tree, and the tree of life was the important one, and man was not to eat of the tree of life, and then after he had taken of it, we read that, God drove out the man; from the and he placed atht the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." (Gen. 3:24. So, we have two different stories which are confused here. I do not think so at all 1 I do not think you wunderstand this if you do not understand the little of the nature of the second tree. Now, the tree of Alas life which was in the midst of the garden is all too easy for us to think of it as some sort of magical tree. All you have to do is to simply eat of that tree and live forever. Now, that is an unbiblical Man is not some sort of a thing you just make a change in him, and that changes him forever. Man is a moving, active organism, and the tree of life was not a tree of magical effects from the eating of it- one apple, one piece from it, but it was a tree of life as I would understand as being the arrangement which God made for completely replacing that which was torn down and destroyed by man's organism in the course of the days' activity. And therefore if one kept on eating of the tree of life he would live forever not by one eating by- but by constantly eating it. We read in Revelation that God is to es-e-reestablish the tree of life. We are not ... Life, eternal life is not a sort of stationary, immovable dream, like the nirvana of the Buddhah. It is to be a continuous thing of activity, and there is a tree troken of life to replace entirely that which is down so that we do not age and die. And so when God says, In the day thou eatest it -- thereof, theu shalt surely die. God was not a cruel tyrant who drove man out of the garden in jealousy of man because he wanted to be like god, and kept him from the