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**Abstract**: When people share the same knowledge and culture, it is difficult to distinguish whether their national speech is humanitarian or racist. Such things make it easy for people to accept unhumanitarian speech just because it stems from their culture. Hence, the purpose of this investigation is to give readers a tool to assist them in discriminating between discourses that are racist and those that are humanitarian. It is called the principle of compliance. The principle said that **if all nations and different cultures apply this discourse, what will be the overall result in respect for people’s lives and plant resources?** Does this discourse encourage greater goodness or evil?. Goodness has been defined as preserving humanity and the Earth's natural resources.

1. **Introduction**

This article provides a straightforward method for distinguishing between racist and humanitarian discourses through understanding the nature of discourse and the universality of moral standards, and hence we will need to clarify: what is meant by discourse in general and then determine what is meant by racist and humanitarian discourse? How can they be distinguished?

At the beginning, discourse is a very complex concept and has many philosophical, social, and political extensions, but we focus on discourse in its most basic sense, which we call a discourse: every speech aims to invite people to do something. There are two types of this speech: first, the speech is directed at all people, called international or global discourse. Second, the one that is directed at a particular class is called national discourse.

In this research, we try to demonstrate that international and national discourse must be subject to a universal moral standard without allowing a particular culture to dominate another culture or imposing its own political, social, cultural, and moral choices on other nations.

I believe that this universal criterion is characterized by two big principles: the preservation of mankind and the preservation of the planet's resources. Every speech consistent with these principles is moral or, at least, neutral to all nations, and every speech contrary to these principles is immoral. Man should seek alternative discourse if he is a listener or reformulate his speech if he is a discourse maker.

The discourse that seeks to preserve these two principles will be considered humanitarian, even if it is said in a small village in an unknown place in the world. So, the international discourse can be humanitarian or **racist with reference to those two values.** Since every society has its pioneers, stars, and leaders who are the makers of the discourse of this society, this discourse should not be contrary to the overall human values shared by humans, namely, these two principles: the principle of human preservation and the preservation of the planet.

The postulate from which this research proceeds is that national discourse, which means the specific discourse for a specific society, should not conflict with international discourse, which is directed at all human beings. This is possible when we perceive that national discourse is an applied international discourse, and therefore that international discourse can be tailored to the characteristics of a particular society in its language, values, and ways of unraveling. Because people may disagree on whether a particular speech is considered a human speech or a racist speech, I have tried to establish a principle that helps to reveal the identity of these speeches at an early stage before being embraced in the human consciousness.

1. **Principle Of Compliance**

As Carl Popper tried to distinguish between scientific and metaphysical propositions through the principle of falsifiability, I will try to distinguish between **racist and humanitarian discourses** through the principle of compliance. This principle can be explained by the following example:

There is a common Arab proverb: My brother and I are against my cousin, but me and my cousin are against the stranger. I believe most cultures have an equivalent proverb that raises the value of relative rather than justice. On the other hand, our prophet Mohammed said: "Help your brother, whether he is an oppressor or is oppressed." A man inquired: "O Messenger of Allah! I help him when he is oppressed, but how can I help him when he is an oppressor?" He (ﷺ) said, "You can keep him from committing oppression. That will be your help to him"[[1]](#footnote-1).

When we compare the two phrases, we discover that the first phrase does not serve to be an international value among humans because it leads to the criterion of partisanship being kinship and race, whereas the second phrase is an international phrase because it makes the criterion of partisanship fair and unfair by preventing the oppressor from his injustice, whatever his relation or statement to you. Based on the foregoing, we can apply the principle of compliance, which is a simple test to reveal the nature of the speech. It is required to be able to imagine that multiple cultures have complied with this discourse; if this discourse results in greater peace, cooperation, and tolerance among nations, it is **humanitarian discourse.**

Let's do this exercise,

Let us assume that one Arab philosopher or even a West philosopher says that "We are a nation with a different religious and cultural heritage than all other nations, and therefore we should have a distinct philosophy from others”. What do you think about such a speech?

Now, what if all nations take this idea and say, Yes, we are also nations that have a different worldview and a different ideology than others? We have to build our own distinct philosophy from the  others." What do you think? Does this lead to more cooperation between nations or more differences? Will this approach support the search for what is common or the search for differences?

Then think that even within the same nation, if it takes this speech seriously, it will have different discourses based on its own internal beliefs. Even if it shares the same references, they may have different interpretations, and each group has the right to seek their own philosophy that differs from the others. But the question here is: what is the alternative discourse that is worth describing as being compatible with all human beings, which we called humanitarian discourses?

The alternative would be to say that every nation has the right to seek the truth. It is the duty of all nations to benefit from others and not to let intellectual differences prevent them from benefiting from others.

1. **Now: What does this kind of speech entail?**

It entails opening to the other, not necessarily to copy it, but leveraging it, improving access to scientific knowledge about the world, the self, and society, but also about religion. As scientific theories vary in the ability to interpret the world, so do religions in the reform of the world, and thus human contact with other religions can be exposed to different visions of the world and multiple values and can be preferred among these religions. Atheism is a form of religion because it is ultimately a certain vision of the world, just like religion. In terms of **humanitarian discourse,** a religion that encourages the killing of mankind and does not encourage the preservation of the earth's natural resources cannot be like a religion that encourages the preservation of mankind and the preservation of the earth's natural resources that are necessary for the continuation of human life and the possibility of life.

Another example is that one of the speeches is based on the distinction between human beings according to the race to which they belong. To present this speech to the test that we suggested in this article and to imagine that all nations took this speech, what would happen?

Each nation will believe that its race is better than others and that others are less, and therefore this is a cause of enslavement and exclusion of other nations for the same reason as ethnic preference. What are the alternative **humanitarian discourses** in which we are not afraid to produce these negative effects and we are not afraid to say them publicly to all human beings?!

The alternative **humanitarian discourse** is that human beings are equal in terms of human nature and that no one is better than the other because of their race, but differentiation is because of the work and benefit they provide to mankind. This discourse is **humanitarian** and applies to all nations, without prejudice. The owners of this discourse are not embarrassed to show it to any nation. Unlike the first speakers, they may be whispering it among themselves and in social circles where intellectual compatibility prevails, while in public they may not seek to manifest it because it contradicts the general values of the world's societies or cultures.

1. **Conclusions**

Finally, what benefit do we get from this distinction? We know that millions of people have died because of ideological discourse, and we also know that many of them live in poverty because of these discourse, Romero, Gustavo says : "Millions of people have been killed in the name of ideologies. Millions have been imprisoned, persecuted, displaced, or tortured for ideological conflicts. The lifestyle of most people on this planet is determined, or at least influenced, by ideologies. Within the same society, families and friends are often separated by ideological differences”[[2]](#footnote-2).

All these speeches were not self-inflicted, but because there were individuals who believed in them. And so I developed this simple test, which I hope will contribute to raising the awareness of individuals as well as policymakers by gaining the ability to distinguish between the different speeches that are presented to them or by them before they embrace those discourses and contribute to their dissemination. An act like this would contribute to the planet being a better place for all, and it would be a bet for the future.

It is a bet because no one knows if humans will win this round or if they will destroy themselves. All ends are still open, and humans have tried many ways to live; sometimes they fail and a few times they succeed. But now, the matter is different; the human being has powerful tools that give more impact, but lucky for them, the impact can be in both good and evil ways. The only thing is, are we able to be controlled by values and ethical systems or choose to not be controlled by anything else?
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