
Notes on the curse of Canaan (not Ham).

In Gen. 9:19-24 we have the events related to us of Noah's experiences after his drinking fermented grape juice. Ham committed a sin. This might be interpreted in several ways, however, I content myself with Br. Russell's statement in Rpt. 3044, "unseemly conduct disrespectful to his father..." Why accept this simple statement? Because the Scriptures do NOT tell us what happened.

This leads us then to Gen. 9:25-27 and Noah's rather prophetic utterances regarding Canaan, Shem and Japheth. We notice that Ham is NOT mentioned.

We also read of Ham's sons in Gen. 10:6, "And the sons of Ham: Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut and Canaan."

Egypt is later known as the "land of Ham." See Psa. 105:23, 27, 106:21, 22. Mizraim is Strong's #4714 and means *upper and lower Egypt*.

However, Canaan's descendants and their lands are described in Gen. 10:15-19. In these verses, his descendants are those people who occupied the Promised Land of Canaan! NOT northern Africa. They were the gross idolaters that God commanded the Hebrews to destroy and to take the Land as theirs. Hence Canaan's descendants were either slaughtered or made subject to SHEM'S descendants—the Hebrews or Israelites.

There is no curse on Ham nor Cush nor Mizraim nor Phut. **Only one of his four sons (Gen. 10:6 and Gen. 9:25), Canaan, is cursed.** There is no reason to think that Canaan's offspring were Negroes, nor were any that inhabited the land of Canaan. Rather, if any of Ham's sons' off-spring were eventually negroes, it would be those that went into Africa—Mizraim, Cush and Ham himself.

So logically, if any of the descendants from any of the other three sons became negroes **this proves that being negro is not the curse.**

When we read the ONE sentence quote by Br. Russell in Rpt. 2344, it is something like this: "the negro race is SUPPOSED to be descended from HAM, whose special degradation is mentioned in Gen. 9:22, 25."

I can understand how this MIGHT imply that Br. Russell thought that the negro race is "a special degradation." However, we emphasize that he is just saying "is supposed to..." This is what some others were stating and he is just repeating it.

However, it is most important to read his lengthy 2 1/2 page article entitled "The Negro Not A Beast." (Rpts. 3042-3044) It is very clear in this article that he does not think that being a negro is a punishment. See sub-heading "How Shall We Account for Racial Differences?"

A few quotes:

"In attempting to account for the wide differences between whites and blacks, and the lesser difference between these and the yellow, brown, and red, we are treading upon **uncertain** ground—as all ground must be in which our imperfect knowledge and imperfect reasoning powers have **not inspired** direction from the Lord's Word. Hence it should be understood at the out-start that all that we or others can do is to **guess** on this subject..."

"Noah declared prophetically that Ham's characteristics, which had led him to unseemly conduct disrespectful to his father, would be found cropping out later, inherited by his son—and prophetically he foretold that this degeneracy would mark the posterity of Canaan, DEGRADING HIM, MAKING HIM SERVILE. We are **not able to determine** to a certainty that the sons of Ham and Canaan are the negroes, but we consider that general view as probable as any other."

We note that Br. Russell is NOT saying that being a Negro is the curse. Rather that the curse would be that this poor character attribute would appear in Canaan's off-spring—those heathens that lived in the land of Canaan as described above—and they would be servants to Shem's off-spring, the Israelites, and to some extent Japheth's descendants (more on this later).

This would be the perfect place for Br. Russell to write that being Negro was the curse, but he did not.

Again, the curse is not being a certain race rather it is being "servants."

It is very useful to see how Br. Russell handled this subject of Ham and his descendants in "The Photo-Drama of Creation," on page 19 briefly, then on pages 22, both sides. He does NOT go into any race theory. Rather he has a colored photo of the three sons of Noah. Please pay particular attention to the one on the left representing his opinion of Ham's descendants. He does not look to be negro.

As Br. Russell observed, God foreknew that Ham's descendants through (only) one son—Canaan—would live in the Land that He would eventually give to Shem's descendants, the Israelites. This was the punishment for Ham, knowing what his actions would bring upon one of his later generations.

Now to the scriptural presentation: of the four sons of Ham **only one** (Canaan) has a detailed geographical description of the land he and his descendants would occupy. See Gen. 10:15–19, especially vs. 19. This same land is extensively referred to in holy writ as “The Promised Land.” This is the land that God Almighty would lead His covenanted people to and give it to them *forever*. It is not historically where the negro race resided.

God instructed Joshua and the Hebrews to decimate the Canaanite inhabitants due to their extreme idolatry. They would be driven into submission (**servants**) to Shem’s descendants, the Hebrews!

Furthermore, when the Greeks, and later the Romans, occupied and dominated the Land of Israel (formerly Canaan of the Canaanites), then also would be fulfilled the prophetic utterance of Noah— “God shall enlarge Japheth and he shall dwell in the tents (the land) of Shem (in Israel), and Canaan (in an extended sense) shall be his servant (too).”

We observe that all humans have 99.99% of the same genetic make-up. The four basic differences in the one human *race* are based upon subjective outward appearances: Negroid, Caucasoid, Mongoloid and Australoid. There are 22 sub-groupings.

We also note that the Caucasoid group is made up of the following categories: Aryans, **Hamites**, **Semites** and Arabs. They are mostly in Europe, North America and the Middle East.

The various skin tones, from fair or light to dark, are based upon biological makeup. We see no attempt in the Scriptures to define the white, black, red, yellow, brown or swarthy olive. There are just a few passing scriptures, none of which try to define a punishment, curse or other problem.

Undoubtedly this is why Br. Russell did not attempt to do so.

Here are a few errors in the Lesson 5 part 2:

1. On page 3 the thought that the lesson of Gen. 9:27 is teaching that the Caucasian race is a race that dominates, is a far overreach. We demonstrated a reasonable interpretation of that verse foregoing. However, there have been many dominating peoples of various races throughout history. Just think of the Mongols and Huns, the Chinese and Japanese, the Mayans and Aztecs along with others.
2. On page 3 verse 26 is referenced. It is stated that this Lord God is Jesus. However, in the Hebrew the verse reads “...LORD God...”. This is an obvious reference to the LORD God Almighty, using the tetragrammaton. This cannot referring to Jesus or his pre-human existence. It is God Almighty and Noah is referring to the fact that it

would eventually be through Shem's descendant, Abraham, that God would make His great covenant.

3. Also on page 3, the presentation regarding who the Semites are is not in accordance with what is more commonly thought today. The author has tried to reduce all the variables among earth's population to just three. This just does not work out in the real world.
4. On page four the thought is presented that Mongoloids are a "peaceful people"! Attila the Hun and Mao Tse-tung! This is a completely unnecessary and inaccurate thought.
5. It is stated that "ALL religions are originated in Asia" and then a list is given. Actually, there are numerous religions that developed elsewhere in ancient times: Druids, Norse mythology, Greek and Roman mythology, the ancient Egyptian mystery religions, Eskimo, North American Indian, Mayan, Aztec, Australian Aboriginal, and more. Again a gross misrepresentation, completely unnecessary.
6. On page 5 Romans 1:27 is quoted to try to demonstrate that homosexuality was an evil of the pre-flood world. However, in the context of Romans 1, this conduct has taken place throughout the Ages, with perhaps the most prominent example being in Abraham's day, with Sodom and Gomorrah, long after the Flood of Noah's day. Actually, we are not informed of what this antediluvian world's "only evil continually" (Genesis 6:5) is. But further in Genesis 6:11, "the earth also was corrupt before God and the earth was filled with violence." There is no mention of homosexual activity.

Therefore, this premise on pages 5 and 6 are without sound scriptural support.

7. It is stated on page 6 that Noah cursed the entire generation of Ham starting with his next son—Canaan. Again, we find several errors. One is that Ham had four sons as already demonstrated. Three of his sons were NOT cursed. So then, three fourths of Ham's generation was NOT cursed. Secondly, Canaan was not "his next son." Canaan was the fourth of four sons.
8. Next on page 6 begins the most serious of slanders, that all Africans are cursed and became Negroes. How absurd! We have already shown from scripture that Canaan did not go into Africa. Rather, his land would be the Promised Land that would eventually belong to Abraham and his natural seed, the Israelites.
9. Furthermore, the author presents his own deprecated opinion of Negroes' appearance! How strange for a Christian to so present their own biased thinking! This has resulted in many of our brethren to be greatly offended, including myself.
10. And again, on page 6, the thought is presented that Negroes have been slaves, which in itself is true. Yet historically most nations have horribly enslaved others. In fact, even in the Law that God gave to Israel, Israelites could sell themselves as servants! In the New Testament the Apostle Paul writes that slaves should serve their

masters faithfully and that masters should be kind and fair to their slaves! See 1 Timothy 6:1-3, Titus 2:9-10, etc.

In fact, even the entire Hebrew nation of tribes were slaves in Egypt!

So then, being Negro, or a slave, is not evidence of being cursed by God or by Noah.

In conclusion, it is up to each one of us to personally study this subject with the intent to be pleasing to God, not to other men, not to other brothers or sisters. If we have been wrong in our previous understanding, let each clear their conscience before the LORD by trying to set the matter correctly with scriptural logic and proof, along with the spirit of humility to any others to whom they may have presented an honest but faulty, erroneous view.

End.
