

Methods of Racism in Modern Philosophy

Reza Sadeghi

Associate Professor of Philosophy Department, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran. E-mail: rezasadeqi@gmail.com

Article Info

ABSTRACT

Article type:

Research Article

Article history:

Received 30 April 2022

Received in revised 6 June 2022

Accepted 11 June 2022

Published online 1 January
2023

The deepest and most rooted form of racism can be found in the Bible which claims the superiority of a race as God's demand or divine destination. But this idea survived in modern philosophy by appeal to the different methods. In this paper I will introduce methods of justifying racism, most of which are in the philosophical context. Legal racism claims that some races have not enough reason to be members of civil society and enjoy their rights. Racism in its historical method, claims that the history of thought has shown that some races play a major role in the production of thought and this is a result of their superiority. In philosophical method, it is argued that some of the human capabilities in some species have not been activated and finally in scientific method, it is claimed that the superiority of one race in the struggle for survival is a scientific achievement of the scientific laws such as Evolution hypothesis.

Keywords:

racism, tolerance,
methodology, justice,
discrimination.

Cite this article: Sadeghi, Reza. (2023). Methods of Racism in Modern Philosophy. *Journal of Philosophical Investigations*, 16(41), 257-270. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22034/JPIUT.2022.33443.3192>



© The Author(s).

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22034/JPIUT.2022.33443.3192>

Publisher: University of Tabriz.

Introduction

Racism has been a cause of suffering and violence in all ages and still is present in all societies not only in practice, even in thought. In this paper, my purpose is not to discuss the history of racism in human societies. My purpose is to examine different methods of defending racism in history of thought, especially in modern philosophy¹. Racism in its Common application is the belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and that these racial differences result in inherent superiority or inferiority². As Grosfoguel argues, in defining racism most sources go beyond its limited meaning of color racism, and in this case we will encounter a wide varieties of racism of which nationalism is just one popular example (Grosfoguel, 2016: 10).

Psychology, individual thought, and social structure are three dimensions in which we may find racism (Shiao; Woody, 2021: 497). But the most dangerous institutionalized racial attitudes and behaviors has emerged in communities where there have been thinkers who by relying on various accepted methods have defended racism and established it in the mind of individuals and the structure of society. However, it is not always easy to find systems of thought that reinforce racism. As Braveman and others argued “Structural and systemic racism are often invisible—at least to those who are not its victims (Braveman; Arkin; Proctor; Kauh; Holm, 2022: 171).

Of course it is a scientific and historical fact that human beings are divided into groups which are physically different from each other. The mere acceptance of this fact that human beings, according to their physical features, such as skin color, are different is not racism. Racism begins when the value of some groups is determined by their races. Also, in any moral system, human beings are evaluated based on their voluntary behavior, but any valuation of human beings based on color, gender, skin, blood, language, ethnicity, physiology, climate, and geography is an example of racism which is immoral and non-human. The rationale for the prohibition of racism is that these differences are generally inherited, irreversible and non-voluntary. So any kind of such differences is not a moral criterion for human valuation. In this context, ethnocentrism, provincialism, Eurocentrism, and nationalism are related to racism and each of these concepts can be a subset of racism or provide a base for justifying it.

It is not immoral if the price of animals is determined by their breed or price of natural materials determined by their color. But there are other criteria for determining the value of human beings. Disagreement with racism is not to say that human beings have no difference in their values or rights. Those valuations and differences of rights which are based on voluntary and changeable behaviors, feelings and beliefs is not a kind of racism and does not have a moral prohibition. A person who believes that children have no respect for their lives and enjoy their killing for these beliefs and feelings is a vicious man. Such a person cannot be expected to enjoy the right to liberty

1. Perhaps this difference can be expressed with the two words racism and racialism. Accordingly racism is a bias against a group, but racialism is a belief that race is the primary determinant of human traits and capacities and so racial differences produce an inherent superiority of a particular race. But given the fact that the difference between these two words is not generally considered, in the whole text we will only use the term racism.

2. SEE RACISM. MERRIAM-WEBSTER DICTIONARY. [HTTPS://WWW.MERRIAM-WEBSTER.COM/DICTIONARY/RACISM](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/racism).

like ordinary people. Accordingly, a person who has learned science with his endeavors is more valuable than when he was ignorant, and someone who can control his anger and lust will have more moral value than someone who is under control of his anger or lust.

Perhaps the need for parental support and the feeling of belonging to close relatives, which is necessary for survival and can be found between animals too, is an instinctive basis for racism in the history. This instinct, which is also the root of the formation of the tribe, is, in its first appearance, merely emotional and psychological, and like other instincts, must be controlled by intellectual, legal, and ethical laws and values, otherwise it can lead to violence against other races or even genocide. In the following, I will argue that this tendency to racism has been so strong in history that to defend it almost all acceptable methods such as legal, historical, philosophical and scientific have been used.

Racism before Enlightenment era

In educational and historical books, the genocide of the Jewish people in Nazi regime is often regarded as the most prominent example of racism. However, in order to consider the roots of racism, we must return to the ancient times. Ancient Greece philosophy divided humans into Greek and barbaric. The Romans also had the same idea. (Hume, 1988: 253) The root of this idea was the myths that introduced the Greeks as descendants of the gods. In the Middle Ages Church found this view as contrary to Christ's teachings and opposed racism. In Christianity, every human being with any color and race can be a member of the Church and enjoy faith, prosperity and salvation with his own will and authority. From this point of view, Augustine as an African became one of the great fathers of the church.

But from the 12th century onward, with the advent of the signs of renaissance and the weakening of Christian doctrines, once again, the signs of racism appeared in European thoughts, and human beings were classified with racial criteria such as blood and land. In the 12th century, Maimonides in *Guide for the Perplexed* emphasized that the Turks and others who live in places around the globe, although superior to the monkey, lack reason and are not considered human. (Hannaford, 1996: 112). Samuel al-Israeli also believed that some people were inherently slave (Hannaford, 1996: 198-199). Later, Montesquieu, being influenced by the same idea, justified slavery by the climate criteria and as we will see, philosophers like John lock, Hume and Kant defended this argument and expanded it by appeal to other methods.

The root of racism in the works of Maimonides and Israeli was not Greek myths but Old Testament which can be regarded as the most persistent and most detailed defense of racism. Old Testament introduces the race of Israelites as a chosen nation by God for his inheritance in the earth:

For thou didst separate them from among all the people of the earth, to be thine inheritance¹ (Kings1, 8: 53).

This text condemns other nations to destruction or enslavement:

When the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee; thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son (Deuteronomy, 7: 3-4).

In Old Testament race and blood is the reason for the supremacy of the children of Israel and therefore, other tribes cannot share this prosperity which is special to the Jewish people. If the superiority of the Jewish people is because of their thoughts or behavior, this text would invite other nations to the same thought or behavior to become a member of God's chosen people. But Old Testament not only never invite other tribes to faith, it has reported several genocides and confirmed them as fulfillment of the god's command. The first recommendation and confirmation of breeding also could be found in this text. Old Testament, in several verses, recommends racial cleansing and treats marriage with other races as a betrayal of God (Nehemiah, 13: 26-28).

The land you go to capture is a land that is unclear from the desires of the nations of the nations ... So now do not give your daughters to their sons, and do not take their daughters to their sons, and they will keep their health and prosperity forever, so that you will be strong (Ghazra, 9: 11-13).

This kind of racism does not exist in the principles of Christianity and Islam. Faith and salvation in these two religions are not assigned to a specific race, and all races are invited to faith and happiness. But Christianity has been involved in preserving this kind of racism because of preserving Old Testament as a sacred book. Meanwhile, Sometimes the racial content of Old Testament is also repeated in the New Testament. As an example in Mark, when a non-Jewish woman needed healing, Jesus answered him that:

Let the children first be filled: for it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs (Mark, 7: 28).

So the church is also responsible for the return of racism.

Legal racism

In the Age of Enlightenment, and with the weakening of religion society, racism survive by appeal to the modern methods such as legal method. Here the best source is John Locke's *Tow treatises on the government*, which has been regarded as a defense for colonial policies and slavery in Great Britain. Locke, in the era of modern colonialism, was a partner in both political power and slave trade companies. So his philosophy of rights was adjusted in such a way as to justify this act and

1. All quotations from the Bible relate to The Holy Bible Set forth in 1611 and commonly known as the King James.

other colonial behaviors. Although Locke in *Two treatises* defended human rights such as freedom and dignity of life and property of members of civil society, he did not consider slaves as members of civil society, and therefore they became deprived of all rights. He defines a slave as follows:

But there is another sort of servants, which by a peculiar name we call slaves, who being captives taken in a just war, are by the right of nature subjected to the absolute dominion and arbitrary power of their masters. These men having, as I say, forfeited their lives, and with it their liberties, and lost their estates; and being in the state of slavery, not capable of any property; cannot in that state be considered as any part of civil society (Locke, 2003: 138).

Locke argued that freedom is conditional on mental and intellectual maturity (Locke, 2003: 125). So if a person does not have the necessary intellect to guide his desires, then the wise will decide instead. "To turn him loose to an unrestrained liberty, before he has reason to guide him, is not the allowing him the privilege of his nature to be free ; but to thrust him out amongst brutes, and abandon him to a state as wretched, and as much beneath that of a man, as theirs" (Locke, 2003: 126). On his view the modern government which realized in Britain was the symbol of the wisdom and the indigenous colonies because lack of modern government were introduced as lacked reason, In Britain, 'wisest and best Princes' Who were 'godlikes' govern (Locke, 2003: 174). But in many colonies, there has been no state at all (Locke, 2003: 144). He also reported the prevalence of cannibalism among the indigenous people of Peru in such a way that every reader was convinced that these cannibals who were so liquorish after man's flesh, that they "would not have the patience to stay till the breath was out of the body, but would suck the blood as it ran from the wounds of the dying man" (Locke, 2003: 38); and does not even have mercy on their child in the cannibal's competition, do not have the authority to their own land and they deserve slavery.

Locke's other legal argument for justifying racial discrimination was based on the principle that work is the main source of value and Land ownership is the result of working on it. (Locke, 2003: 112) Land ownership is as much as we can use. "To enjoy as much as any one can make use of to any advantage of life before it spoils, so much he may by his labour fix a property in" (Locke, 2003: 113) This principle comes aside from the fact that no work has been done in the colonies lands before occupation. So that the fertile lands in the colonies that nobody has worked on it, is the common property of all human beings, and whoever works on them owns them.

He explains in details that a large part of the earth is uncultivated and it is more than the needs of the inhabitants of those regions (Locke, 2003: 114). Indigenous lands are not even worth the fence. With the seizure of the earth nobody will be harmed. "and this Abraham did, in a country where he was a stranger" (Locke, 2003: 117) By serving on the ground and increasing production, we serve the human species. Prophet God gives land "to the use of the industrious and rational (and labour was to be his title to it), not to the fancy or covetousness of the quarrelsome and contentious." (Locke, 2003: 114)

He consistently compares the amount of British withdrawal from the earth with the amount of native harvest, indicating that they waste resources. (Locke, 2003: 116) Locke permitted war against groups that waste sources of the earth, and again at the time that British government had a large workforce, not working on the lands and resources of the colonies was considered as a great waste and naturally war for agricultural land restoration in the colonies as a fair war.

Where there being more land than the inhabitants possess and make use of, any one has liberty to make use of the waste (Locke, 2003: 183).

Finally in John Locke's political philosophy, the legitimacy of the government is merely the result of a social contract. This principle can also be the basis for the legitimacy of racist governments. Because racist regimes may have a majority of votes. If a person like Hitler is not legitimate for the government even when he is accepted and has the majority, it means that the legitimacy of a government depends, in addition to public acceptance, on other conditions. Nonetheless, all reasons for racism are implicit in John Locke's work, and he has never explicitly defended racism. But in the works of philosophers like Bacon and Hume, there is a kind of explicit racism advocated by the historical method.

Historical racism

In modern times, with the advent of empirical philosophy, racism has also been defended by historical method. The basis of the arguments of empiricists such as Bacon and Hume is that in the history of thought the European race has contributed more to the production of science, and it is an historical evidence that non-European races have less intellectual abilities. Francis Bacon, who simulates the superiority of European to the superiority of God, states in the *New Organon*:

If you compare how men live in the most civilized provinces of Europe with how they live in the wildest and most barbarous areas of the American continent, you will think the difference is big enough—the difference in the condition of the people in themselves as well as in what conveniences and comforts they have available to them—to justify the saying that ‘man is a god to man’. And this difference doesn’t come from the Europeans’ having better soil, a better climate, or better physiques, but from the arts (Bacon, 1620: 118).

Bacon here does not accept the main role of environmental conditions in the flourishing and talent development of a generation and does not take into account the economic and political conditions that play an important role in the growth of science and the accumulation of wealth. This problem is brighter in Hume's historical approach to racism. In discussing the national characters, he states that some nations are “inferior to the rest of the species, and are incapable of all the higher attainments of the human mind” (Hume, 1882: 252). He, in a famous footnote, expands historical method and asks his reader to introduce just one eminent either in action or speculation between black men:

I am apt to suspect the Negroes and in general all other species of men (for there are four or five different kinds) to be naturally inferior to the whites. There never was a civilized nation of any other complexion than white, nor even any individual. No ingenious manufactures amongst them, no arts, no sciences. On the other hand, the most rude and barbarous of the whites, such as the ancient Germans, the present Tartars, have still something eminent about them in their valour, form of government, or some other particular. Such a uniform and constant differences could not happen in so many countries and ages, if nature had not made an original distinction betwixt these breeds of men. Not to mention our colonies, there are Negroe slaves dispersed all over Europe, of which none ever discovered any symptoms of ingenuity, tho' low people, without education, will start up amongst us, and distinguish themselves in every profession. In Jamaica indeed they talk of one negroe as a man of parts and learning; but 'tis likely he is admired for very slender accomplishments like a parrot, who speaks a few words plainly (Hume, 1882: 252n).

If Hume regarded a system that opposes his view as philosophy he could see that Augustine was a great philosopher from Africa in the Middle Ages and, as Lord Monboddo in *Antient Metaphysics* argued, that Greek philosophy was derived from the ancient Egyptians and that the ancient Egyptians as an African nation possessed of genius as much as any European nation that Hume might care to name (Garrett, 2000: 178n).

It should also be noted that European men have not been in the same situation as women and blacks throughout history. Two breeds can be compared if they are in the same condition. If European noble white men, were humiliated, like women or black people, throughout a few thousand years of history, and be caught in hard day-to-day work, can they play a role in producing thought? and Suppose members of an African tribe has been called themselves over the centuries as a superior race, and it is constantly indoctrinate to their mind that God's grace is that they should finally dominate the other races and to govern the entire land. It is likely that this tribe will be able to dominate the world after several thousand years of effort. Specially, if they allow themselves to use any instrument to achieve this goal and don't consider any moral prohibition in dealing with other races. Then in that case, it was that African tribe which is now dominate media, banks and power centers.

Hume did not recognize racism as opposed to principles such as justice. His argument is that if there are weaker beings than humans, we have no moral obligation toward them, and they are condemned to follow us. According to him:

Were there a species of creatures, intermingled with men, which, though rational, were possessed of such inferior strength, both of body and mind... we should not, properly speaking, lie under any restraint of justice with regard to them, nor

could they possess any right or property, exclusive of such arbitrary lords. Our intercourse with them could not be called society, which supposes a degree of equality; but absolute command on the one side, and servile obedience on the other (Hume, 1983: 25).

He introduces animals, non-Europeans and women¹ as three examples of weaker creatures, and writes about the superiority of Europeans:

The great superiority of civilized Europeans above barbarous Indians, tempted us to imagine ourselves on the same footing with regard to them, and made us throw off all restraints of justice, and even of humanity, in our treatment of them (Hume, 1983: 23).

Even the rules of war are special to the war between civilized nations and not to be practiced in the civilized war against the wild:

And were a civilized nation engaged with barbarians, who observed no rules even of war; the former must also suspend their observance of them, where they no longer serve to any purpose; and must render every action or encounter as bloody and pernicious as possible to the first aggressors (Hume, 1983: 23).

Although Hume was an extreme racist, he did not agree with slavery. But his opposition to slavery does not mean he was worried about the human's place and rights of a slave. His reason was that slavery weakens human transcendental traits in the masters. (Palter, 1995: 8.) Therefore, his philosophy like his cooperation with the government played an important role in the British Colonial policy.

Hume, like Bacon, uses the historical method to justify racism but relying on this method is problematic for him. Because in his epistemology, he criticizes the principle of causality and the method of induction, and emphasizes that the generalization of empirical laws is without reason. He concludes that there is always the possibility of changing the course of nature, and if this applies to the present situation of the races, it is always possible for the black and other colonized nations to have a main role in scientific development. This is a clear double standard, that Hume in the discussion of characteristics of other human beings does not pay attention to the skepticism that he posed about the general empirical laws. Sometimes even it seems that he was going to consider other races to be different in their nature and essence and so the other problem is that in the discussion of the human classes he has come to some sort of racial essentialism:

1. Of course here, Hume does not explicitly express his opinion about the superiority of men. Here he just explain that though in many nations, the female sex is, reduced to like slavery, and is rendered incapable of all property, in opposition to their lordly masters, but such are the insinuation, address, and charms of their fair companions, that women are commonly able to break the confederacy, and share with the other sex in all the rights and privileges of society. But we will see that he elsewhere explicitly accepts that men have lordly superiority over women.

Racial essentialism or the idea of unchanging racial substances that support human social hierarchy, was introduced into philosophy by David Hume and expanded upon by Immanuel Kant (Zack, 2014: 85).

Hume claimed that experience has shown that some races are superior, and Kant added that they must be. The next part is about the role of Kant, who agreed with Hume in racism and justified it in a philosophical method. In summarizing criticism of Hume it can be said that racism as one of the main causes of human suffering is contrary to his moral principles and human rights. But the problem with Hume's view is not just moral or legal. Hume rejects essentialism in his philosophy and therefore he cannot defend the inherent distinction between different races. This claim that other races did not contribute to science and philosophy, even if true, doesn't show inherent difference between races and could be due to social and economic conditions of them.

Philosophical racism

James believes that slave trade is the beginning of racial divisions in the modern age and believes that the slave trade was at odds with all the philosophical concepts of that time. (James, 2016: 61) But this is not true, and the fact is that modern philosophy also supported racial divisions. Often in discussing racism in modern philosophy, Heidegger is considered as greatest racist for his association with the Nazi rule. He stated at the beginning of his presidency at the University of Freiburg that he intended to place Nazism at the heart of philosophy. So his critics believe that Nazism and racism are related to Heidegger's philosophical system, and there are writings that are so much shame that attempts have been made to prevent them from being published. In these works, he has spoken about the true nature of Nazism (Rockham, 1375: 107).

At that time, he was a member of the Nazi Party, and during his thirty-one year after Hitler's death, he was able to correct his remarks. But he never did it. From Heidegger's point of view, every thought has a historical nature, and separating Heidegger's ideas from the times that Nazism overcame is not compatible with Heidegger's thinking. Heidegger's other contribution to the spread of racism is that he introduced Nietzsche as a great philosopher to the world, and, as we will see, Nietzsche was simultaneously a great racist. However, dimensions of racism in Heidegger's thinking has often led to neglecting the role of other modern philosophers, especially Kant, in promoting racism.

In his ethics, Kant emphasized universal moral principles and has discussed the possibility of a global peace based on the unity among nations. His critique of European colonial politics is also well known (Heather, 2008: 245), but his thought has another aspect, which is not usually taken into consideration. Kant had anthropological courses in which he discussed inter-ethnic differences, and recent studies show that these lessons were the basis of the deepest racist thought in the eighteenth century (Count, 1950: 704).

To clarify that these lessons were not minor in Kant's academic life, it should be noted that he had 28 ethics courses and 79 ethnographic anthropology courses (Eze, 1997: 104). Bernaskeni

believes that before Kant, the concept of race was not concerned as a scientific concept and Kant introduced it as a scientific concept (Bernasconi, 2001: 11). Kant is influenced by the historical argument of Hume in discussing racism. He welcomed Hume's vision that black people lacking talent and tried to make a philosophical basis for it.

The Negroes of Africa have by nature no feeling that rises above the trifling. Mr Hume challenges anyone to cite a single example in which a Negro has shown talents, and asserts that among the hundreds of thousands of blacks who are transported elsewhere from their countries, although many of them have even been set free, still not a single one was ever found who presented anything great in art or science or any other praiseworthy quality, even though among the whites some continually rise aloft from the lowest rabble, and through superior gifts earn respect in the world. So fundamental is the difference between these two races of man, and it appears to be as great in regard to mental capacities as in color. The religion of fetishes so widespread among them is perhaps a sort of idolatry that sinks as deeply into the trifling as appears to be possible to human nature. A bird's feather, a cow's horn, a conch shell, or any other common object, as soon as it becomes consecrated by a few words, is an object of veneration and of invocation in swearing oaths. The blacks are very vain but in the Negro's way, and so talkative that they must be driven apart from each other with thrashings (Kant, 1997: 55-56).

Kant by accepting Hume's idea that there is a significant difference between the races, try to explain the logic of this difference by geographical anthropology. His critics believe that Kant, under the influence of Rousseau, accepted Eurocentric racism so far that he even denied "the humanity of others" (Mikkelsen, 2013: 5). So in the last decades, Kant's contributions to the racial differences and his prominent role in the extension of racism has been considered, and now even Kant's advocates are convinced that Kant's emphasis on the necessity of racial differences justifies historical inequalities and was the main obstacle to moral progress and Achieving human goals in modern time (Hedrick, 2008: 245). The history of race discrimination in post-Kantian world convinces us that Kant's arguments about ethics, human values and human rights should be evaluated in the light of his racial definition of man.

Kant divides humans into different groups according to their skin color: European White, Asian Yellowstone, African Black and American Indians. Then, based on the popular stories at that time he pointed to examples of the barbarism of non-European nations, such as the permissibility of theft in Africa, the burning of children in Brazil and the strangling of them by Eskimos, which as a non-human behavior can be a sign of a lack of ethical principles. At that time, the publication of these stories was a way to justify colonialism in western societies and Kant's role was to make a philosophical justification for these stories.

According to Kant the differences between humans are not accidental or derived from external conditions. In his view, "the difference in the natural talents among different nations must lie in the nature of man himself" (Eze, 1997: 116). In his view, those races which do not execute ethical principles probably lack intellectual and self-conscious. Kant even thinks these people are deprived of the genius and moral talent that are gifts of nature. In Kant's table of moral classifications, while the Americans are completely uneducable because they lack "affect and passion", the Africans can only be "trained" as slaves and servants. So Kant "advises us to use a split bamboo cane instead of a whip, so that the 'negro' will suffer a great deal of pains (because of the 'negro's' thick skin, he would not be racked with sufficient agonies through a whip) but without dying" (Eze, 1997: 73). To beat "the Negro" efficiently requires "a split cane rather than a whip, because the blood needs to find a way out of the Negro's thick skin to avoid festering" (Eze, 1997: 73).

If justifying racism by philosophical argument is real racism, Kant is the first racialist. He accepted Hume's historical argument and defended racism in a philosophical method. In this new method the "true" nature of "man does not consist in what one *is* but in what one *ought to become*. Although Humans do not have an already given, or ready-made, static essence; they have an ethical one which is transcendental, universal, transcultural, and ahistorical (Eze, 1997: 126).

Scientific racism

In the nineteenth century Darwinism has also been used as a scientific basis for defending racism. Specifically Nietzsche in defense of the will of power, permanently refers to the evolution hypothesis according to which, in the struggle for survival, weaker groups are condemned to destruction. Relied on principles of evolution in human history and society, he concludes that the weak must be destroyed so that Superman can rule the earth.

In Nietzsche's view, the common moral values, such as kindness, charity, peace and the maintenance of the poor, only make weak human generations an obstacle to growth of the superman. The real moral virtue in his view is the war to destroy the weak. So he is rightly has been called the "spiritual father of fascism" and his thoughts have been the source of violence and war in the twentieth century. At the second part of the *Antichrist* he writes:

What is good? — Whatever augments the feeling of power, the will to power, power itself, in man. What is evil? — Whatever springs from weakness. What is happiness? — The feeling that power *increases*— that resistance is overcome. Not contentment, but more power; *not* peace at any price, but war; *not* virtue, but efficiency (virtue in the Renaissance sense, *virtu*, virtue free of moral acid). The weak and the botched shall perish: first principle of *our* charity. And one should help them to it. What is more harmful than any vice? — Practical sympathy for the botched and the weak — Christianity (Nietzsche, 1888: 38).

In Nietzsche's work, there is also a dangerous form of moral and epistemic relativism that can be the basis of racism. If values are relative and historical or if there is no way to know the real

virtues, then there is no way to deny and reject racism. Materialism is also as prevalent in modern thought as relativism, and it can fortify racism. By accepting spirit as an immaterial part of human entity, that all humans have it, different body features lose their importance in human valuation. If man's value is due to an immaterial spirit that is the source of morality, affection, and awareness and reason, then all human beings, both black and white, men and women, will have the same value for having a soul. But in materialism, human being is summed up in his body, and naturally human value is determined by the color, power and size of bodies. Since bodies are different, if there is no soul, the value of humans will be different, and there will be no way to escape racism.

Nationalism is also a modern thought that, along with racism, has been a source of hatred and violence in the last centuries. Although for Kant, the characteristics of civilized nations are the result of their culture, and the characteristics of other nations are the result of their nature. However, in his view, the cultural growth of European nations is related to their race. (Hedrick, 2008: 250). Thus, the concept of nationality, whether defined by nature or by culture, is ultimately bound up with the concept of race, and a hidden form of racism also exists in nationalism.

Some researches¹ in racism have focused on the history of thought, especially the history of philosophy, and have shown that here is a kind of hidden racism in this field that may be considered the most common type of racism. These researches show that ignoring the nonwestern philosophies in the history of philosophy is a deliberate decision based on a definition of rational thinking that has been common since Kant according to which Western philosophy is equivalent to reason and the nonwestern man lacks power of philosophical thinking. The issue is not just that history of philosophy only reports the thoughts of Europeans. The problem is in philosophical texts that European philosophers do not pay attention to the non-European philosophic thoughts and do not consider other races as one side of philosophical dialogue. Always implicitly there is a presumption that philosophy is the invention and monopoly of European white people and this is the reason beyond ignoring the heritage of other races in philosophy as core branch of human sciences that engineer and lead other scientific disciplines.

Although all types of racism are dangerous, racism will be more persistent and more harmful if it is considered as a necessity. If a religion justifies the superiority of a race as the will of God, racism becomes a necessity and also if the difference between the value of races is considered to be a historical or rational imperative. While there is a religious justification for racism in Old Testament in the new era, Kant tried to provide philosophical and rational foundations for the classification of human beings, and for this reason it was said that the title of "Founder of the First racist Theory" deserves Kant (Eze, 1997: 129), but Kantian racism lacks internal integrity and has

1. Van Norden, Bryan W., 2017, *Taking Back Philosophy: A Multicultural Manifesto* (New York: Columbia University Press,) Peter K. J. Park, ed. 2013, *Africa, Asia, and the History of Philosophy: Racism in the Formation of the Philosophical Canon, 1780–1830* (Albany: State University of New York)

no valid empirical foundations. His definition of race is not consistent with scientific view and his racial view is incompatible with ethical principles such as justice.

Conclusion

Although racism has survived throughout history by relying on different methods, relativism and materialism seem to be the two main roots of racism in modern thought. As long as knowledge or ethics is relative there is no way to deny racism as a vice and when whole human reality is summing up in his body the characteristics of the human body will be the only criterion of valuation. So until these two roots of racism exist in modern thought, there is no way to overcome racism. Without these two bases, all reasons for racism will be sterile. These methods, which are numerous and sometimes hidden, are the foundations for preservation and propagation of this dangerous and damaging hallucination in human societies during thousands of years. Claiming racial superiority is the cause of many wars and robberies, and this illusion has been strengthened by the methods discussed in this article.

The historical role of Western white man in the development of science and philosophy has been due to the economic and political conditions which have been provided in a particular geographical area in a monopoly way. The practical successes of a particular race in the domination of wealth and media may also be the result of claiming superiority and attempting to dominate and if any other races, have sought after domination for several centuries, they eventually, would dominate the entire earth in a period. While the sources of history of science, if written with a racial look, is at risk of a reversal and bias, and there is always the danger that the role of other races in the development of science and philosophy is ignored and a particular ethnic role is highlighted. If in anthropology we accept that all humans have the spirit and they can have the same intellectual and emotional powers, in this case racial discrimination cannot be justified by any method.

References

- Bacon, Francis. (1620). *The New Organon or True Directions concerning the interpretation of Nature*, Australia: University of Adelaide.
- Bernasconi, Robert. (2001). Who Invented the Concept of Race? Kant's Role in the Enlightenment Construction of Race, in Robert Bernasconi (ed.), *Race*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Braveman Paula A.; Elaine Arkin, Dwayne Proctor; Tina Kauh; Nicole Holm. (2022). Systemic and Structural Racism: Definitions, Examples, Health Damages, and Approaches to Dismantling" in *Health Affairs*, 41(2): 171–178.
- Chukwudi Eze, Emmanuel. (1997). The Color of Reason: The Idea of "Race" in Kant's Anthropology, in *Postcolonial African Philosophy: a critical reader*, Edited by Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University, pp. 103-131.
- Count, Earl W. (1950). *This Is Race: An Anthology Selected from the International Literature on the Races of Man*, New York: Schuman.
- Garrett, Aaron. (2000). Hume's Revised Racism Revisited, *Hume Studies*, XXVI, No. 1: 171-178.
- Grosfoguel, Ramon. (2016). What is Racism? in *Journal of World-System Research*, 22(1): 9-15.
- Hannaford, Ivan. (1996). *Race: The History of an Idea in the West*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

-
- Hedrick, Todd. (2008). Race, Difference and Anthropology in Kant's Cosmopolitanism, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 46(2): 245–68.
- Hume, David. (1882). *Essays, Moral, Political and Litrary*, edited by T. H. GREEN and T. H. GROSE, Oxford, London.
- Hume, David. (1983). *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, J. B. Schneewind (ed.), Indianapolis, Cambridge.
- James, Robert. (2016). *Notes on American Civilisation*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Locke, John. (2003). *Two Treatises of Government and a Letter Concerning Toleration*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Mikkelsen, John M. (2013). *Recent Work on Kant's Race Theory / the Texts / the Translations*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. (1888). *The Antichrist, Translated from the German with an introduction by H. L. Mencken*, Adelaide: University of Adelaide.
- Palter, Robert. (1995). *Hume and Prejudice*, *Hume Studies*, XXI, No. 1: 3-23
- Shiao, Jiannbin and Woody, Ashley. (2021). The Meaning of "Racism", in *Sociological Perspectives*, 64(4): 495–517.
- Zack, N. (2014). The Philosophical Roots of Racial Essentialism and Its Legacy, in *Confluence: Online Journal of World Philosophies*, Vol. 1: 85-99.