

Federal Museum Denies Slavery in Africa Was 'Dehumanizing'



<http://www.dfamily.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journal.html>

[Smithsonian - Whiteman Slavery dehumanizing. Nonwhite Slavery, current or historical, is a matter of culture and acceptable. Revisionist history.] American History - 1800

Federal Museum Denies Slavery in Africa Was 'Dehumanizing'

<http://www.newsmax.com/archives/articles/2003/3/6/145738.shtml>

Marc Morano, CNSNews.com

Thursday, March 6, 2003

Some Arbiters Put Humans in Second Place

WASHINGTON --

The Smithsonian's African American history museum states that although instances of slavery can be found throughout human history, the practice did **not become "dehumanizing" until white Europeans came along and took slaves to the Americas.**

[This seems to suggest to me there is a right way and a wrong way to capture and keep a slave. I am very curious to learn what the right methods are as I would very much like to have one.]

The museum's West Africa exhibit, which opened Feb. 3 and continues through the end of August, includes the following statement at the entrance of the exhibit:

"Slavery had existed in Africa as it had in other parts of the world, for centuries, but it was not based on race and it did not result in dehumanization and death, as did transatlantic slavery."

[So, if I don't notice the race of my slave, I'm at least half way there?

Do I get points if my slave is the same race I am?

Does nationality come into the mix, as in 80% Iris, 20 Dutch (*no one is American of any part unless they are an American Indian, as I understand it*).]

It claims, "Because the economies of Africa did not depend on slave labor, the number of enslaved people was small until European traders arrived."

[This is difficult to understand. ??

If I have one slave, I may be alright. If I have 7 slaves, then i now have a dehumanizing industry of slaves?

You know, slaves aren't cheap. They have dentist bills just like everyone else only I got to pay them.]

Julia Hotton, curator of the West Africa exhibit, "Captive Passage: The Transatlantic Slave Trade and the Making of the Americas," believes the European trans-Atlantic slave trade was much more violent than the African slave system.

When asked to explain **why**, as the museum exhibit states, **African slavery was not "dehumanizing,"** Hotton suggested it would be wise **not "to concentrate on that particular phrase,"** but added that "it was a different slave system" in Africa.

[What? We are to take the phrase at face value and sign off on it? Why should we not ask upon what gyrations of logic they have come to some conclusion and presented it as fact.

Can you see that is what we have here? An opinion, with evidence arranged to support an opinion, and then presented as **fact**.

When you go to an Smithsonian exhibit, are you expecting historical facts or a political worldview?

If the former, then isn't this a betrayal of trust? Deceitful?]

Slavery in Africa "just wasn't as violent and as perpetual as it was here," Hotton explained.

When pressed again on the issue of slavery in Africa, Hotton backpedaled.

"I am sure it was... I am sure it was dehumanizing. We are now talking about a matter of degree. That is very difficult," Hotton said.

[Beg pardon?

You've changed your mind?

African slavery is dehumanizing too? Does this mean I am not going to get my own slave?

We have a problem here. The Smithsonian exhibit said Slavery was not dehumanizing until the White men got involved. Now, the curator caves under very little pressure (*does there seem to be much discussion or pressure on them so far?*).

Does this mean the exhibit is going to be changed for the benefit of the future 100,000+ students and tourist coming their way yet?

Does this mean all the 100s of thousands of people who have gone THROUGH the Exhibit already will get certified letters telling them "Oops! We were wrong. We gave you bad information?"

"I don't know how absolute that is because I can't guarantee that somewhere along the way a slave somewhere did not die because of mistreatment," Hotton said.

[Is that the definition between benevolent and dehumanizing slavery? To be race blind and not let your slave die on your watch?

Easy! We'll dye all slaves "green" before we buy them and we'll give them their freedom just before they die? Would that work?]

'Hypocrisy'

Brad Phillips, the president of Persecution Project Foundation, a Christian ministry aiding victims of today's strife in Africa, said the Smithsonian exhibit's message was one of "hypocrisy and inconsistency."

Phillips, who has personally witnessed the effects of modern-day slavery in Sudan during his more than 60 trips there, told CNSNews.com all slavery is "dehumanizing."

"Slavery is slavery is slavery is slavery ... when you have little children, little girls that are being abducted or sold by their parents for economic reasons, being sold as sexual slaves in Burma and Thailand, it's all dehumanizing. Let's just be consistent; let's apply the same standards," Phillips said.

[We are consistent. Did any of the slaves die? Were the buyers white?]

Professor Robert Eng, a history professor at the University of Pennsylvania, also criticized the Smithsonian's views about the history of slavery in Africa.

"It's like comparing different levels of hell," said Eng regarding whether the trans-Atlantic slave trade was worse than Africa's domestic slave trade.

But professor Cheikh Babou, an African Studies professor at the University of Pennsylvania, believes race-based slavery was much worse than other types of slavery and agrees with the Smithsonian's view that African slavery was not "dehumanizing."

"I think that the type of slavery we saw in West Africa and other areas of Africa, where people were connected to their culture and environment, where they were not considered outside of the human purview, was different from what we saw later," Babou told CNSNews.com.

The Joy of African Slavery

According to Babou, many African slaves were treated like family members.

"A domestic slave, a slave that was pretty much incorporated into family, was like an adopted child in the family. They were not a commodity. They were not dehumanized," Babou explained.

[On one hand, there would not be "**trade**" except for the import/export business if all slaves were treated as family members.

On the other hand, there certainly quite a number of stories of slaves being treated as part of the family. Is not a mistress or nanny at least two family positions.]

Phillips disagreed, insisting that Africa's domestic slave trade was and still is dehumanizing.

"Slavery is a cultural system. It has been going on [since] ... Moses," Phillips said.

[So has lying, stealing, murder, and many other sins. What is and what ought are not quite the same thing, are they?]

"Of course [**slavery in Africa**] was dehumanizing. Of course people were denied their God-given rights. People were treated as subhumans; they were treated as animals," he said.

[God-given rights... That's interesting. I thought the Smithsonian people were humanist? Can you speak in terms of "God's" anything with people who do not recognize there is a god?]

Slavery Today: Amputations, Rape, Family Destroyed ...

Phillips said present-day slavery in Africa frequently results in "having your hands and feet cut off, sexual slavery, chattel slavery, being forcibly evicted from your home, having your wives taken, your children being taken by force for slavery."

[Ah, but did they die, was it race related, and is a nasty white person involved?]

Phillips pointed to the existence of slavery in Sudan as evidence of a double standard among academics and political leaders.

Why Don't 'Reparations' Agitators Object?

"Where is the outrage? The same people that want reparations for American slavery - where is

their outrage for Africans who are being slaughtered today?" Phillips asked.

[What do you think?
Is there a double standard?

Should reparations be made to African's who have every had a slave for a past relative?

What happens if they have both slaves and slave owners or slave traders in their ancestry?
Can they just pay themselves?

Is there such a thing as non dehumanizing slavery?

If so, how would it look?
What sort of culture would it be?
What about the slavery we read about in the Old Testament?]

The Smithsonian is already being criticized for its portrayal of America at the Museum of American History.

The Smithsonian museums receive approximately two-thirds of their funding from the federal government and the rest from corporate and private donations.

The National Park Service is also under fire for presenting a video at the Lincoln Memorial that many visitors believe implies Abraham Lincoln would have supported abortion and homosexual "**rights**," as well as the modern feminist agenda. However, the Park Service is seeking to modify the content of the video, following several reports by CNSNews.com.



<http://www.dfamily.com/philosophy/teach/hswtl/journal.html>