

Charles W Mills on Kant's Untermenschen - revisited Part 2:  
Genocidal history

O.A. LADIMEJI

African Century Journal

June 2019

In Part 1 it was argued that Mills misconstrued Kant's use of persona through not seeing its roots in Roman law. In Roman law sons and women did not have 'personality', not just slaves. This lack of personality was not a reflection on their nature or ability, particularly as a change of circumstance could completely alter this. Having or lacking personality was an 'accident' of the man created by law. Kant then modifies that by creating an entity called race to represent the collective through which history works, so that now the race may have personality or not. In this way the issue is not one individual versus another. In order to play a role in history the race must have personality just as the man under Roman law can only act in law if he has personality. Sons and women lacked personality but this did not mean they were inadequate. For Kant non-White races lacked 'historical personality'. Whereas in Roman law it was the court and the laws that granted personality under Kant it is 'nature' that performs this service. Without historical personality a 'race' cannot take human development further just as without personality a man cannot bring a case to court e.g. make legal history.

### **Concepts of racism**

Mills takes racism as the expression of hostile opinions. This is entirely inadequate. It would suggest that someone who hid their explicit opinions could not be a racist, even where their work was designed for that purpose. Basically, Mills accepts the personality view of racism popularised by Gordon Allport, and does not ask what role does racism play in someone's arguments, what work does the idea do, as if uncovering the racism is sufficient? This is a serious failing as it exculpates Kant from any other motive and puts him on a par with anyone else expressing derogatory opinions. As Bernasconi has correctly pointed out such an emphasis only leads to an environment where people do not say what they mean.

Genocide however is on another level from day to day personal racist abuse. Had there been a focus on the question: what work is this idea doing then the argument that Kant's racist comments were a personal failing would have no credibility.

Our target here is not the racism of Kant, where apart from his cunning doctrine of genocide one can say that Kant roughly said what he meant as to his opinion of other 'races' - but our target is the racism, obscurantism and practiced deceit of western Kant scholars specifically and western philosophers generally.

## Interpretation of Kant:

In order to understand what Kant is truly saying one needs to keep certain statements in mind. Bernasconi quotes Kant:

'...humanity is at its greatest perfection in the race of the whites. The yellow Indians do have a meagre talent. The Negroes are far below them and at the lowest point are a part of the American people's.' (Ward & Lott, 2002) p.147

What is significant here is that Kant treats races as if they have potential personality and rights and disabilities. Thus he concludes:

.. 'Americans and Blacks cannot govern themselves. They thus serve only for slaves' (Ward & Lott, 2002) p.152 This statement is not about individuals.

Kant also did a good trade in anti-semitism describing Jews as a nation of cheaters. 'nation of cheaters' (Kant, 2006, p. 124) and he recommended the 'euthanasia of Judaism' (Kant, 1979, p. 124).

This use of the word 'euthanasia' must be put in context. The Inquisition was still in existence and the original, particularly Spanish, purpose had been to convert the Jews but there were constant suspicions that the conversions were fake and so the Inquisition targeted 'conversos', those Jews who had apparently converted to Christianity but were accused of in reality continuing to practice Judaism, and many were condemned to the stake (Lea, 1906). In this context where forcible conversion had been found insufficient to eliminate Judaism from Christendom, the use of the word 'euthanasia' to refer to a suggested transformation of the Jews to Christianity and thus the elimination of Judaism speaks volumes. Had Kant wished to merely reintroduce the Inquisition to Germany could he not have said so? Why would it be any more successful then as compared to its record in the past? Is there not a direct line here to Auschwitz?

In Kant's studies there is a tendency to separate 'racism' from 'anti-semitism'. However this manoeuvre can be seen to reflect among other matters an attempt by some in Jewish community to 'cut a deal' with the devil. If the role and fate of Jews can be separated from that of the inferior races then they can seek refuge on some acceptable terms within European society. Thus an understanding of Kant's attitudes to Jews must be separated from his attitude to inferior races - despite the violence this does to Kant's texts. Kant's views are focussed on the 'race' not individuals. Thus Kant could have said without blushing some of his best friends were Jewish (Moses Mendelssohn). Strangely this approach ignores the history of the conversos who tried the

## Mills and Kant - part 2

same strategy or Jews in Weimar Germany. By separating ‘anti semitism’ from ‘racism’ they were playing with the devil. In all past instances the devil won.

There is something important in arguing that other races have no contribution to make to human development. It may sound like a purported statement of fact but this is to misread such statements. To say that other races have contributed little and in Kant’s view are incapable of future contributions is to state clearly that they will not be missed, that their destruction will not hinder the future development of human nature, that their disappearance may be regrettable but no loss to humanity in the grand scheme of things. Once one understands what Kant is saying it is rather easy to see that he states himself quite clearly. Only the fog of modern interpretations conceals Kant’s blatant message. Let us look at a specific work.

### Idea for a Universal History ...

(Kant, 2017)

Kant writes:

1. *‘All tendencies of any creature to which it is predisposed by Nature are destined in the end to develop themselves perfectly and agreeably to their final purpose’* (Proposition the first) If only Whites have these excellent qualities then Nature must destine only whites to the perfection. Other races are mere traife.
2. *‘In Man, as the sole rational creature upon earth, those tendencies which have the use of his reason for their object are destined to obtain their perfect development in the species only, and not in the individual.’* (Proposition the second)  
This ‘perfect development in the species’ can only apply to Whites as only they have what it takes to develop further, and here we see the limits of the reasoning powers of other races means they have no role to play in the future development of the species. Specifically Kant say this development is not at the level of the individual but the group. Individual abilities are not relevant here.
3. *‘It is the will of Nature that Man should owe to himself alone everything which transcends the mere mechanic constitution of his animal existence, and that he should be susceptible of no other happiness or perfection than what he has created for himself, instinct apart, through his own reason.’* (Proposition the Third)  
However the perfection that man seeks is not for himself but for his ‘race’. He explains: ‘Undoubtedly it seems surprising on this view of the case that the earlier generations appear to exist only for the sake of the latter .... Mysterious as this appears, it is, however, at the same time necessary, if we once assume a race of rational animals as destined by means of this characteristic reason to a perfect development of their tendencies, and subject to mortality in the individual, but immortal in the species.’  
According to Kant it is the will of Nature (which replace the divine will) that Man strives

## Mills and Kant - part 2

for future perfection of the species. Now this would at first appear to mean humanity as a species but on reflection this cannot be so as non-Whites cannot achieve this perfection. If the species is destined to reach this nirvana then it must do so without the presence of other 'races' who cannot progress to this level. Further Nature employs challenges to develop the progress of man towards a higher state. Those 'races' which live idly in comfort are therefore lacking in the necessary drive to achieve perfection as their environment allows them to live indolently. These are the inferior races. However Kant is faced with the query as to why if transplanted into harsher Western climes they should not develop the same character as the Whites. To avoid this Kant proposes that once their character is inscribed it is fixed and cannot be changed. What use has Nature of these if it decides to prevent them from developing? The only use left for these other races is either to serve the Whites in their progress directly as slaves or to be the appropriate victims of slaughter and genocide to allow Whites to learn that there must be a better way.

4. *'The means which Nature employs to bring about the development of all tendencies she has laid in Man is the antagonism of these tendencies in the social state -no farther, however, than to the point at which this antagonism becomes the cause of social arrangements found in law.'* (Proposition the Fourth) It is envy jealousy and ambition that leads man to develop ..'In this way arise the first steps from the savage state to the state of culture, which consists peculiarly in the social worth of Man. Talents of every kind are now unfolded..' Without the evil motives of men civilisation would not progress. 'But for these anti-social propensities, so unamiable in themselves, .... an Arcadian life would arise, of perfect harmony and mutual love, such as must suffocate and stifle all talents in their very germs. Man as gentle as the sheep they fed, would communicate to their existence no higher value than belongs to mere animal life, and would leave the vacuum of creation, which exists in reference to the final purpose of man's nature, unfilled.' He then puts matters bluntly: 'Man, for his own sake as an individual,wishes for concord; but Nature knows better what is good for Man as a species; and she ordains discord', and all this reveals the the 'hand of a wise Creator'. If in order to attain perfection the White race has to destroy the Native Americans, and subsequently all other races, then this is regrettable, inevitable and necessary to fulfil the purpose of Nature and of the Creator. This is the secret design of Nature and whilst to the common man it must appear morally abominable yet to the 'higher reason' it is necessary. Such a Kantian position allows one to express moral horror at genocide while accepting it as inevitable and necessary. So much so that any attempt to stop the genocide of all other races will be merely hindering the development of perfection in the White race and delaying the inevitable.
5. *'The History of the Human Species as a whole may be regarded as the unravelling of a hidden Plan of Nature for accomplishing a perfect State of Civil Constitution for society...'* (Proposition the Eighth) Kant immediately affirms that this idea has little empirical support. 'A question arises upon it - whether experience has yet observed any traces of such unravelling in History? I answer - some little'. He then gives the explanation that the evidence we have is of such a small part of whole that we could never see the whole. But then where does this idea come from. If we argue that is an intuition then we have a problem because

## Mills and Kant - part 2

according to Kant the plan of Nature involves only the White Race surviving and completing the plan of History. It is unlikely that any other race would share such intuitions. Now it becomes clear why 'other races' must be inadequate at the level of higher reason. There is now a reason why they will not have the same intuition and why we cannot expect them to agree with us. If they had sufficient reason they could possibly agree with us but at the same time if they were capable of such 'higher reasoning' they would not be destined for extinction. In Proposition the Ninth, Kant states: '...our quarter of the globe, which quarter is in all probability destined to give laws to all the rest.' It does appear that too little attention is paid to these words. Kant talking of the history of humanity and future development sees Whites giving laws to all the rest. But giving laws requires conquest, so we are left with Kant's explicit support for global conquest by the Whites. We cannot be said to 'give' laws where others merely copy our provisions. It is the destiny of White people to rule the world and to become the sole survivors, sole exemplars of the human race in its perfection by the eclipse and disappearance of all other races. To express it in Roman law terms - other races lack historical personality, they cannot move the wheel of history. Kant accepts that at a very early time other races may have played a small role but now history has moved on and beyond them.

6. When Kant speaks of the cunning of history or the cunning of nature, he speaks admiringly of achieving one's ends through cunning - that should be a clue, it should alert one to the possibility of the cunning of Kant.

Given Kant's views as described can they be sanitised? If we take the racial subordination out of the story then as a matter of the accident of history the White race could be wiped out in a series of wars and human perfection achieved without them. But Kant has specified that human perfection cannot be achieved without the White race as in fact only they can achieve this. If for any reason the White race were threatened with extinction it would not be a mere racial tragedy but a tragedy for human history as the destiny of man would be destroyed and frustrated. It would therefore follow that it was a matter of destiny and to the highest good that, if push came to shove so to speak, the white race should destroy all other races to prevent a dreadful accident bringing the true end of Nature to nothing.

## UNIVERSALISM

One should first attend to the issue of how universal is Kant apart from his racism. Under the influence of Newton Kant took the law like form to be a signifier of any truth. So we are presented with a mathematical universal as in 'for all X if Y then Z'. This is universalism in form alone and strictly generates scientific racism. If we hold that for all persons X certain rights are inalienable Y and we do not wish to include non-Whites then all that is required is to redefine the relevant variable X and exclude non-whites from personhood! The categorical imperative is as leaky a specification as a sieve.

In any case what is the loss if we abandon Kant's morality? The core idea of universality can be found in the Sermon on the Mount and in the Buddhist canon - Dhammapada. Kant does not

## Mills and Kant - part 2

take us any further if he even takes us that far as the Buddhist emphasise the importance of all sentient beings and the Sermon on the Mount has no equivocations.

In his otherwise excellent 'Will the real Kant please stand up', Bernasconi writes:

'Clearly the casualty of such efforts is an understanding of the historical dimension of a philosopher's work and I believe that this leaves anyone who takes this route ill-equipped to address the question of the coexistence in the same thinker of both racism and moral universalism, which is why they tend to ignore one or the other, usually the racism. This approach allows philosophers to persist in presenting racism as no more than a surface feature of a philosophy, in contrast with moral universalism, which is a philosophical thesis that, as such, will always trump racist particularism'. (Bernasconi, 2003, p. 15) It should be clear from the above that there is NO contradiction between Kant's universalism and his racism.

### Genocide

It can be said there are quotes here and there for Kant opposing deliberate genocide but this is a misunderstanding. According to his theory the plan of nature will take its course and lead to the wiping out of all other races. This is the cunning of 'nature' which achieves its ends without needing direct human understanding. It also allows another interpretation - 'do not speak of it, but you understand me!' or shall we say the 'cunning' of Kant. A nod is as good as a wink, as they say. Some may argue that this is mere and extreme supposition. However Kant goes on to explicitly recommend this. Eunah Lee writes::

"Kant notes, "every member of our race is well advised to be on his guard and not to reveal himself completely" if he ever wishes to live peacefully with other People." (lee, 2019) It would have been preferable for Ms Lee to have completed the quotation:

'... in our race everyone finds it advisable to be on his guard and not to allow others to view *completely* how he is. This already betrays the propensity of our species to be evil-minded toward one another' (Kant, 2006, p. 237).

If each race has an underlying 'evil-minded' intention to all other races then if the White race is to be the final and sole survivor and all other races are to be exterminated one can ask 'how is this to be done?'. According to Kant Nature has chosen her means to bring about her desired ends and this is war. Just as it was Nature's wish that man populated the earth she achieved this by cunning -'But, to attain this end, she has chosen war'. Perpetual Peace, First supplement (Kant, 2016, p. 103) so inevitably Nature would use the same instrument to achieve the sole survivorship of the White race.

### J'Accuse

What is the argument here? It is not primarily that Kant is a racist, nor that Kant proposed genocide. Kant was who he was and as he was, may he rest in peace. However 'cunning' Kant sought to be in his exposition many of his contemporaries understood him clearly. For those who value truth, the issue here is the modern community of Western scholars or Western academia represented by specifically or primarily the Kantian scholarly community and generally

## Mills and Kant - part 2

the philosophical academy that over many decades sought to deliberate conceal and distort Kant's teachings. Inevitably some scholars will argue - and such arguments are best delivered sotto voce over a drink after a conference - that Kant may have been devilish but it is against the collective liberal interests of western culture to allow Kant to be taken over by the extreme right and so to deny them Kant his views must be distorted. This manoeuvre is not so much dishonest, they claim, as serving a higher purpose. But such arguments are worthless because invariably the next step is to deny the racism altogether and prevent the anti-racists from attempting to clean the stables. At this point the liberal establishment are at one with the extreme right - genocidal views are dressed up in new clothes but in the underworld of the far right the traditions of the true Kant will be handed down unchallenged from generation to generation. No doubt the far right will inflame their initiates with stories of a 'liberal conspiracy' to conceal the truth - and not entirely lacking in any justification. In one case a Reader in Genetics at Oxford University was fully conversant with this true philosophy tradition while openly supporting what today would be called alt.right views on race, (Ladimeji, 1974).

In this regard there is an additional sotto voce argument: the liberal establishment says to itself we know Kant is recommending genocide but non whites are so dim that even though it is before their eyes, in plain sight so to speak, they cannot see it which is proof they are not as intelligent as ourselves. Since they cannot see it we are duty bound not to tell them - *for their own good*. This may sound far fetched except this argument was actually made not sotto voce but in cold hard print.

McCarney writes: On the one hand -'The entire canon of Western philosophy from Aristotle to Wittgenstein is likely to stand convicted' of racism. On the other hand the truth could be demoralising to the tender sensibilities of non- Whites:

'Such an intellectual construct cannot possibly empower but rather serves to crush them under the weight of history. Those whom it empowers can only be the racists, conveying to them the assurance that the entire tradition of Western philosophy is, whatever surface protestations it may make, really on their side. The whiff of a kind of treason of the clerks hangs in the air here. A proper sense of clerky responsibility would require them instead to deny racism the least shred of intellectual legitimacy or credibility and exhibit it as the vicious stupidity and unreason it is.' (Bernasconi & McCarney, 2003) p.34.

One must wonder at his tact in putting this into open published words capable of being read by non-Whites. One has to assume he believes them to be so stupid as not to be able to understand what he is saying. But can he really believe that the right wing Whites are also intellectually inferior and cannot read? Or should we simply conclude that this is a double bluff and he may not expect the right wing to be confused at all. Incidentally, did you notice and acknowledge his reference to 'treason' in describing the behaviour of a 'white' scholar, such as Bernasconi, exposing the racism of Kant to non-white races?

At the end of the day one either has faith in truth or not. Once one can lie for a 'higher purpose', there appears no particular purpose for Western philosophy except as an obscurantists' smokescreen.

## References

Bernasconi, R. (2003). Will the real Kant please stand up. *Radical Philosophy*, 117, 13–22.

Bernasconi, R., & McCarney, J. (2003). Joseph McCarney and Robert Bernasconi:

Exchange on Hegel's racism / Radical Philosophy. *Radical Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/extras/exchange-on-hegels-racism>

Kant, I. (1979). *Kant, Immanuel - Conflict of the Faculties (Abaris, 1979) | Immanuel Kant | A Priori And A Posteriori* (M. J. Gregor, Trans.). New York, USA: Abaris Books Inc.

Kant, I. (2006). *Anthopology from a pragmatic point of view* (R. B. Louden & M. Kuehn, Eds.). England: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, I. (2016). *Perpetual Peace*. United Kingdom: Delphi Classics.

Kant, I. (2017). *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose - 1784* (Delphi Classics). Dephi Publishing Ltd.

Ladimeji, O. A. (1974). Science, Racism and Social Darwinism: A Review of Race by JR

Baker. *Race & Class*. Retrieved from

[https://www.academia.edu/27071070/Science\\_Racism\\_and\\_Social\\_Darwinism\\_A\\_Review\\_of\\_Race\\_by\\_JR\\_Baker](https://www.academia.edu/27071070/Science_Racism_and_Social_Darwinism_A_Review_of_Race_by_JR_Baker)

Lea, H. Charles. (1906). *A History of the Inquisition of Spain; vol. 1* (Vol. 1). Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/book/187100045/A-History-of-the-Inquisition-of-Spain-vol-1>

## Mills and Kant - part 2

Lee, Eunah. (2019). Race and the Self-Defeating Character of Kant's Argument in Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View. In V. Waibel, M. Ruffing, & D. Wagner (Eds.), *Nature and Freedom* (pp. 2691–2698). Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.

Ward, J., & Lott, T. L. (Eds.). (2002). *Philosophers on race: critical essays*. Oxford UK: Blackwell Publ.