THE "ENMITY" OF GENESIS 3:15 IN THE QUEST FOR PEACE IN AFRICA

AFOLARIN OLUTUNDE OJEWOLE

Department of Religious Studies, Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo Ogun State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The need for peace and security continues to be the clarion call concerning Africa and the rest of the world. Africa has been worst hit with all forms of conflict over the centuries. How can Africa find peace? How does the understanding of Genesis 3:14-19 contribute to the quest for peace in this continent? This article seeks to open up a peace dialogue from the proper exegesis of this text. The first use of the term "enmity" in the Bible occurs in this text and it seems to impact the understanding of conflicts all through the Bible. This article creates better understanding of peaceful coexistence from a better understanding of the biblical text.

KEYWORDS: Enmity, Peace, Seed of the Woman, Seed of the Serpent, Genesis 3:15, AU, ECOWAS, Gospel

INTRODUCTION

The search for lasting peace has been elusive in most of Africa. The continent has had been ravaged by various forms of enmity and unrest that have slowed down its progress. The biblical corpus has contributed to the understanding of this problem. This article is intended to show the genesis of the enmity among human beings from the biblical standpoint. It enumerates the uses of the word "enmity."

The prediction of enmity between humans and humans, humans and the devil, and humans and the environment can be traced to the watershed text found in Genesis 3:14-19. This divinely instituted enmity is the result of the sin of Adam and Eve and the Fall of the human race. The whole human race is engulfed in the ensuing enmity.

It begins with the literary analysis of the text and proceeds to explain the nuances of the word "enmity." It continues with the identification of the classification of the human race into the two warring categories. It considers some of the ways this human enmity has played out in the African continent. It concludes by suggesting the way forward.

Background to and Literary Structure of Genesis 3

Some scholars have erroneously treated Genesis 3 as only a myth or legend (Childs, 1962; Gunkel, 1964; Soggin, 1975; Rogerson, 1991). Gunkel surmises his form criticism of the book of Genesis, which he simply calls a "collection of legends" (1964, p. vii). Discounting any ability of history writing prior to late Judaism, he charged the ancients as lacking any mature objectivity. "They were able to present historical events only in poetic form, in songs and legends" (Gunkel, 1964, p. vii).

Other biblical scholars have proved this view wrong (Anderson, 1967; Kaiser, Jr, 1970; Doukhan, 1978; Davidson, 1994; Wolde, 1996). The book of Genesis is historical. This is demonstrated by the recurring expression "generation/history of" toledot throughout the book. It gives literary history of the creation and earliest genealogy of humankind (Wiseman, 1985). The book of Genesis is preoccupied with generations, procreation, and family lineage and origin. The language of Genesis 3 is picturesque, flowing, evocative, imaginative, and poetic. It portrays relationships.

There is a dramatic use of dialogue (Ojewole, 2008). Furthermore, the New Testament supports the historicity of Genesis 1-11 by making several references to it in historical terms (See Mark 10:6; Luke 3:38; Rom 5:12; 1 Cor 6:16; Eph 5:31; Jude 11, 14; and Rev 14:7).

The structure of this chapter clearly reveals a chiasm, which shows the intention of the writer to bring out a special message at the center of the story:

A Serpent and Woman alone. God absent. Prohibition of eat

from the tree. Eve enticed to "knowing good and evil" (vss. 1-5)

B Adam and Eve naked, clothed themselves (vss. 6-7)

C God walks in the garden and "called unto Adam" (vss. 8-9a)

D God speaks to Adam (vss. 9a-12)

E God speaks to the woman (vs. 13)

F God speaks to the Serpent (vss. 14-15)

E' God speaks to the woman (vs. 16)

D' God speaks to Adam (vss. 17-19)

C' Still in the garden, "Adam calls his wife's name Eve" (vs. 20)

B' God clothed Adam and Eve (vs. 21)

A' God alone. Prohibition of eating from the tree.

Humans "knowing good and evil"

It is important to note that vss. 14 and 15 constitute the chiastic climax of

Genesis 3. Thus, it is shown that the message of these verses is central in the context.

The main message of this climatic portion is found in Genesis 3:15. This climatic verse begins with the word "enmity." This syntax of the verse presents the "enmity" emphatically.

Genesis 3:14-19 contains a series of divine speeches. The first one covers verses 14-15, beginning with wayyiqtol background statement. The second and third speeches each begin with qatal in verses 16 and 17 and are syntactically related and connected to the first. We can render this connection as follows: "Then Yahweh God said to the serpent . To the woman, for her part, he said . . . To the man, for his part, he said . ." (Naccacci, 1994, p. 194).

Gen 3:15 also contains an interesting progression of parallelism as follows:

Serpent ("you") SINGULAR Woman

Seed of Serpent COLLECTIVE Seed of woman

Serpent ("you"/"Your head"SINGULAR "he"/ "his heel"

The MT of Gen 3:15 is transliterated as follows:

weʾêḇâ ʾāšît bênkā ûḇên hāʾiššâ ûḇên zarcakā ûḇên zarcāh hûʾ yešûpkā rōʾš weʾattâ tešûpennû ᶜāqēḇ.

Genesis 3: 15 Can Be Divided up as Follows:15(a) weʾêḇâ ʾāšît

>   15(b) bênkā ûḇên hāʾiššâ

>   15(c) ûḇên zarcakā ûḇên zarcāh

>   15(d) hûʾ yešûpkā rōʾš

>   15(e) weʾattâ tešûpennû ᶜāqēḇ

Word Study of Enmity

The noun ʾêḇâ is rare, appearing only five times in the OT in Gen 3:15; Num 35:21; Ezek 25:15; 35:5 (Rosenbaum, 1984). It means both enmity and hostility. ʾāyaḇ is the verb, "be an enemy"; ʾōyēḇ is Qal participle, "enemy," "foe." The root ʾyḇ occurs two hundred and eighty-three (283) times in the OT, fifty-four (54) of which are in the Pentateuch. This root ʾyḇ is well attested in ANE literature. The Akkadian ayy_bu, "enemy," occurs in letters, historical, omen, and literary texts to designate individual and national enemies (Williams, 1997).

The Ugaritic ib, "enemy," turns up in some letters, as well as in the Aqhat legend. In the Baal cycle ib appears parallel to xrt, foe, šnu, "one who hates" and qm, "adversary"; all refer to enemies of Baal (Williams, 1997).

The verb ʾāyaḇ denotes "hatred and active hostility on the part of a person or group of persons (e.g., a nation) directed towards an individual, group, or nation" (Williams, 1997, p. 370). The noun, "enmity, hostility" shows unending hostility among nations in Ezek 25:15 (Philistines versus Israelites) and Ezek 35:5 (Edomites versus Israelites). In Numbers 35:21-22, it distinguishes between intentional (with hostility or hatred) killing and unintentional (without hostility or hatred) killing, the later allowing the culprit to flee to a city of refuge, the former requiring the killer's death (Williams, 1997, p. 369).

Enmity is deep-rooted hatred, deep-seated dislike or ill will or a manifestation of such feeling between two or more parties, classes of people or entities. Enmity is a lack of harmony. Its synonyms include: animosity, animus, antagonism, antipathy, hostility, and rancor. Other words related to enmity include: uncordiality, unfriendliness; alienation, disaffection, estrangement; abhorrence, detestation, dislike, hate, hatred, loathing; aversion; bad blood, bitterness, daggers, gall, malevolence, malice, malignancy, malignity, spite, and spleen. Enmity involves conflict, contention, disaccord, dissension, dissonance, disunion, disunity, mischief, strife, inconsonance, uncongeniality, collision, and polarization (Webster, 1996). Enmity involves a feeling of resentfulness based upon jealousy and implying rivalry. Rivalry is expressed as "wanting to be better than someone else" or "wanting to make people think they are better" (Louw & Nida, 1996, p. 760).

There are other Hebrew words that communicate similar emotions as enmity. In Hosea 9:7-8, the word maśṭēmâ means hostility, animosity, enmity, representing a state of opposition to another, with possibly feelings of strife and long-term antagonism toward another (Swanson, 1997). The word ᶜāmar is used in Deuteronomy 24:7 and it means to "deal tyrannically against a person or a people" (BDB, 2000, p. 771). In Isaiah 41:12 is mentioned another related word: mǎṣṣûṯ meaning strife or enmity, and the concept of being in opposition or a hostile position. The expression in Isaiah 41:12 is ʾîš mǎṣṣûṯ means "enemy, man of strife, one who is in hostility or strife" (TWOT, 1400b).

The Significance of the Enmity

In Gen 3:15, emphasis is given to the noun ʾêḇâ "enmity" because it is placed at the beginning of the sentence. It stands at the head of the lead clause in the apposition as the operating word there. The word guides the meaning and movement of the remaining clauses and phrases of the verse, which serve to explain it. Thus, it carries the most weight in that verse, syntactically.

On a closer look, indeed, the word ʾêḇâ "enmity" runs through all the Genesis 3:14-19 pronouncements as they have been described as being syntactically united. "Enmity is 'established' between the human and the animal world, between man and nature, and between humans as well" (Savran, 1994, 41).

The application and demonstration of this enmity happens at different levels. There is an obvious shift from the single individuals: bênkā ûḇên hāʾiššâ "The serpent and the woman," to the plural collective: ûḇên zarcakā ûḇên zarcāh "The seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman," and finally to a definitely single individual representative locked in a duel: "The serpent and the Woman's Seed," understandable from the phrases hûʾ yešûpkā rōʾš and weʾattâ tešûpennû ᶜāqēḇ. This evidences the narrowing from collective to individual, from plural to singular. This has very significant theological implications for the understanding and application of this verse.

In its first occurrence, Genesis 3:15, ʾêḇâ is the first word in the sentence and serves as the object of the verb. This word receives the greatest emphasis in this sentence. Rosenbaum (1984) treats it as a technical and legal term that informed the later definition and development of the homicide law. On the surface, ʾêḇâ seems to be the punishment for a "mere act of deception" recorded in Genesis 3:15. "If we accept the Biblical principle of 'measure for measure,' then the vendetta between the two species mandated . . . must indicate that a far more serious crime is involved, more serious even than the exile of mankind from the Eden would imply" (Rosenbaum, 1984, p.146-147).

Upon examining the other biblical texts relating to homicide, Rosenbaum (1984) found that "hatred" and "enmity" are related but are not simple synonyms. So also are enmity and rivalry. A state of "permanent belligerency" exists between humans and snakes as "permanent mortal enemies" (Rosenbaum, 1984, p.147). Rosenbaum (1984) then concludes:

Broadly speaking, the real fruit of that deception which took place in Eden was murder. By robbing Adam and Eve of immortality, the snake and its descendants are the murderers of our ancestors and, by extension, of ourselves as well. Any human death, whatever the apparent cause, is another crime to be laid at the den of the serpent (p. 150).

The perpetual aspect of the fight between the woman and the serpent, lasting for a long time, is strengthened by the word ʾêḇâ. Two of the other four places this word is used in the Old Testament, in addition to Genesis 3:15, include Ezekiel 25:15 and 35:5. "Both use the expression ʾôlām ʾêḇâ 'ancient enmity,' which indicates that the enmity is something old and never-ending" (Hotler, 1990, p. 110).

It can be concluded from the scriptural usage of the root ʾyḇ, that enmity, like its verb root, is not applicable to non-morally culpable beasts but only "between persons or morally responsible agents" (Leupold, 1953, 1:164). Hence, this "rules out the idea of mere hostility, which is not enmity, between man and serpents. The personal tempter emerges ever more distinctly as the verse progresses" (Leupold, 1953, 1:164-165).

The fact that the on-going enmity between the serpent and the woman is perpetual has caused many scholars to erroneously insist that neither side of the duel is victorious, except on a temporary basis. They appeal to the text and theme of the passage and fail to see anything beyond an endlessly hopeless battle.

However, this position is fallacious because the curse is on the serpent and not on the humans and thus cannot result in a draw but victory for humanity (Wenham, 1987). A draw will mean a promotion for the serpent rather than demotion and can hardly be a curse for it (Turner, 1990). God's part in the enmity He established is to protect His followers while putting fear in the hearts of, dispossessing, and destroying their enemies, thus assuring His children victory (Scott, 1974). Several scholars, especially in the Christian era from medieval times to date, have defended this conclusion (Kidner, 1967; Saydon, 1962). This victory was set in motion by God in order to return to normalcy the distorted hierarchy of creation and lordship of humanity over other creatures (Gen 1:26-29; 2:19-20).

Identifying the Seed of the Woman and Seed of the Serpent

The identification of the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent in Genesis 3:15 depends on the type of interpretation parameters employed for the text. These include: "Literal, Symbolic, Figurative, Naturalistic, Allegorical, Aetiological, Messianic, Mariological, Historical, Political, Christological, Eschatological, Collective, Singular, Representative, Rationalistic, and Form-Critical interpretations" (Ojewole, 2008, p. 12). These varying explanations also overlap considerably. Genesis 3:15 is figurative, Christological, and eschatological. A close reading of the text helps one to observe a movement from collective figurative Seed to singular representative Christological Seed. There is also a movement from God's attention to the literal snake to the symbolic serpent that represents and evil force, Satan himself (Ojewole, 2008).

Genesis 3:15 is called the Protoevangelium, the first Gospel, beginning from Martin Luther (Luther, 1958; Unger, 1960). It is the first Messianic prophecy and surprisingly, it occurs in the context of a curse upon the serpent. While a literal snake confronted mother Eve (Gen 3:1-3), the symbolic power behind the snake is the real culprit. Hence the serpent is identified as Satan, the devil himself. The woman is mother Eve. The children of human beings who follow Satan constitute the collective seed of the serpent. The children of human beings who follow God and righteousness constitute the collective seed of the woman. The collective seed of woman are the righteous human beings, embracing all those who share the woman's enmity toward Satan. The collective seed of the serpent are the wicked human beings, embracing all who willing yield to Satan without so much as a fight.

When Adam and Eve dragged the human race into sin, they inadvertently entered into agreement with the deceiver, the serpent-Satan. If God "had not interceded the human race would have been lost forever. Immediately Christ implanted enmity in Adam and Eve and later in their offspring—enmity against Satan as a part of the first gospel text" (Pink, 2005, p. 63). Humanity, in its fallen nature, has no innate enmity between them and Satan, but rather a natural bent towards unrighteousness. Subsequently, all Homo sapiens are born sinners. This divine-imputed enmity in humanity against Satan and sin is not a human contribution but entirely a gift from God. "It is grace that implants enmity in human nature . . . It has everything to do with general revelation, for all humans have this 'enmity' within, which explains why so many non-Christians have a sense of justice and fairness" (Gulley, 2003, p. 191-192). This enmity would prevent Satan from recruiting all mankind for his rebellion against God. This is good news.

There is a progression of parallelism of enmity in Genesis 3:15, as mentioned above. Serpent battles humanity on

three different levels. First, on the personal singular level the woman would do battle with Serpent. God put enmity in her heart toward Serpent for the benefit of resisting Satan victoriously. Second, the enmity is passed on to the seed of woman and the seed of Serpent. Third, the collective seed of the woman narrows down to a singular representative Seed of the woman. The enmity between the two seeds would reach its climax in a confrontation whereby the singular representative Seed of the woman confronts and exterminates the devil. In the process, the serpent painfully strikes the heel of this Messianic Champion of righteousness (Smith, 1993).

The Enmity of Gen 3:15 in Human History

The enmity of Genesis 3:15 began to rage at the very dawn of history. Genesis 3 and 4 elucidate the contrast between the godly and ungodly offspring of Adam and Eve. This enmity can be traced on individual, small group, and societal levels. Cain and Abel were the initial representatives of the Serpent's seed and the woman's seed respectively.

Cain and Abel were taught and instructed to bring sacrificial offerings of worship to Yahweh. The casual and carefree attitude of Cain, devoid of devotion, faith, and love may be seen when he brought to the Lord "some of the fruits of the ground" (Gen 4:3). This blood-less offering was unacceptable to God. In giving "the firstlings of the flock and the fat thereof" (Gen 4:4), Abel gave the best parts of his best animals. God accepted Abel's righteous offering of faith, love, and heart devotion (Matt 23:35; Heb 11:4).

Hardened and impudent, Cain was wrath against God and Abel. Cain neglected God's direct warning and wooing and eventually slew Abel, his brother (Gen 4:7-10). He did this "because his deeds were evil and his brother's were righteous" (1 John 3:11-12). The enmity of Genesis 3:15 was first fulfilled in the murderous act of Cain against Abel, his brother. Thus, Cain clarified himself as a seed of the serpent persecuting the seed of the woman typified by Abel. Cain's posterity sustained the evil lineage of the seed of the serpent. Not until the birth of Seth, in place of Abel "whom Cain killed" (Gen 4:25) did the "seed of the woman" return in perpetuity. "At that time people began to call on the name of the Lord" (Gen 4:26b). The seed of the woman became tantamount to those who proclaim the name of the Lord from generation to generation (Gen 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 22:9; 26:25; 33:20; 35:1; Exod 17:15; 1 Kings 18:24; Joel 2:32; Zeph 3:9; Acts 2:21).

"Cain went out from the presence of the Lord" (Gen 4:16). He built a family comprising of those who make up the seed of the serpent. "They have gone the way of Cain" (Jude 11). Among them was Lamech who was the first to violate the principle of monogamy. He also recorded a boastful ballad celebrating vengeance (Gen 4:23-24). In spite of their rebellion, Cain's lineage was given divine grace to become leader of various aspects of culture with creative talents.

Genesis 5 itemizes the seed of the woman representing the family of faith from Adam and Seth until Enoch, the seventh generation (Jude 14). These were righteous and godly people who walked with God until Noah's generation. During this time the seed of Serpent became ever more numerous. The teeming population of the world became dichotomized into these two communities. Genesis 6 revealed God's disapproval of the intermarriage or mixing of the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. Both groups can never be reconciled, nor light and darkness; for they shall be perpetually contrary the one to the other. With the worsening level of human degradation, every thought of man's heart was only evil continually, rebelling openly, publicly, flagrantly, and presumptuously against God (Gen 6:5).

These two classes of people typify respectively the lost and the saved; the self-righteous and the broken spirited; the unbeliever and the genuine believer; those who rely salvation by works rather than faith in Christ, "those who insist

upon salvation by human merits, and those who are willing to be saved by Divine grace; those who are rejected and cursed by God, and those who are accepted and blessed" (Pink, 2005, p. 41).

A perpetual enmity has ensued between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the devil among humankind, resulting into all-out war between the righteous seed of the woman and the wicked seed of the serpent. Just like wicked Cain who persecuted righteous Abel, the Serpent's seed continues to hate, assault, buffet, and seek to devour the righteous. This is the fruit of this enmity between the clashing seeds (Henry, 1994).

This dichotomy of seed continued until the time of Noah when God deem it best to destroy the world with fire saving only Noah and his wife and their three sons and their wives. Noah became a type of "new Adam" (Ronning, 1997, p. 180-181). Interestingly, both the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent are represented in the progeny of Noah. After Noah's "fall" through drunkenness, Ham exhibited the seed of the serpent as can be seen in his disrespect of his father and the subsequent curse upon Ham and his descendants. Contrariwise, Shem and Japheth and their descendants constituted the seed of the woman and received blessings (Gen 9:21-27).

The proliferation of the wicked seed of the serpent is enumerated in the genealogy of Ham in Genesis 10:6-20 which included the Nimrod the founder of rebellious Babel and Nineveh. From Ham also came the defiant tribes of Canaanites, Jebusites, Amorites, and Sodom and Gomorrah. The seed of Ham united in rebellion and self-aggrandizement in the construction of the Tower of Babel (Gen 11:1-9). The righteous seed are from Japheth (Gen 10:1-5) and Shem, producing faithful Abraham (Gen 10:21-31; 11:10-32).

From the patriarchal era, the seed of the woman, the seed of promise, becomes the seed of Abraham. God blessed Abraham and his chosen offspring as carriers of blessing of creation mandate of Genesis 1:28; saying: "I will greatly multiply you, I will make you very fruitful, . . . kings will come forth from you" (Gen 17:2, 6, 7). Nonetheless, Abraham produced the blessed seed of the woman through the chosen son, Isaac, and the rejected seed of the serpent through Ismael. Dramatic enmity ensued between Ishmael and Isaac and their descendants. This enmity degenerated in later history into shedding of blood, pre-meditated murder, or hostility between nations leading to war, and all forms of human atrocities.

The ancient enmity of the Philistines against Israel (Ezek 25:15) can be traced back to the Philistine opposition to Isaac, who even named one of his wells blocked by them: "enmity" (Gen 26:21). Isaac's two sons developed enmity from the womb (Gen 25:21-26). "Esau becomes his brother's enemy, as Cain did his brother Abel; like Cain he resolves to kill him" (Westermann, 1985, p. 443). Enmity played out in the lives of Jacob and Esau and in between the nations descended from them. Ezekiel 35:5 speaks of the "ancient enmity" exhibited by the nation of Edom against the nation of Israel, which likely manifested in the Edomites' opposition to Israel's request to pass through Edomite territory on their way to the promised land (Num 20:18-21).

Jacob's children also exhibited the two opposing seeds in enmity. Joseph's ten older brothers initially behaved like Cain, Ham, Ishmael, and Esau, as the moral offspring of the serpent while Joseph and Benjamin would have been the righteous ones. The ten brothers sold Joseph into slavery and lied to cover up their story.

Years after the children of Israel peacefully settled in Egypt, they became victims of Egyptian jealousy, punishment, and slavery (Exod 1:9-13). This was a grand clash of the two seeds. "The nation of Israel is portrayed as God's new creation, the righteous seed at enmity with Egypt, of the seed of the serpent" (Ronning, 1997, p. 211). Further clash between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent on the national level is observed. The neighboring nations

to Israel constituted a nemesis to Israel as Satan instigated them. The Canaanites, Midianites, Amorites, Philistines, Amalakites, Edomites, Assyrians, Babylonians, Medo-Persians, Greece, Romans, and others fanned the flame of enmity against the people of God (Exod 17:8-16; Num 20:14-21; 21:1-3, 21-35; 22-25; 31:1-12; Dan 2; 7).

The Quest for Peace Over the Ancient Human Enmity

Peace is shalom in Hebrew and eirēnē in Greek literature and the New Testament. Peace is the cessation of personal, interpersonal, and national conflict, battle, and enmity; and the presence of calm and inner, domestic, and societal tranquility (Luke 14:32; Acts 12:20; Rom. 14:19; 1 Cor. 7:15; Eph. 4:3). Peace minimizes and eliminates hatred, personal enmity, and collective enmity (Carpenter & Comfort, 2000).

The medieval military ethics attempts to limit private feuds and conceptual and political enmity gave rise to the classical doctrine of the "just war" developed by Augustine and studied by theologians, ethicists, policy makers, and military leaders. This posits that only the lawful government may define an enemy and declare war. Serious considerations must be made of the morality of going to war, moral conduct within war and the morality of post-war settlement and reconstruction (Guthrie & Quinlan, 2007; Fotion, 2007). This was only partially effective as peoples' wars of the 19th century and world wars of the 20th century escalated enmity and wars among nations. "The combination of ideological nationalism with the explosion of weapons technology has made it extremely doubtful whether legal attempts to restrict enmity can succeed" (Huber, 2003, p. 93).

Modern peace movements have been classified by traditions (religious, internationalist, socialist, feminist, conservationist) and by goals or objectives (opposition to all war or to a specific war, opposition to military conscription, opposition to arms races or to specific weapons, advocacy for world order and nonviolent social change). Various organized peace societies began in early 19th century with the likes of the New York Peace Society, London Peace Society, and American Peace Society. There have since been numerous peace organizations and international peace congresses around the world (Chatfield, 1992).

Peace advocates, philanthropists, religious and political figures have shared their concerns for peace and unity among people and nations. The Nobel Peace prize, peace accords, and civil rights campaigns have assisted in promoting nonviolent social change. The United Nations continue their efforts at better negotiations against war, nuclear weaponry, and furthering disarmaments peace education and peace research. Many of these efforts continue to highlight nonviolent alternatives to war and urge citizens to ensure more democratic decision-making in governance nations (Burkholder, 2005).

In the African continent, peace and security has been elusive and far-fetched. There are tribal and inter-tribal wars, colonialism, neo-colonialism, foreign exploitation, political hooliganism, governmental power abuse, ballot robbery, uncontrolled inflation, debilitating debts, environmental pollution, neglected Endemic Tropical Diseases, child and women abuse, or dearth of human rights and civil liberties consistent with a sustainable democratic order. Poor and corrupt African leadership has impoverished the continent (Ngwube, 2013). "Without enduring peace there can be no meaningful development in Africa" (Nhema, 2004, p. 12).

The Organization of African Union (OAU) began in 1963 as the continental organization and was reconstituted as African Union (AU) in 2002. It aims at fostering peaceful and diplomatic cooperation, defending the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of the 32-member African States; while ensuring better human rights and living standards for

all Africans. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the West African regional organization formed in 1975 includes fifteen countries. ECOWAS is posed to grant member nations and their citizens free access to their abundant resources, economic and commercial activities, and engender sustainable environment, efficient education and health systems while ensuring an atmosphere of peace and security. The Southern African Development Community (SADC) was later formed in 1992 to further political, security, and socio-economic cooperation and integration among the fifteen southern African states. The East African Community (EAC), comprising five eastern African countries was resuscitated in 2000.

The AU and ECOWAS have both worked in consonance with the Security Council of the United Nations in managing and authorizing the use of force to maintain peace in Africa. Both African organizations lack needed resources to quench the complex conflicts that rattle the continent without tangible assistance from the United Nations and the international community (Omorogbe, 2011). UN seems to employ selective intervention machinery for African conflicts. The international community awaits Africans to resolve African issues. The UN and USA encourage the use of preventive diplomacy for managing conflicts in Africa and elsewhere (Ngwube, 2013).

However, Africans need to boost their timely conflict prevention, resolution, and mediation capacities and increase their voice in the Security Council of UN especially in deciding how to handle African conflicts like those of Mali, Libya and Ivory Coast (Dersso, 2012). Nonetheless, they were somewhat effective in the African peace and security-keeping mission in Burundi, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Comoros, and Somalia from 1990-2003 (Arthur, 2010). The AU's Peace and Security Council for conflict management and prevention and peace building is still young, inexperience, and bogged down with power tussle and administrative bottlenecks (Ngwube, 2013). Furthermore, African leaders are suspicious of one another (Ngwube, 2013).

CONCLUSIONS

Genesis 3:15 describes the beginning of conflicts in the world, dividing humanity into only two groups: righteous and wicked. This article has given the extent of this enmity from the earlier biblical history of the world begin from Cain the first murderer. Enmity was divinely imputed into humanity towards Satan and all evil. The real purpose of God is to use the enmity to truncate the alliance of evil that came with the fall of humanity into sin. It was the divine plan to disassociate humanity from devilish alliance with Satan and prevent conflicts among humans or between humans and the animals and the environment.

This enmity was to offer converting grace and renewing power and prevent humanity from becoming servants ever ready to do Satan's bidding. This enmity helps us to cultivate hatred towards sin, deception, pretense, and everything that bears the marks of Satan's guile (Ellen White, 1999, p. 117). Rather, Satan has capitalized on fueling enmity between humans instead of human beings being at enmity against Satan. The litany of woes around the world is the handiwork of Satan. Biblical concepts would help the human race to revert to God and hate the devil.

The conflicts in the world and especially Africa would be alleviated as people turn to God and revert to the path of love and peace. Various government, international organizations, and non-governmental groups have become catalyst and advocates of peace. The UN has designated several "International days" in each year to commemorate and emphasize various aspects of peace in the world. There are at least 33 of such international days, all of which have the potential of helping the whole world to rally around peace and security. Each month has at least one such day. These days remember

victims of war, abuse, holocaust, slavery and other violence while advocate anti-corruption, non-violence, health, tolerance, dialogue, development, friendship, human rights, dignity, and solidarity (UNO, 2015).

AU designated 2010 as the "Year of Peace and Security" dubbed: "Make Peace Happen" (Mbakwe, 2010). More such efforts and emphasis would make peace and progress lasting reality in Africa. The regional organizations are making better effort to encourage peace and cooperation. The need for regional armed peacekeeping forces remains critical. More trust and cooperation among nations are non-negotiable

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, Bernhard W. (1967). Creation and Chaos: The Reinterpretation of Mythical Symbolism in the Bible. New York: Associated.

2. Arthur, Peter. (2010). ECOWAS and regional peacekeeping integration in West Africa: Lessons for the future. Africa Today, 57(2), 3-24.

3. Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. [BDB]. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.

4. Burkholder, J. R. (2005). Peace movements. In ed. Erwin Fahlbusch et al., The Encyclopedia of Christianity. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 113-115.

5. Carpenter, E. E. and Comfort, P. W. (2000). Holman Treasury of Key Bible Words: 200 Greek and 200 Hebrew Words Defined and Explained. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

6. Chatfield, C. (1992). The American Peace Movement: Ideals and Activism. New York: Twayne Publishers.

7. Childs, Brevard S. (1962). Myth and Reality in the Old Testament, Studies in Biblical Theology, 27. London: SCM.

8. Curtis, Devon and Dzinesa, Gwinyayi A., eds. (2012). Peacebuilding, Power and Politics in Africa. Cambridge Center for African Studies Series. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

9. Davidson, Richard M. (1994). In the beginning: How to interpret Genesis 1. Dialogue 6 (3), 9-12.

10. Dersso, Solomon. (2012). The Quest for Pax Africana: The Case of the African Union's Peace and Security Regime. African Journal on Conflict Resolution 11, 11-47.

11. Doukhan, Jacques (1978). The Genesis Creation Story: Its Literary Structure. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, 5. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.

12. Fotion, Nicholas. (2007). War and Ethics. New York: Continuum.

13. Gulley, Norman R. (2003). Systematic Theology: Prolegomena. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.

14. Gunkel, Hermann Gunkel. (1964). The Legends of Genesis, the Biblical Saga and History. Trans. W. H. Carruth. New York: Schocken.

15. Guthrie, Charles and Quinlan, Michael. (2007). Just War: The Just War Tradition: Ethics in Modern Warfare. United Kingdom: Bloomsbury Publishing.

16. Harris, R. L., Archer, G. L., and Waltke, B. K., eds. (1980). Theological Workbook of the Old Testament (TWOT). Chicago, IL: Moody.

17. Henry, Matthew. (1994). Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible: Complete and Unabridged in One Volume. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

18. Holter, Knut. (1990). The serpent in Eden as a symbol of Israel's political enemies: A Yahwistic criticism of the Solomonic foreign policy? Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament 1, 106-112.

19. Huber, Wolfgang. (2003). Enemy. The Encyclopedia of Christianity. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 93.

20. Kaiser, Walter C. Jr. (1970). The literary form of Genesis 1-11. In New Perspectives on the Old Testament, ed. J. B. Payne. Waco, TX: Word.

21. Kidner, Derek. (1967). Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary. Tyndale Old Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

22. Leupold, Herbert C. (1953). Exposition of Genesis. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

23. Louw, J. P. and Nida, E. A. (1996). Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains. New York: United Bible Societies.

24. Luther, Martin (1958). Luther's Works. Vol. 1, Lectures on Genesis Chapters 1-5. Trans. George V. Schick. Ed. Jaroslav Pelikan. Saint Loius: Concordia.

25. Mbakwe, Tom. (2010). Make peace happen. New African, 498, 44.

26. Niccacci, Alviero. (1994). Analysis of biblical narrative. In R. D. Bergen, ed., Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 175-198.

27. Ngwube, Arinze. (2013). The African Union and its conflict resolution apparatus. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter). 2(8), 33-42.

28. Nhema, Alfred G. (2004). The Quest for Peace in Africa: Transformations, democracy and public policy. Utrecht: International Books.

29. Ojewole, Afolarin O. (2008). The Seed in Genesis 3:15: An Exegetical and Intertextual Study. Adventist Theological Society Publications. Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society.

30. Omorogbe, Eki Y. (2011). Can the African Union deliver peace and security? Journal of Conflict and Security Law, 61, 35-62.

31. Pink, A. W. (2005). Gleanings in Genesis. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software.

32. Rogerson, John W. (1991). Genesis 1-11. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press.

33. Ronning, John L. (1997). The curse on the serpent (Gen 3:15) in biblical theology and hermeneutics. Ph.D. dissertation, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

34. Rosenbaum, Stanley N. (1984). Israelite homicide law and the term "Enmity" in Genesis 3:15. Journal of Law and Religion, 2, 145-151.

35. Savran, G. (1994). Beastly speech: Intertextuality, Balaam's ass, and the Garden of Eden. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 64, 33-55.

36. Saydon, Paul P. (1962). The conative imperfect in Hebrew. Vetus Testamentum 12, 124-126.

37. Scott, Jack B. (1974). The place of enmity in scriptural teaching. In The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis, ed. John H. Skilton et al., 128-140. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed.

38. Smith, James E. (1993). The Pentateuch. 2nd ed. Old Testament Survey Series. Joplin, MO: College Press.

39. Soggin, J. Alberto. (1975). The fall of man in the third chapter of Genesis. In Old Testment and Oriental Studies. Biblica et Orientalia, 29. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 88-111.

40. Swanson, James. (1997). Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc.

41. Turner, Laurence A. (1990). Announcements of Plot in Genesis. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 96. Sheffield, England: Sheffield.

42. Unger, Dominic J. (1960). The First-Gospel: Genesis 3:15. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute.

43. Wenham, Gordon J. (1987). Genesis 1-15. Word Biblical Commentary. Vol. 1. Waco: Word.

44. Westermann, Claus. (1985). Genesis 12-36: A Commentary. Translated by John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

45. White, Ellen G. (1999). The Faith I Live By. Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald.

46. Williams, Tyler F. (1997). ᵓyḇ. In ed. Willem A. VanGemeren et al, New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1:365-371.

47. Wiseman, P. J. (1985). Ancient Records and the Structure of Genesis: A Case for Literary Unity. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

48. Wolde, Ellen van. (1996). Stories of the Beginning: Genesis 1-11 and Other Creation Stories. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM.

49. UNO. (2015). http://www.un.org/en/sections/observances/international-days