind have an excuse? There are some scriptures that indicate that the tree of knowledge was the grandest, tallest and most beautiful tree in the garden of Eden [**Ezekiel 31:1-11; see Dan 4:11ff**]. After being tempted by the snake (Satan) Eve chose the tree that looked best and Adam followed his wife's lead and also ate from that forbidden tree even though he was commanded in person by God not to eat from it. He made the mistake of following his beautiful wife instead of being a leader and saying no to her. Eve knew from Adam (Genesis 3:2) that she was not suppose to eat from that tempting tree or she would die the death. But she did anyway and so did Adam. **Unhappiness** entered the world along with death because they chose by appearance instead of by knowledge. But at that time they didn't have the **knowledge** of good, evil and death. They were just created! They had yet to learn about good and evil and death. After they ate the forbidden fruit they were cast out of the garden of eden to learn the knowledge of good, evil, death and hardship.

What is the purpose of this age? Why is there evil in this world? Isn't God all powerful? So why didn't God just create people instantly happy, make people good and make people immortal? After all he made angels immoral, even Satan. What's going on here? Is God at fault for making the tree of **knowledge** of good and evil more grand than the other trees? Isn't God at fault for making the angels of evil, including Satan? Why isn't the age we live in a happy age? Can God make happiness? Yes, God can, but it takes the **knowledge** of good *and* evil and everything that the **knowledge** of good and evil entails for happiness to be created.

Let me explain:

¹ Was it a free choice? See, New Mind Papers, NM9 — "Free Will versus Predestination"

Law of Knowledge

— Happiness comes through Knowledge —

by Walter R. Dolen

There is an actual *law of knowledge*. As we will show there is also a connection between this law and happiness. What is happiness? Is happiness something you put on? Is paradise a place you just go to? No! Happiness is **not** something you put on; paradise is **not** a place you can go to, to be happy. Without the **knowledge** of good and evil, you cannot know or live in paradise. Yes, you can live in “paradise,” a place without hunger or death or fear or evil, all your life, but you would never be happy in such a place, if you never experienced or lived in a non-paradise place. Why? Because you would never have had something to compare paradise with. Riches, a perfect body, a perfect mate or a perfect environment cannot make you happy *unless*, unless you have something to compare them to. You have to *know* certain things to be happy. Happiness is not understood in isolation. Happiness is not a thing in itself. You cannot put happiness on without knowledge. You can't create happiness without its opposite quality, which is unhappiness. Happiness is a comparative quality, which comes into being through a learning process. Happiness is the opposite to unhappiness. To learn about or know either, you must compare one to the other because they are comparative qualities. Our experience with opposite qualities teaches us this. You know you are rich if you have poor people around you. You know some food is good tasting if you have tasted bad tasting food. You know something is up because you know there is a down. You know something is right because you know there is something left. You know something is functional because you know there is something dysfunctional. The same goes for good and evil. You are able to know there is something good because you learned something is evil through comparing both qualities. If you never had any experience with evil, you wouldn't even know what was good. You have to know both good and evil to know either. Furthermore, the fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil not only teaches you about good and evil, but about everything else. Wait. How can I say that? Because there is a law of knowledge that manifests this. You learn about good and evil through this law. You can be happy only because of this law.

Law of Knowledge

The Mind processes information through a method called the “law of knowledge.” The *Law of knowledge* is a rule or principle or formula for obtaining knowledge, whether this knowledge is obtained by a child or by an adult or by an animal or even by a spiritual angel.

Basic Definition of the Law of Knowledge:

Knowledge of **A** is equal to and dependent on the knowledge of **non-A**

(**A** can be any particular object, technique or belief; **non-A** is anything but that particular object, technique or belief)

It follows —

The depth of one's knowledge of **A** is contingent upon the depth of one's knowledge of **non-A**; particularly, in the case of **opposite qualities** (light and darkness), you must know *both* qualities to know either; you must compare each with the other to know either.

In other words:

- To know **A** you must also know **non-A**;
- The knowledge of **A** presupposes knowledge of **non-A**;
- In order to know **A** you must compare **A** with **non-A**.
- the knowledge of **A** is proportional to the knowledge of **non-A**;

Examples

Knowledge of *Opposite Values*

Light and Darkness: A way to explain the law of knowledge is to manifest how it works with opposite qualities. To begin we will use the example of a totally blind person (from birth). Try to empathize with a person that was totally blind from birth. Light is the quality that allows one's eyes to see objects. Without light no one would see even if they had perfect eyes. Light is the quality that the totally blind person cannot perceive or comprehend and is clinically recorded as NLP — “no light perception.”

If one has never seen light, how would you explain light to that person? What choice words would describe light to someone who has never seen light? To explain anything to someone who has never seen it, you have to use comparison, and say it is like this or like that. But there is no comparative quality in the universe that compares with light. It would be impossible for someone to explain light to another, let alone sight, if that person had never seen light.

Yet at the same time one truly doesn't know what *darkness* is until one has seen light. The very definition of dark is: “without light.” Darkness means without light as light means “without darkness.” Each definition is dependent on its opposite quality. A definition of something is a statement of the knowledge of that thing. To know light or darkness by their very definition presupposes knowledge of each other. A totally blind person in order to know what darkness is, would have to see light. He knows darkness only if he sees light, for it is only then that he will understand what people were talking about when they spoke of darkness. The only reason that anyone can close their eyes, and call the result darkness, is because they have *seen* light. One cannot know darkness or light unless one has seen both and compared both qualities with each other. Specifically in the case of opposite qualities, one's knowledge of light (**A**) is dependent upon and equal to one's knowledge of darkness (**non-A**), and vice versa.

The ability to see light and darkness does not bring sight. We are blind if we do not see light and we are blind if we *only* see light. Being blind because we only see light is like awakening from sleep and someone immediately beams a bright light into our eyes: we are blind from the light. Having knowledge of only light and darkness is very limited knowledge and doesn't equate to sight; sight is distinguishing between different objects, not just between light and darkness. There is more to sight than just knowing both extremes. Sophisticated knowledge does not dwell in extremes, it dwells in-between: we only have sight because we see in shades of light (colored) and varying luminance.

Sound and Silence: The same applies to sound and silence. If one has never heard sound, how would he know what is silence? Sound and silence are opposite qualities as light and darkness are opposite qualities. You must know both to know either, and you must compare each with the other to know either. Since these two qualities are interrelated, one has to know both to know either. The very basic definition of sound (“without silence”) and silence (“without sound”) need the opposite quality to define it. To know sound or silence by their very basic definition presupposes knowledge of each other.

Life and Death: Further, one doesn't know what life is until he has known or seen death. To have knowledge of life you must have knowledge of death. One is very aware of life only if one has seen or become aware of death. Life and death are comparative qualities and are tied to each other in our minds. We can only know what life is if we know what death is and vice versa. Real understanding comes from knowing what is between both extremes. One extreme is death; the

other is eternal life. Between these extremes is the sickness-health continuum. It is the knowledge of the differences that lay between the extremes that gives us understanding and appreciation of life.

Knowledge of *Relative Values*

Hot and Cold: The law of knowledge also applies to qualities of hot and cold, except these two qualities should be called, comparative opposite qualities. One knows something is cold only so far as he has something hot to compare it with. You can place your hand into a container of water that is 90 degrees and it may feel warm to you depending on the relative temperature of the air around you. But if you place your hand into a container that is 120 degrees and keep it there for a while, and then place it again into the container of water of 90 degrees, the 90 degree water will then feel cool while before it felt warm. Your knowledge of hot or cold is obtained through contrast and comparison of both qualities. Knowledge of hot or cold presupposes knowledge of the other quality. Hot and cold are comparative qualities and are tied to each other in our minds.

Good and Evil: It follows that since good and evil are opposite qualities, in order to know good you must know evil, but also to know evil, you must know good. In order to “know” either quality you must *compare* both qualities with each other. Conceptually, good and evil are opposites, yet they are also tied to each other in the mind. Good and evil are comparative qualities. The water of 90 degrees can be compared to a small town with 5 murders per year, while the water of 120 degrees may be the same town with 50 murders per year. When the town had 5 murders a year, one felt it was bad, but when it became 50 murders a year, one could look back at the 5 murders per year as “the good old days.” Here is an example of relative evil. An example could also be given about relative good. So there is relativity to good and evil. To have real knowledge of either you must have knowledge of both and the many shades in-between.

Right and Left: The right side has no meaning unless there be a left side just as good has no meaning without evil. You don’t know what the meaning of right is until you know about left; you don’t know what left is until you know what right is. You need knowledge about both to know either. You don’t know something is “high” unless you know there is something “lower.” You don’t know something is “low” unless you know something is “higher.” You don’t know a “plus” quality until you know its “minus” quality. You don’t know a “minus” quality unless you know its “plus” quality.

Appreciation and Knowledge: You don’t know or realize harmony, if you have never known confusion. If one had always lived in an environment where there was no confusion, where there was only harmony, would he realize the goodness of that harmonic environment? Would harmony be appreciated or mean anything special in such an environment? Can anyone really *appreciate* harmony if they have never lived in confusion? Confusion and harmony are comparative qualities and one only knows either by knowing both.

If one had good vision for forty years, and then loses his sight, he would truly know the value of sight, as does a blind person who miraculously gains his sight. (This actually is more difficult since the few totally blind persons from birth who gained their sight had/have trouble “learning” to see since sight is also an ability that is learned.) But why does someone after he loses his sight, come to *appreciate* the sight he once had?

Appreciation and Happiness: What does it mean to appreciate something? Webster’s Dictionary says that to appreciate something one must: “recognize it gratefully; estimate its worth; estimate it rightly; be fully aware of it; and notice it with discrimination.” When one comes to appreciate something, one in fact comes to know that thing and be grateful for its worthiness. One comes to know the worth of good only after he has lived in evil. There is no such thing as paradise without learning or living in its contrary; there is no such thing as **happiness** without learning or living in its contrary. How can one really be happy unless one has been sad in the past before he reached the place of **happiness**? **Happiness** is a plus quality and one compares it in his mind with its negative quality (unhappiness) in order to fully understand **happiness**. You become happy after you know and live in an unhappy state because you have something to compare it to.

Opposite qualities need to be compared to each other to know either. Opposite qualities are tied to each other in our minds because we need to understand both in order to understand either. This connection or tie-in between opposites is only in our minds and is used by our minds to sharpen our understanding. We would never understand a positive quality if we never had its negative quality to compare it with. Of course, once we learn both concepts we choose only the positive one since it is within the positive quality that happiness dwells. In case of opposite qualities, where there is no real negative quality, such as in spatial directions (right and left or up and down) there are no negatives to negate.

Summarizing the Law of Knowledge as it pertains to *good and evil*:

[compare this with our definition of the Law above]

Knowledge of **Good** (A) is equal to and dependent on the knowledge of **Evil** (non-A)

(A can be any particular good object, technique, behavior or belief; **non-A** is anything but that particular good object, technique, behavior or belief)

It follows —

The depth of one's knowledge of **Good** is contingent upon the depth of one's knowledge of **Evil**; particularly, in the case of **opposite qualities** (good and evil), you must know *both* qualities to know either; you must compare each with the other to know either.

In other words:

- To know *good* you must also know **evil**;
- The knowledge of **good** presupposes knowledge of **evil**;
- In order to know **good** you must compare **good** with **evil**.
- the knowledge of **good** is proportional to the knowledge of **evil**;

Read more about the law of knowledge in the *New Mind* papers in part NM19 or in the *God Papers* in part GP7 for details.

So far we have mostly talked about opposite qualities such as light and darkness or good and evil. But **the Law of Knowledge not only explains knowledge of opposite qualities, but also knowledge of everything capable of being known. To know more about this, read on:**

How a Child Learns What a Cow Is

Another way to understand the Law of Knowledge is to understand how a child learns. Children's simple generalizations reflect lack of differentiation. That is, a child's wrong generalization about a cow (**A**) reflects lack of knowledge of the difference between a cow and all that is not a cow (**non-A**), such as other four legged animals.

A child when he is first learning about four legged animals sometimes may mix up a cow and a horse,² or a cow and a deer, or even a cow and a dog. This is because the child does not know what a cow is not. When parents first begin telling their child what a cow is, they point to a cow and say, "that is a cow." The child 'sees' this living animal with four legs. Yet he doesn't know what a cow is very well. His knowledge is superficial because he may only have seen a few other four legged animals and thus has little information to compare the four legged cow with.

² My young daughter brought this home to me when she mixed up four legged animals

Depending on how many other four legged animals are pointed out to him, he may still mix the cow up with any or all other four legged animals. After a cow is pointed out to him he may call a horse a cow, after all, to the child a horse is a four legged living animal (not a two legged animal or a toy animal or stuffed animal) just like the cow pointed out earlier by his parents. But the child is wrong. This four legged animal is a horse, not a cow. The child fails to differentiate between a cow and a horse. How does the parent correct the child? The parent says, “no, it is not a cow, it is a horse.” The parent is telling the child what a cow is not. The parent by telling the child what is not a cow, is helping the child to learn what is a cow. Normally, after the child learns that a horse is not a cow, he normally doesn’t call a horse a cow again. But the child may call a deer or other four legged animals a cow. When the child does this he is again corrected, “no, it is not a cow, it is a deer.” The child has learned something else is not a cow (**A**); he has learned one more of the **non-A’s** (all else besides cows). The more the child learns about other four legged animals not being cows, the better he is able to understand what a cow is. A cow is a four legged animal of a certain size (a cow is not a dog because for one thing a cow is bigger than a dog, etc.) and not any other four legged animal: it is not a dog, it is not a horse, it is not a deer, it is not an elephant, it is not a bear, etc.

But further the child from other knowledge knows a living cow is not a mountain, it is not dead (not a dead toy, not a dead stuffed animal, etc.), it is not a rock, it is not the sky, it is not a two legged animal, it is not an ant, it is not a fish, it is not fog, it is not a color, it is not a quality like “good,” it is not a plant, it is not water, etc. The child knows more what a cow is, by the more he knows what a cow is not. Thus, the knowledge of a cow (**A**) is dependent on the knowledge of what a cow is not (**non-A**); the more he knows what a cow is not (**non-A**) the more the child knows what is a cow (**A**).

How a Child Learns the Color Green

Let’s use another example, the color *green*. The more we know what the color green is *not*, the more we know the uniqueness of the color green. One way to identify green, besides pointing to it, is to show what green is *not*. Since most of us know what the color green is, we will again try to understand how a child learns the color green.

First “green” is a subdivision of color. Before a child can learn what the color “green” is, he must know what is color. In order for a child to understand “color” his parents tell him, “that thing is the *color* green, that thing is the *color* red, that thing is the *color* blue, that thing is the *color* orange, that thing is the *color* purple, that thing is the *color*” Along with learning what color is, the child comes to understand (through comparison) what color is *not*: the color green on a wall is not the wall, it is not the *material* that makes up the wall such as wall board, or wood studs, or nails, etc., but the quality on the wall that we call “green” is the *color* of the wall. A child learns what the color is by understanding what color is not. So before a parent can make a child understand exactly what the “color” green is, the child has to understand what “color” is, by understanding what “color” is not. Once he understands the concept of color, this knowledge becomes acquired knowledge, and he can use this prior knowledge to build a better understanding of the color green. He comes to understand what the different colors are because each color is being named or pointed out to him by his parents or teachers. If his teacher correctly points out to him the color that is universally taught as green, then he obtains the true knowledge of green. Through comparison with past knowledge in his mind, he comes to know what green is and is not. If he is taught incorrectly what the color green is (his teachers points out red, but calls it green), he obtains false knowledge.

Green is not:

a tree, a bush, a rock, an animal, a fish, a man, the universe, the sun, the moon, our parents, a car, a road, atoms, space, form or shape, relative position in space, time, a dimension, or any other thing or quality except for a quality we call “color.”

More specifically green is not:

red, blue, orange, purple, nor any other color but green

Note: The nature of green or any other color has to do with human brain and its software, and the way mind-brain interprets the electromagnetic spectrum rays reflecting off the ‘green’ object.

To summarize, *green* is **A**; *green* is not **non-A** (a rock, a shape, a concept, or red). We know *green* (**A**) because we know what *green* is not. Knowledge of **A** is equal or dependent on the knowledge of **non-A**.

Afterword: There are other subdivisions of this law, which are dependent on how one defines a category. The mind seems to have a need to classify things, which may be some aspect of the mind's wiring (software). An example of a subdivision is: the knowledge of cows (**A**) is dependent on how we categorize cows as well as well as one's knowledge of all the non-cows in that category (**some non-As**), as well as our knowledge of all that is not in that category (**the remainder of non-As**).

Copyright (c) 1970-2022 by Walter R. Dolen

[First published in early versions of the BeComingOne Papers and was first conceived in a college essay in the late 1960s. This version is an updated improved version of a 2012 version.]

[buy the author's books here](#)

Knowledge.

What is knowledge? Although the definition of knowledge is an ongoing debate among philosophers, we will define it as follows:

knowledge —

- is the information held by our mind's memory about something
- is the realization of something or awareness of something or comprehension of something or identification of something by certain characteristics or differences.

There are at least five categories of knowledge:

- *knowledge about things* (objects, persons, places, materials, etc),
- *knowledge of how to do things* (technique),
- *knowledge of beliefs* (concepts; theories; assumptions),
- *intuitive knowledge* (subconscious; genetically wired 'instincts' or software of the brain),
- *false or fictitious knowledge* (whether taught as truth or not; works of fiction; etc.).

Mind: I use the word *mind* to mean the totality of *physical brain-body* because the mind (the whole brain-body system) holds the memory of the processed impulses that have entered the memory cells from all the body's senses, from its nervous system and from each cell of the body through the axon-synapse system³ and other systems we may not be aware of at this time. The *mind*, the "thinking thing" according to Descartes (1596-1650), is **not** a non-material substance as Descartes wrongfully supposed: it is material, physical. [There may be other forces that also interact with the material forces, i.e., intelligent electro magic waves and/or the "other-mind."] There is no such thing as a mind-body dichotomy: the brain interacts, passively and actively, with the whole body. The mind is the intelligence and awareness aspect of this brain-body. This awareness is what most people call consciousness — being aware of one's self within the external world. Awareness is something learned. This awareness comes from the knowledge obtained through the process called

³ Axons are long projections of nerve cells (neurons) that conduct electrical impulses through which they make contact with other cells (neurons, muscles or glands) at junctions called synapses. The bundles of axons that make up nerves can be very small (one millimeter) or very long: the sciatic nerve is one meter in length. In the [nervous system](#), a synapse is a structure that permits a [neuron](#) to pass an electrical or chemical signal to another cell. These impulses permeate the whole body.

the law of knowledge. Knowledge is acquired by our mind through all our senses, nervous system, our memory and through our unique genetically wired brains — the ‘software of the brain,’⁴ and possibly from other electromagnetic waves or other information (from the other-mind or new mind) that our mind acquires. Not only does the mind receive impulses, it also sends out impulses to all body members including the brain itself. The nervous system and brain are interconnected and interactive with every cell in the body. One axon can communicate with thousands of synaptic terminals, just as one line of software code can interact with thousands of other lines of code, which in turn are connected to and work with the inter-circuits of the computer’s brain or CPU. We can look at this by analogy: the whole body is an integral extension of the mind as the peripherals of the computer (its printer, monitor, speaker, electronic sniffer, keyboard, memory board, robotic arms, Internet and camera) are integral extensions of the electronic computer. The mind is worthless without the body; the computer’s CPU is worthless without its peripherals. The mind can only obtain information through its body and its interaction with its environment; the computer can only obtain information through its peripherals and their interaction with its environment. From this information the mind and/or computer interacts with the world. In the next world, the new heaven and earth, the New Mind will interact with God’s Mind of love while the other-mind with its confusion will no longer exist. Happiness will always exist; no pain or unhappiness will exist. This is the good news.

The closing word

The real God could not create good without also creating evil. That is why there where two angels in the Holy of holies. At the right side was the Becoming-One angel, the angel with God’s real Name — the real God’s messenger. At the left side was the other god who brought evil and death to the world [GP8]:

Isa 45:6 That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. **I am the Becoming-One, and there is none else.**

Isa 45:7 I form the light, and create darkness: **I make peace, and create evil:** I the Becoming-One do all these things.

He creates evil so we can know good. He creates evil through the left cherub. Our God is the right side, the side of Jesus Christ, who will bring the peace and bring everything back into the power of God.

⁴ Computer software is simply the interconnectivity of computer processing unit (CPU); this interconnectivity is programed (wired) into the CPU. At one time software was merely “wired control panels” [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:IBM402plugboard.Shrigley.wireside.jpg>] that directed certain impulses from one section of the computer to another. This is comparative to how our brains are wired, through the axon-synapses’ interconnectivity [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chemical_synapse]. The programable plugboard can be re-wired, just as our brain can be re-wired after an injury.

Notes

Scriptures on the Tree of knowledge of Good and Evil (BCB translation):

Genesis 1:24 And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living soul after her kind, animal, and creeping thing, and living things of the earth after her kind: and it was so.

25 And God made the living things of the earth after her kind, and animal after her kind, and every thing that creeps upon the earth after his kind: and God saw that it was good.

26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the animal, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps, upon the earth.

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

28 And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue her: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moves upon the earth.

29 And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for food.

...

Genesis 2:7 And the Becoming-One God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

8 And the Becoming-One God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.

9 And out of the ground made the Becoming-One God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the **tree of knowledge of good and evil**.

...

Genesis 2:15 And the Becoming-One God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.

16 And the Becoming-One God commanded the man, saying, **Of every tree of the garden you may freely eat:**

17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, you shall not eat of it: for in the day that you eat from it, in dying, you will die.

...

Gen 3:1 **Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Becoming-One God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yes,** has God said, you shall not eat of every tree of the garden?

2 And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:

3 But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God has said, you shall not eat of it, neither shall you touch it, lest you die.

4 **And the serpent said unto the woman, not in dying shall you be dead. [He slips in this lie here]**

5 For God does know that in the day you eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be as God, knowing good and evil.

6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

7 And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.

8 And they heard the voice of the Becoming-One God walking in the garden in the wind of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Becoming-One God among the trees of the garden.

9 And the Becoming-One God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where are you?

10 And he said, I heard your voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.

11 And he said, Who told you that you were naked? have you eaten of the tree, whereof I commanded you that you should not eat?

12 And the man said, The woman whom you gave to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.

13 And the Becoming-One God said unto the woman, What is this that you have done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.

14 And the Becoming-One God said unto the serpent, Because you have done this, you are cursed above every animal, and above every beast of the field; upon your belly shall you go, and dust shall you eat all the days of your life:

15 And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her seed; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel.

16 Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply your pain and your conception; in pain you shall bring forth children; and your desire shall be to your husband, and he shall rule over you.

17 And unto Adam he said, Because you have listened unto the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree, of which I commanded you, saying, you shall not eat of it: cursed is the ground for your sake; in toil shall you eat of it all the days of your life;

18 Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to you; and you shall eat the herb of the field;

19 In the sweat of your face shall you eat bread, till you return unto the ground; for out of it were you taken: for dust you are, and unto dust shall you return.

20 And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living.

21 Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Becoming-One God make coats of skins, and clothed them.

22 And the Becoming-One God said, Behold, the man is become as one from us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for olam . . .

23 Therefore the Becoming-One God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from where he was taken.

24 So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubs, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to guard the way of the tree of life.

Go back

...

A few more Scriptures on the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil

Eze 31:1 And it came to pass in the eleventh year, in the third month, in the first day of the month, that the word of the BeComig-One came unto me, saying, [ab. 3388 YM; 587/6 BC]

2 Son of man, speak unto Pharaoh [a type of Satan] king of Egypt, and to his multitude; Whom are you like in your greatness?

3 Behold, the **Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon** [a type of the tree of knowledge...] **with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of a high stature; and his top was among the thick boughs.**

4 The waters made him great, the deep set him up on high with her rivers running round about his plants, and sent out her little rivers unto all the trees of the field.

5 Therefore **his height was exalted above all the trees of the field**, and his boughs were multiplied, and his branches became long because of the multitude of waters, when he shot forth.

6 All the fowls of the heavens made their nests in his boughs, and under his branches did all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under his shadow dwelt all great nations.

7 Thus was he fair in his greatness, in the length of his branches: for his root was by great waters.

8 **The cedars in the garden of God could not hide him:** the fir trees were not like his boughs, and the chestnut trees were not like his branches; **nor any tree in the garden of God was like unto him in his beauty.**

9 **I have made him fair by the multitude of his branches: so that all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God, envied him.**

10 Therefore thus says my Lord(s) the Becoming-One; Because you have lifted up yourself in height, and he has shot up his top among the thick boughs, and his heart is lifted up in his height;

The following shows in prophecy how this great tree will be destroyed:

Daniel 4:9 O Belteshazzar [another name for Daniel], master of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in you, and no secret troubles you, tell me the visions of my dream that I have seen, and the interpretation thereof.

10 Thus were the visions of mine head in my bed; I saw, and behold, **a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great.**

11 The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth:

12 The leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was food for all: the beasts of the field had shadow under it, and the fowls of the heavens dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it.

13 I saw in the visions of my head upon my bed, and, behold, a watcher and a holy one came down from heaven;

14 He cried aloud, and said thus, Hew down the tree, and cut off his branches, shake off his leaves, and scatter his fruit: let the beasts get away from under it, and the fowls from his branches:

15 Nevertheless leave the stump of his roots in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts in the grass of the earth:

16 Let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beasts' heart be given unto him: and let seven times pass over him.

17 This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the most High rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomsoever he will, and sets up over it the basest of men.

18 This dream I king Nebuchadnezzar have seen. Now you, O Belteshazzar, declare the interpretation thereof, forasmuch as all the wise men of my kingdom are not able to make known unto me the interpretation: but you are able; for the spirit of the holy gods is in you.

19 Then Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, was astonished for one hour, and his thoughts troubled him. The king spoke, and said, Belteshazzar, let not the dream, or the interpretation thereof, trouble you. Belteshazzar answered and said, My lord, the dream be to them that hate you, and the interpretation thereof to your enemies.

20 **The tree that you saw, which grew, and was strong, whose height reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to all the earth;**

21 Whose leaves were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was food for all; under which the beasts of the field dwelt, and upon whose branches the fowls of the heavens had their habitation:

22 It is you, O king, that are grown and become strong: for your greatness is grown, and reaches unto heaven, and your dominion to the end of the earth.

23 **And whereas the king saw a watcher and a holy one coming down from heaven, and saying, Hew the tree down, and destroy it;** yet leave the stump of the roots thereof in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts of the field, till seven times pass over him;

24 This is the interpretation, O king, and this is the decree of the most High, which is come upon my lord the king:

Go Back

See my book, [Prophecy Papers](#), to see more details. This is understandable once you understand the type and antitype of the Bible.

Note: This paper was reworked on August 28, 2022 to be more understandable to the average reader than its original released paper of August 7, 2022. A few spelling errors and typos were corrected on December 7, 2022.