

# Endsights:



*"Isn't Christianity a tool used to enslave people of African descent?"*

By John Odoom  
Contributor

A perversion of Christianity has been used in order to enslave black people. We're all very familiar with the history of slavery in our nation, but there are some attacks upon the message of Christ concerning freedom and equality for everyone. One of these instances is found in the Old Testament, Genesis 9:18-28. You may not have heard about this supposed curse, but many "educated" whites have—incorrectly. In one of my classes, the professor, being convinced, used the story about Ham and Noah as a theory to explain the attitudes of certain writers concerning the positional relationship in which they place black and white characters (often making the black character inferior to the white one). The professor told the story like this: Noah got drunk. He was in his tent and he took his clothes off. His son Ham saw him and went out and told his two brothers and they came in and covered Noah up. When Noah woke up, he placed a curse on Ham that he would be a servant to his brothers. So this is called the Hamitic curse.

Actually, the bible never said it was a curse on Ham. The curse was on the Canaan, Noah's grandson. Genesis 9:25 says, "Cursed be Canaan; A servant of servants he shall be to his brothers." Whether Canaan was personally involved with his father's sin I do not know (he might have seen Noah's condition first and then told his father). But Ham is punished for his dishonor to his father by having a son who would bring dishonor to Noah. The curse is not on the Hamites, but on the Canaanites. Why do "educated" whites call it the Hamitic curse? We know that Ham is an ancestor of Ethiopians and Africans. Some white people have twisted the Scripture to say that the curse was on Ham, and that it is indirectly a curse on all people of African descent, when it was in fact a curse on Canaan. Many people have greatly misunderstood and misinterpreted the context of this passage

At any rate, God has already taken care of that. If

you look at Psalms 135:11, it says that "all the kingdoms of Canaan have been destroyed." God's prophecy against Canaan has already taken place, so we, as black people, are to be encouraged, not enslaved—we were not meant to be servants by a mandate from God.

In the New Testament, Paul teaches about slavery. Some people say that what Paul is teaching on slavery is alright, however, in ancient Rome it was possible for anyone to be a slave. So called slavery in the Roman world was not based upon superiority or inferiority or skin color. Paul addresses himself only to those masters and servants who had received his message and who had become Christians. He is talking about a Christian slave and a Christian master. He is not making a general statement to those who are not in the Body of Christ.

If you read the book of Philemon, Paul addresses a slave holder, Philemon, and it doesn't say anything about taking Onesimus back and making him a slave again. It says, "treat him as a brother".

It is an historical fact that the principles Paul taught concerning slave and master relations within the Christian community actually laid the foundation for the abolition of slavery in the Roman world. So Paul is being misquoted. Cultural Christianity has taken what Paul has said and has twisted it.

Many who criticized Paul because he did not condemn slavery as it was manifested in America failed to realize that he could not condemn what did not exist. The type of slavery that our grandfathers and grandmothers had to bear was not what Paul was addressing. What the Bible says on slavery cannot be twisted to say that slavery is alright for those people of African descent.

Galatians 3:28 says, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, Paul elevates men and women of all races to equality, as one in the Body of Christ. What we see today is a perversion of the gospel for selfish reasons. Man is made in God's image; God doesn't have a color. No one is inferior to anyone else on this basis.

**Express yourself about issues that concern Black Ink readers. Drop your article by Suite 108-D Student Union, or mail to Black Ink, CB# 5210, Student Union, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514**

*Black Ink will hold a staff meeting today in room 226 of the Carolina Union at 6:30. All interested UNC students and staff are welcome.*

*Think Black Ink...*

**Today!!**

## What's Goin' On?

"We've got to find a way...bring some understanding here today... What's goin' on?" Marvin Gaye asked it in the 60's, now I'm asking it in the 90's.

When the results of the Senate race were reported, I couldn't help but ask myself how much progress we have made during the last thirty years.

When one really thinks about the competition between Gantt and Helms, one cannot overlook the "color war" that is going on. At first, it seemed as though this race was based upon morals and upon who was right for representing the State of North Carolina. However, a covert war was slowly, yet surely, being waged based on color. Yet, this "color war" that I am speaking of cannot solely be focused upon the Gantt-Helms campaign.

Somehow, without anyone's knowledge, this war found its way upon our campus and then into our lives. This war slinked and slid like a poisonous viper until it found shelter in the minds of each college student. Yet the war did not stop here. It began to feed upon everyone's minds, upon our hopes and our fears; upon our love and our hate until it became unravelled and uncontrollable.

The results of such an insurrection were in the form of the attempted degradation and dehumanization of our beautiful, black homecoming queen, the destruction of a Gantt poster (a destruction dripping with the anguish and affliction similar to that of three decades ago), and the erection of oppressive and offensive statues in front of our major library.

Yet, who can fully take the blame for these demeaning goings on? Who can be picked out of this terrible color war that is being waged? The answer does not lie in pointing out a particular individual who must take the blame. In actuality there was no intended color war in the beginning. However, the terrible slurs that degraded our homecoming queen, defaced Mr. Gantt's poster, and erected such offensive statues merely opened our eyes. We are now aware of the present conditions of the State of North Carolina.

The issue at hand, therefore, is what is to be done about it. It is very obvious that the present state of North Carolina is not a pretty picture. I think the scenario of tug-of-war best suits this situation. The Blacks are pulling on one side and the Whites are pulling on the other side. Nobody is slackening off of the rope, yet nobody is winning either. No one is getting anywhere. The reason for this stand still is that no one realizes that we have to do the right thing—not the black and white thing!

Now, in the 90's, the Winans are singing, "Our opinions might not be the same, but there are so many things that are. Hand in hand we can form a change that never can be torn apart. Together we stand...divided we fall. Let's build a bridge, tear down the wall..." Please, let's not wait another thirty years to find out "What's Goin' On!"—Chandra McLean