CLONING IN GENESIS FOR SEX HIERARCHY IN THE FEMINIST DOMAIN

Falak Shan  
Bachelor of Clinical Medicine, Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, China  
Shanaaz Essop  
Master’s Degree Student - University Of Kwazulu – Natal’s School Of Theology, Philosophy And Classics At The Pietermaritzburg Campus Of The University

Abstract
The paper attempts by means of a literature review to discuss Cloning as outlined in Genesis for sex hierarchy in the feminist Domain. In positing arguments in respect of the subject matter, the researchers are aware that the topic is a controversial issue that will raise concerns from various quarters. In no way does the paper attempt to compromise the belief system of Christians or for that matter Christianity. It explores the concept as outlined in the Old Testament and links the concept to the New Testament in terms of both the theological and socio – cultural paradigm. The paper must therefore, be clearly understood without emotion from the perspectives of feminist theology. In so doing the paper makes some salient observations, in this regard using the bible as its point of reference. It therefore, further explores the mass control of people through the processes of colonialism and imperialism that was used to subjugate people in order to adhere to the tenets of Christianity. In so doing, the paper argues that Christianity was used to passively and aggressively, exploit the masses, and to drive its globalizing agenda. It also argues that the concepts of liberation and equality, in the context of feminism, are reactionary to social reform and therefore, cannot be substantiated by biblical reinterpretation. It further argues that including genesis there are other verses of gender inequality in the bible, which seems to ratify Eve’s secondary position to Adam or woman’s secondary position to men. The paper therefore explores the biological aspects of biblical patriarchy in terms of the concepts of primal socialization. The authors have no doubt that the paper through the concept of a literature review will open up sensitive issues that have not hitherto been explored. The paper uses empirical evidence based on science to articulate the views of the authors. In this sense the literature review sets out to explore and discuss this important issue from the perspective of broadening our horizons in respect of issues that have hitherto not been fully explained to the adherents of the different religions and particularly to the adherents of Christianity in terms of the equality of women. It is hoped that this paper will reach a wide audience and shed some light on an important subject matter and topic that requires further in depth exploration by researchers in general.
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Introduction

Christian theological belief has placed much import on the book of Genesis, as it holds fifty percent of their belief; the original sin which links the Old Testament to the salvation concept in the New Testament. Genesis has been under scrutiny by Scholars in both theological and socio-cultural paradigms. W.S. Towne (2005) explored Adam and Eve under the concept of Clones of God. He aligned his research, primarily, to the concept of the Imago Dei in Genesis as follows:

1. Feminists have reviewed the bible especially Genesis 3 under the paradigm of feminist theology defending Eve and pointing out the 'mythical reality' of 'Satan' being punished prior to Eve (Sakenfeld, K.D., 1985). The word 'tsela' in Genesis 2 which once was traditionally accepted as 'rib' has now morphed into an alternate interpretation of the word meaning 'side of Adam' which has made an impression with regard to the egalitarian social wave, substantiating the concept that women are the 'better half of men' (Simpson, W., 1996). The 'creation' of Adam and Eve in Genesis 1 and 2 requires a contemporary investigation as well; it is consummate that the concept of the 'creation' from the 'apar' and 'tsela' be explored further.

Ontologically, history and mythology has influenced belief and socio-cultural constructivism. This paved the way for a philosophical ideal of the sacred (Pals, D.L., 2006); moulding religious beliefs, mythology, history and socio-cultural normative as factual actualities. The colonial system was not separate from this ideal and moreover, capitalised on the actuality to benefit imperial rule and subjugate people the world over for mass control passively and aggressively. In retrospect colonialism used religion, specifically the tenets of Christianity, to drive its globalising project (Antonio, E.P, 2006). Colonialism was rooted in patriarchal concepts and the bible is considered a patriarchal text (Gomola, A, 2010). The feminist Biblicist rally against the concepts of patriarchy in the bible, rooting for gender equality; they make an alternative, interpretative contribution to the bible from a different epistemological stance (Kruschwitz, R.B., et al. 2013; Gomola, A, 2010). Park states that "historic and present day discussions make it important to add empirical evidence to conjecture" (Park, I.Z., 2009: 276) and therefore it would be consummate to re-examine the biblical binary creation (Adam and Eve) for the foundational patriarchal biblical belief, using empirical evidence from scientific paradigm of genetic engineering and cloning. In the current research paradigms "a difference in epistemology begins primarily as a philosophical exercise" (Krause, S.E., 2005: 759) paving the way for multiple realities (Olson, H., 1995). Harlow (2006: 164) asserts that it is a duty to confront evolving God-denying ideologies with the Christian analysis of the evidence of science and philosophical arguments. Conversely, evolving science can be applied to argue God-affirming ideologies as is concept of cloning as an interpretation for the biblical creation of Eve. The combination of qualitative and quantitative paradigms in research can reflect "unique ontological views about the nature of
"the means to determine the reality of a social phenomenon is through the triangulation of cognition processes, which include elements of both constructivism (qualitative) and positivism (quantitative) rather than solely one or the other" (Krause, S.E., 2005: 767). The concept of science falls under the quantitative paradigm of research; cloning and genetic engineering falls under the scientific research paradigm. However, theology and feminism is part of social science and falls primarily under the qualitative paradigm. Therefore, Cloning in Genesis is. A conflation of the two research paradigms (qualitative and quantitative). Harlow also asserts that the narration of Genesis is incomplete as "it does not exhaust everything there is to know about creation" (2006: 165). The truth of all things can be debated and is relative to its hypothesis or philosophy (Krause, S.E., 2005). Harlow asserts further, 'we moderns should try our best to ascertain what Genesis meant to its ancient audience... And to identify its essential and enduring theological message" (2006: 168). On reflection of the theological understanding of Genesis, a path is formed for modern ideologies to re-interpret Genesis with a fresh approach to make contemporary the traditional theological understanding.

The philosophical ideation "... in the moments when eternity breaks into time, there we will find myth" held by psychologist Rollo May makes a profound prolepsis for the book of Genesis as it marks in time (a break in eternity) for the merits of creation. A lay understanding identifies Moses as the metonym of the book of Genesis. On historical examination, the book of Genesis intimates an epistemological conflation of ancient Sumerian mythology (Harlow, D.C., 2006: 163-172) which may have led to the enculturation of Genesis penmanship. However, Dhoukhan, makes a polemic case for the historical over the mythological claim of Genesis; "In ancient mythological literature, the message (poetic or philosophical) does not necessarily depend on the historical actuality of the story it conveys "(2004: 24), The events of Genesis must be viewed outside the realm of theology (mythological material) as statements of the "content of events "(2004: 24), its development and the "sequence of its components "(2004: 24). In contrast traditional mythology has lost its links in its textual source. The Genesis 1,2,3 in coherency, demonstrates conflated chains of multiple chronicles with central characters (Adam and Eve), and can be verified by a later source (Quran) by name and concept. The book of Genesis in the absence of tangible historical evidence can be viewed philosophically as myth and conversely, it can be viewed as historical as it signifies spiritual truth in the philosophical domain (Dhoukhan, J.B., 2004: 24). Hence, metaphysics can be used to argue both the mythological and the history paradigm of the Book of Genesis.

It is acknowledged that the book of Genesis is recognised in the literary genre as a narrative which is the written account of events, namely, a story (Coates, G.W., 1983).Genesis is referred to loosely as the 'Biblical Creation Narratives'; as a narrative the elementary tempo in Genesis confers tenure of creation of the male and female to God. The concept of the 'how', 'why' and 'when' of male-female genesis is absent - generating a narrow link in the anthropocentric account. As a result, the verse demonstrates an abrupt mythological illusion that God created the male and female simultaneously and devoid of effort. In Genesis 2 the creation of man
and woman is made lucid by expanding the narration to 'time' (when), 'why' and the 'how'. Different translations do not deflect from the ideation that Adam was created first and Eve was created second. Furthermore, in spite of varying translation and interpretations, the core theme of the 'Adam and Eve creation narrative' has retained its mythological and philosophical understanding - Adam first, Eve second and finally, Eve was created from Adam for Adam. Therefore, whilst the exegesis is necessary as a critical interpretative tool for the collective translation and/or meaning, a contemporary interpretative approach would be employed to generate a scientific understanding of the existing exegesis thus conflating qualitative and quantitative paradigms. «80 the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while He slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh...” (Gen 2:20-22). This process of deep sleep prior to removing a body part and systematically closing the flesh is akin to a medical procedure of general anesthetic and surgery (Pawson, D0, 2015: 5.1). Essentially, a part of Adam was removed and used to generate another being. The concept of generating another biological organism from existing genetic cellular material is termed in our contemporary scientific paradigm as cloning. The purpose of re-compilation of existing literature is to explore the genetic concept of cloning as an engineering tool of 'God' for the creation of Eve and its effect on feminism. *Genesis 1:27* (RSV).

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

*Genesis 2: 7* (RSV)
Then the Lord God formed man of the dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.

*Genesis 2:20-22* (RSV)
"But for the man there was not found a helper fit for him. So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh; and the rib which Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man.

*Genesis 2:23* (RSV)
Then the man said, "This at last is the bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.

In Gen 1:26 God decides on the creation of humanity (Adam) and in 1:27 the decision materializes: "So God created man in his own image," and as the tempo of the prose gains momentum, "In the image of God he created him;" and with specificity God created, "Male and female he created them." Harlow, asserts that 'Adam' is a 'generic and genderless' (2006: 179), Hebrew word for human being (Towner, W.S, 2005) and God formed the 'Adam' out of the dust of the 'adamant J which is akin to "earthling form the earth" or "human from the humus"(Harlow, D.C., 2006: 184; Tribal, P., 1978: 77-78). It can be argued on the grounds of semantics that not ascribing the socio-cultural normative gender-label is not equivalent to 'genderless' especially in the evolving social scientific arena. Genderless implies a pre-existing normative of gender and hence, would be unjust to assert a
genderless 'Adam'. It would be likewise for ascribing ‘Adam’ to ‘no gender’. In Genesis 2, (human) pairing marked the inception of the divisive normative of gender - male and female. Hence, it can be asserted that gender was not generated with the 'creation' of the 'eve' but with the pairing of the 'Adam' and the 'eve'. It is important to note the translation of the 'adamah' from 'man' in the KJV and RSV of the Bible to 'humankind' or 'human being' in the NRSV (Towner, W.S, 2005) was in response to eliminate contemporary social wave of gender-normative (Butler, J., 1999). Gen I:27 makes the analogy of the "image of god" and the creation of the "him" but concludes with "male and female he created them" with no clarity that "image of god" extends to the creation of the "female". The dynamics of Eve's creation was completely different to Adam.

In Genesis 1 the word 'bara' which means create is associated with three creations. The general creation of the heaven and earth Gen 1:1, the creation of human beings Gen 1:27 and the creation of the great fish Gen 1:21. According to Dhoukhan (2004: 18) the word 'create' is used for the 'fish' as a response to the ancient Babylonians and Egyptians who worshipped it. The use of the word 'create' was to demunify the importance of the fish to an 'object' that was made or created. The broader message was that made or created things are not to be worshipped. In order to create the heavens and earth ex-nihilo hold veracity only on the premise of paucity of information given by the author of Genesis; essentially, the author's beginning is the start of the narrative. Therefore, the ideation of create' is aligned with ex-nihilo concept with regard to heaven and earth on source and form criticism. According to the Greek philosopher Democritus, "nothing has sprung from nothing" holds philosophical truths for all concepts of creation. In Genesis 2: 5 God realizes that there was 'no man' to till the ground. In Gen 2:7 God uses 'dust' from the ground to form Adam and God physically breaths into the nostrils 'the breath of life'. The question arises therefrom is: Did God create Adam or did God engineer Adam?

The Divine understanding of 'create' is to bring into existence something from nothing whilst engineer means to design and build objects or structures from 'other' material. The 'apar' (dust) was the material which God created and used to design and build Adam. Hence, in the genesis of the heavens and the earth the term 'create' may be used but in the genesis of Adam the term engineer may be more appropriate as 'raw' materials from the earth were used in the design and construction of Adam. In Gen-2:18 God realized that man being alone was 'not good' and God affirms that he would make man a 'fitting' helper. However, in Gen2: 19-20 creates for man animals as helpers after which God realizes that the animals were not suitable 'partners or helpers' for Adam. In Gen 2:21, God embarks on another engineering/or creation feat. This time God uses material from Adam himself (tse/a) to design and construct the 'partner', namely Eve. As a result thereof, Eve was not created ex-nihilo but from Adam. Hence, the term engineer is more appropriate than create. The question posed is: What kind of engineering did God use? According to theism, God was active 'in the beginning' and it responsible for the merism of creation including human beings. The verse from Ps139:13: "For you have formed my inwards parts; you knitted together in my mother's womb" intimates that God is responsible for procreation of human beings as well. The question
follows: How does the 'hand of God' prevail without physical visible intercession? Both questions have answers that have evolved from Genetic Engineering.

The human organism is made up of 46 chromosomes. Chromosomes comprise of 23 gene pairs which are arranged into the double helix DNA strand. From the gene base pairing, genetics is conceptualized. Genetic engineering is an experimental field in our current copes of. Scientific research mainly in the publicized field of medicine and food industry. Cloning is another scientific experimental field in genetics. Genetic engineering is an artificial process while cloning is found in both natural and artificial worlds - an organism is genetically altered in genetic engineering; a genetically 'identical' organism is produced in cloning (Dorff E.N, 1998). Cloning techniques are fundamental for the continued existence of genetic engineering but cloning is not dependent on genetic engineering. According to Carter, J, 2014, cloning is a form of reproduction of offspring which does not result from the chance union of the egg. And sperm as in sexual reproduction; it is a premeditated replication of the existing genetic constituents of another single individual which is termed asexual reproduction. Human cloning can be the asexual reproduction of a new human organism that is genetically virtually identical to the donor human being (Carter, J, 2014). Genetic engineering and cloning operates from a model of genetic programming. DNA is part of intelligent design and according to the theist paradigm intelligent design is God-propietry (Poythress, V.S, 2013). Intelligent design can be aligned with cellular programming. In the book of Genesis the constituents of the earth, namely, 'apar' (dust) was modified to 'create' the 'Adam', and the 'tsela' was modifies to 'create' the 'eve'. According to the scope of genetic engineering the creation of Eve, not Adam, falls in the paradigm of cloning. The way that Adam was engineered cannot be aligned to any modern scientific concept at this point in human understanding. Furthermore, the antitheory of Darwinism (Laughlin, R.B., 2006) rejects purpose and gradualism (Poythress, V.S, 2013) and therefore, fOITIS a weak analogous framework for the biblical creation narratives and the materialization of Adam.

The term "clone" was first coined by J.B.S. Haldane, British biologist in a speech he gave in 1963 (Clark, A., 2014: 1). Cloning dates back to 1885 when a sea urchin embryo was split in two and each were grown into independent organisms by Han Adolf Edward Dreisch (Royal, A., 2009: 1). In 1902, a more complex organism was cloned, a vertebrate, Salamander (frog) by Hans Spemann (2009: 2). The cloning of a mammal, in 1996, Dolly the sheep (Dorff, E.N, 1998: 1), was publicized as a 'new' science to the world in 1997 through the process of nuclear transfer (Royal, A., 2009: 2) by development biologist Dr Ian Willem at the Roslin Institute in Scotland (Clark, A., 2014: 2). After Dolly many other types of mammalian cloning was accomplished through either donor cells or cultured cells. It is interesting to note that Dolly was a ewe - a female sheep. In 1998 Dolly gave birth to her first lamb (2009: 4). In 2002 according to Allison Royal, Clonaid, an independent establishment funded by the private sector, claimed to have cloned a female 'Eve' successfully (2009: 4). The claim of cloning an 'Eve' lacked credibility as DNA testing between mother and child was refused by Clonaid. Further, the bill to ban cloning had failed in the USA with only "an executive order to ban federal funding for cloning research but did not prohibit privately funded research" (2009: 4-5). It has been 22 years since the
cloning of Dolly but there is no new information on the progress of human cloning.

Was it possible for Eve to be a clone of Adam? A strong probability does exist. 'Something' from Adam was removed - the bible calls it the "tsela" - to form Eve. If only the flesh of Adam was used, a "deep sleep" would not have been necessary; this is akin to a biopsy.

Furthermore, if only bone marrow was required a "deep sleep" is not necessary again. The concept of "deep sleep" looks at surgical procedure that was invasive and deep, for the extraction of 'tsela'. In Gen2:23 Adam makes the announcement, "Then the man said, 'this at last is the bone of my bones and the flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman because she was taken out of Man.'" The Hebrew equivalent for bone is 'esem' for the first 'bone' and 'esern' for the second 'bones'. The word 'bone' appears 97 times in the bible. But the only time that it appears together as 'bone' and 'flesh' is in Lk. 24:39: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have." In Lk 24:39, the word order is different and read as 'flesh and bone'. Lk 24:39 occurred three days post-crucifixion of Jesus and he appeared to his disciples in the 'upper room' where he explained to them that he was alive.

In Lk 24:39 'flesh and bones' is in reference to death. According to forensic analysis, death is followed by the decomposition of a corpse 4-15 minutes after the heart has stopped (Vass, A.A., 2001; Bio-ops). Human decomposition occurs in four stages - autolysis, putrefaction, putrefaction with carnivores and finally, diagenesis (bone decomposition) (2001: 2). Simplistically, decomposition is separated into pre-skeletonisation and post-skeletonisation (2001: 2). Autolysis, putrefaction, and putrefaction with carnivores belong to the pre-skeletonisation process. The flesh is the soft tissue of the body; comprised of the skin, muscles, connection tissue, fat and internal organs. The flesh or the soft tissue breaks down first. The rapidity of flesh decomposition depends on temperature and humidity (2001: 2; Bio-ops). According to the bible, Jesus was crucified on a Friday any time between 9am or 'afternoon', depending on the gospel. He was removed from the cross/stake/tree around three hours later (depending on the gospel) and taken to the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea where he was buried. Jesus reached 'anastasis' (resurrection) on the third day (Sunday). According to World Climate Repore and the study conducted by Loehle, C. and McCulloch, J.H. in 2008 which used the non-tree-ring analysis to determine global temperatures for the last 2000 years found that global temperatures are not entirely dissimilar to current -

1. Mk 5: 25; John 14:19. The gospel of Mark and John do not corroborate with regard to the time of the event of crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus.

2. See references temperatures and temperatures from 0-200 years were not dissimilar to today's temperatures with a fluctuation between average -2 and 1. The exact season of Jesus's crucifixion is not known but if we use the above criteria of a -2 and 1 temperature shift for Jerusalem hot dry summer (18 to 38 degrees + 1) and cold wet winter (5 to 10 degrees - 1), between the Friday and the Sunday, decomposition would have set in either scenario. When Jesus said in Lk 24:39: "See my hands and my feet
that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have", he was bearing witness to the denial of death. Hence, the significance of the word orders of "flesh" before "bones" explains the complicated concept of death followed by human decomposition.

Conversely, in Gen 2: 23 the word 'bone' precedes 'flesh' in order. This is significant for human biological development or embryogenesis or life. The human embryo development is a complex process of dividing and differentiating cells which takes up to six weeks to develop (Boklage, C.E., 2012: 13). Dr Boklage stated that 'no part of human embryogenesis is the 'beginning of human life'. Every human life today is a continuation of something that began a very long time ago"(2012:13). This statement is riot only profound for contemporary understanding of human biological continuation but also, substantiates 'human appearance' from the 'apar' and 'tsela' in Genesis, rejecting thee-nihilo concept of creation for Adam and Eve. The process of embryogenesis commences with fertilization of ovum and spermatozoa which are cells that contain genetic material that has undergone meiosis (reduction of chromosome by half). It is important to note that the centrosome of the ovum is not retained during meiosis for the female; however, in the male the sperm cell has retained its centrosome after meiosis (2012:14). The centrosome.' Is the main microtubule organising centre of the cell and functions as a regulator of cell-cycle function or cellular programming. When two meiotic cells unite it forms the zygote; it will divide via mitosis (cell multiplication by division) until a 16 cell Morula is formed which descends to embed itself in the uterine wall; shedding the blastocoels. Cellular differentiation result in cellular migration and the Morula is reshaped, forming a Gastrula; differentiating into ectoderm, endoderm and mesoderm. At the beginning of the 20 day, the mesoderm undergoes segmentation to form 42-44 pairs of somite flanking the neural tube. Each somite will differentiate to form the spinal column (Rawls, A., Fisher, R. E., 2010). The neural tube will eventually form the brain and spinal cord. The spinal column is the bone-like framework that develops. This demonstrates human biological development through the process of embryogenesis were bone tissue is laid down before the skin, muscle and internal organs which make up the soft tissue. Therefore, simplistically bones are laid down before soft tissue. The word 'flesh' of Genesis is parallel to soft tissue. In Gen 2:23 the word bone precedes the word flesh which is an indication of how the event of the 'creation' and or life of Eve occurred or how Eve developed. The concept of bone before flesh is scientifically accurate for human development on a biological cellular level. This is significant because the complex process of embryogenesis is hidden or lost in the generic translation of Genesis.

3. Discovered by Edouard van 8eneden in 1883 and was later named and described by Theodor Boveri in 1888. It is curious that Adam said, "bone of my bones" According to the haematopoietic understanding of bones, the concept of blood, bone marrow and stem cells are made intelligible. Blood cells are short lived and need to be replaced continuously. The average human requires approximately 100 billion new aematopoietic cells each day (Domen, J., Wagers, A., and Weissman., LL., 2006 : 14). Following the radiation fall out in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, scientists researched methods to repair the haematopoietic systems. The research led to the established fact of cells that "can both self-renew (make copies) and generate (if not all) the cell
*populations in the blood must exist in bone marrow*(2006: 14-15). The cells are called Haematopoietic Stem Cells (HSC) or commonly called stem cells. Donor stem cells retain their unique genetic coding (chromosomal signature) whilst inside a host and is considered the building blocks of blood. Furthermore, stem cells aid in the protection of the chromosomes (associated with telomerase for telomere length maintenance). During DNA replication (2006: 20). In Gen 2:23 Adam may have been referencing cellular biology, providing humanity with the clue of how the asexual fertilization of Eve was sustained using stem cells from the bone of Adam. The word "tsela" is non-plural even in its progressive interpretation but, the word "bones" is used in the second instance of Gen 2:23, suggesting plurality. This may indicate the use of plural stem cells from the one "tsela"; referencing cellular biology again.

Somatic cells refer to essentially all cells in the body except the germ line cells which are the cells in the sexual organs that produce sperm and eggs. In the absence of sexual reproduction somatic cells are necessary for the vertical relay of genetic traits. In Gen 2:23 the "flesh of my flesh" may be an indication that diploid somatic cells were removed superficially; keeping cognizance of the fact that 'bone' lies deep to flesh and flesh is superficial. The repetition of the word "flesh" may indicate the direct genetic relay from the somatic cell of Adam to Eve as in asexual reproduction. In the, Asexual reproduction of cloning an embryo is formed. Cloning occurs via somatic nuclear transfer whereby the nucleus from an adult (somatic) cell is removed and inserted into an enucleated (empty) ovum/ooocyte (Brock, D.W. 1998). This will result in the development of the embryo for the process of embryogenesis. The 'tsela' and the 'basar' from Adam may have been subjected to the process genetic engineering for the formation of the embryo. It can be postulated that male DNA (XY) is split into the X and Y from one of Adams somatic cells. Each of these cells has a centrosome by virtue of it being male (Boklage, C.E.) 2012; the splitting of a second XY Adamic somatic cell - a second X and Y is made available. The X from the second cell can be spliced with X from the first cell, thus forming the XX complex by asexual fertilisation.

Therefore, it can be surmised that the generic translation of the book of Genesis hides complexities that only can be rooted out as humans make progress in all avenues of life. The word profiling, syntaxes and repetition is no co-incidence for the complete and comprehensive understanding of the verses found in Genesis. Just as the social scientist apply their evolved phenomena to examine the exegesis of the bible for new socio-cultural understanding; or evangelist who use the bible for conversion; or constitutions of governments who use it for law-making; scientist must also examine the existing exegesis for the understanding of humankind and human origins.

Feminists, group within social science, have made a fair contribution to biblical exegesis to revolutionize their work for females. In the nineteenth century brave women led the abolitionist movement and the struggle for women's suffrage which later was urbanized by a generation of professional scholars during the Civil Rights struggle of the 1960's (Kruschwitz, RB., et al. 2013:10) giving rise to the Women's Liberation Movement which fought for equal opportunity and equal pay, that is, justice between men and women during the industrial revolution (Kugal, S.,
Feminism is a rebellion or a response to the former familial hierarchical biblical gender normative (Butler, L., 1999) which gained momentum from the Women's Liberation Movement; as a response to gender inequality.

The bible is considered a patriarchal text which serves as an impediment for feminism (Gomola, A., 2010). The word patriarchy is derived from Greek - patria (taken from the root word pater meaning 'father') which means 'family', and arche which means 'beginning', 'first in origin, and 'to rule' (Quinn, J., 2009). A patriarch is a family ruler (2009: 1) or head of the family. According to Alexis Alexander Gornola, the bible is "a cause for indignation as it belittles women" (2010: 193) and began with "Jive, the temptress" (2010: 193). To recapitulate, in Genesis the matriarch of women (Eve) is tainted with firstly, insubordination to God's instruction Gen3: 3, "God said, you shall not eat of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die."; secondly, succumbing to Satan in Gen 3:4-5, "But the serpent said to the woman, you will not die. For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.") thirdly playing the part of the temptress/persuader, in Gen3: 6, "So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate; and she also gave some to her husband, and he ate". In Gen 3: 14-15 God cursed Satan for his role in misdirecting the humans, "The Lord God said to the serpent, 'Because you have done this, cursed are you above all cattle, and above all wild animals; upon your belly you shall go, and dust you shall eat all the days of your life. It 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." Thereafter, Eve is rebuked by God and according to Gen 3:16, "To the woman he said, you will greatly multiply your pain in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children, yet your desire shall before your husband, and he shall rule over YOU.". In Gen 3:17, "And to Adam he said, 'Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree of which I commanded you, you shall not eat of it; cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life; thorns and thistles, it shall bring forth to you; and you shall eat the plants of the field. In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust, and to dust you shall return. Lastly, Adam together with Eve was exiled from Eden.

After the 'rebellion' initiated by Eve, "human dominion over the cursed and hostile creatures and the unyielding ground is now frustrated (Gen 3: 17-19). Unfulfilled dominion appears to find its distorted outlet in human-to-human domination, for God predicts the typical post-fall patriarchal social order: "and he shall rule over you" (Gen 3:16b). The fracture and distortion in the paradigmatic horizontal relationship of husband and wife soon escalate into Cain's fratricide and Lamech's murder in Genesis 4. Society in general breaks down in a thorough going descent into violence and corruption that culminates in the sin-saturated world of Noah's lime (Gen 6:11-12). Humanity "falls" into a sorry state of alienation, shame, aversion, and male-domination" (Kruschwitz, R.B., et al. 2013: 12-13). Therefore, according to Kruschwitz et al., the 'fall' created an avenue for "male domination" (2013: 13) or patriarchy which has evolved to mean 'the enemy' or 'the ghost' that feminists
rally against.

As recent as the late 1800's and early1900's Euro-western tradition practiced the tenets of Christianity, that is, the bible formed a basis of law for constitutions of countries; the bible was used in courts when it came to divorce. On the grounds of gender-based violence in America (1862) and Gen 3:16 was quoted; "your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you" (Korsak, M.P., 2002: 142) to vindicate the husband who abused their spouses. The Woman's Bible Commentary published between 1895-1898, during the first wave of feminism, incepted a polemic epistemological response and foundation against traditional patriarchal interpretations of the bible (Gomola, A., 2010: 194) giving rise to feminist theology. Feminist theology appropriates biblical interpretation for the restoration of female equity in the social sphere (Gomola, A., 2010: J93) and from Kruschwitz it appears that feminism is a protracted defence of Eve (2013: 12-13). Moreover, feminist theology only serves to gloss over anti-feminine verses of the bible and are yet to produce a new text (Simon, S., 1996: 133); this is also true for the revised meaning of the word 'tsela' in Genesis 2 (Simpson, W., 1996) which has done very little to revolutionize the text or substantiate the female re-positioning in the biblical hierarchy of creation and/or the familial hierarchal system. The case that Adam was created before Eve in Genesis 1 and 2 is also glossed over in feminist theology and emphasis is again, on the defence of Eve in Genesis 3 (Sakenfeld, K.D., 1985). Further, Gray-Reneberg, J and Div, M. (1996) in response to gender-based violence placed emphasis on equality in creation of Adam and Eve based on the argument that both, male and female, were created in the "image of God", and that man had no dominion over the woman. Towner also examines the binary creation of Adam and Eve with the "image of God" and he states "if we see the image of the divine in maleness and femaleness of humankind, it is not in their sexual conjunction" (Towner, W.S., 2005:348). Further, Towner likens the "imago" to a relationship with God using a minor metaphor when a person looks into the minor they can identify with the image (2005:349) and he concludes that humankind are God's stewards who are responsible for the operation of the world (2005:356); the authority/ domination invested in humankind is for "nurturing" (2005:356). The Imago Dei concept forms only a philosophical allegory for equality in creation as the starting material of Adam was the 'apar' and Eve the 'tsela', and not from the 'god'. The image of God is based only on supposition for equality of creation.

The hierarchy of creation in Genesis is God, Heavens and Earth, Adam, Animals and lastly, Eve. The creation of Eve can be re-positioned after Adam and prior to animals as she is a 'direct descendent' of Adam as a result of asexual reproduction. Apart from the protracted defense of Eve, feminist theologists' reinterpretation of the bible is based also on emphasis and de-emphasis of verses (Tate, W.R., 2006) which is a form of 'cherry picking' (bias) to forward the feminist agenda. The work of reinterpretation done by Mary Phil Korsak on the word for word translation of Genesis using neutral language instead of masculine language defers "androcentric translation" (Gornola. A., 2010: 199) but does not re-position Eve in creation or make her equal to Adam. As mentioned previously, the gender definition became meaningful upon 'pairing' and not upon creation. Pairing is the 'yin and yang'? Of all created things
and it is the reason that saved human beings from becoming extinct. The hierarchy of creation is also meaningful as it demonstrated the process of asexual reproduction (genetic engineering and cloning for embryogenesis of life) of Eve. In essence Adam 'fathered' Eve; this interpretation of creation defers the concept of binary equality and de-ratifies feminism core agenda of gender equality. As for the protracted defense of Eve, theistically, wrongdoing begets punishment or the 'cause and effect' scenario in scientific experimental paradigm and according to book of Isaiah the sins of the father, or mother in the case of Eve, does not fall on the offspring or on the larger scale humanity. Kruszewitz (2013: 13) "male domination" interpretation after the 'fall' borders on defensive hegemony from the words "and he shall rule over you" (Gen 3: 16). The Hebrew word for "rule" is 'masal'. In Gen 3: 16; it means to govern, control, in - .charge; exercise. The alternate meaning to "masal" has a 'nurturing responsibility,' a distinction similar to Towner's concept (2005:356). A comparative review of the same word (rule) in Hebrew in Gen 1:26, 1:27 and 37:8 is 'rada' which means to 'to rule over', 'to cause to dominate'; ,subdue. It can be gauged that 'rada' has a 'domination' or 'superiority' but, a tone which is ,lacking in Gen 3: 16. What is the implication of Adam, having masal' over Eve? The relationship between Adam and Eve was that of vertical genetic transfer. Further, the binary relationship was also a horizontal memetic transfer (Alvarez, A, 2004); this was the horizontal transfer of cultural information as Adam can be considered an agent of primary socialization as GQD. It can therefore, be opined that the 'fall' was a form of secondary socialization" and Satan was an agent of secondary socialization. In this context, Gen 3: 16 can review Adam as the parent/ caretaker/ guardian of Eve. This meant that Adam was responsible for Eve and, he was duty-bound to God in his responsibility for her. If the 'fall' is interpreted as the socialization of Eve (and Adam), Kruschewitz, "male domination» postulation, for the inception of patriarchy, can be revised for feminists and for feminist theologians.

Therefore, in our opinion, the concepts of liberalism and equality, in the context of feminism, are reactionary to social reform in the secular paradigm and, cannot to be substantiated by biblical reinterpretation by feminist Biblicists and/ or theologians. Excluding the book of '4 the theory of 'yin and yang' was derived from the age long observation of nature. It describes the way phenomena naturally group in pairs of opposites. See reference 5 in 1976, the biologist Richard Dawkins hypothesized the existence of a unit of cultural transmission, analogous to the gene which he termed meme. They are transferred via imitation from brain to brain. Six agents of socialization. See reference 7 Socialization is a general term for the many different ways and processes by which children come to be able to function as members of their social community. It is in part a process of learning and in part a process of being taught, but modern views of socialization also stress the active role of children in making sense of their social world, and constructing their own ways of being part of their social group. It is mediated through agents of socialization.

CONCLUSION
Genesis, there are other stark verses of gender inequality in the bible which serves to ratify Eve's secondary position to Adam or women's secondary position to men. However, crude theology with its myriad of inclusions has paved an avenue for feminism and has bluntly discounted biblical binary creation with regard to hierarchy
(order) of creation - Adam before Eve, and Eve was genetically engineered (cloned) from Adam's 'tsela'; Adam is the 'father' of Eve and hence, responsible for the matriarch of womanhood. This ought to be the social normative as prescribed by the bible.

It is also my opinion that feminism demonstrates a 'crude’ epistemological reductionism (Nelson, 1 M., 2009: 44-47) with regard to patriarchy (biblical or otherwise) as 'the enemy’ of female social progress; in the paradigm of feminism the gross movement of gender equality is a covert radicalization of female domination, defeminisation and finally, the destruction of the heart of humanity - the family unit. The radicalization of gender/sex social equality will definitely topple the hierarchal familial system of the patriarch concept (Quinn, J.,2009: 1) of 'father', 'mother' and offspring in descending order. The offspring may have the vertical transfer of genes from 'father and mother' but the horizontal transfer of memes to the offspring (Tolle, E., 2005; Alvarez, A., 2004) will depend on social influence from outside the family unit (secondary socialization); it is important to note that from biblical sources that the agent of socialization is pertinent for a favourable meme transference. Social influence can affect offspring negatively or positively, giving rise to adverse conditioning that is not family orientated. Furthermore, feminism may in turn displace a man's familial and social position and this may propagate a reactionary hegemony’s. Equal footing and role reversal are two very indistinct avenues for egalitarianism and may lead to confusion. All social constructs demonstrates a hierarchical (ordered) template for smooth operations so too did God in his creation. The creation of Adam first was not a random act as I demonstrated that male cells carry the centrosome for life. The use of the 'tsela' from Adam underwent metamorphosis to create Eve; this we termed as cloning which we substantiated through the scientific biological process of embryogenesis using the word order in Genesis 2 to demonstrate the exact nature of the concept of materialisation of Eve. Basically, Adam is the father of Eve through asexual reproduction. And like all parents have responsibilities and duties to their offspring, Adam had guardianship and guiding authority over the socialization of Eve. Feminists must reinforce cognizance that Eve did not protest to "and he shall rule over you" and there is a biological aspect to biblical patriarchy for an ordered and efficient primal socialization.
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