

# Race and Racialized Populations: Ascriptions, Power, and Identity

*Jonathan Michael Kaplan*

*Oregon State University*

## *Abstract*

In this paper, I endorse the view defended by Hochman and others that there are no races but rather there are only *racialized populations*. The distinction between “race” being real but socially constructed and being its being non-existent or a ‘myth’ might seem of little importance. But aside from conceptual clarity, the view that there are only racialized populations makes better sense of how racialized populations came into being, how racialization has the profound impacts that it does, and what kind of worlds we might imagine (and work towards) where racialization ceases to have such meaningful power and impacts. In biomedicine, the racialization of populations can explain a number of seemingly disparate phenomena, including both the ways in which racialized populations can suffer biological harm through the mechanisms of racialization and the ways in which important biological differences between populations are missed and misunderstood when racialized populations are mistaken for races with the particular kinds of biological meaning carried by the connotations of the ‘race’ concept. I consider the relationship between racialization and self-identity as a challenge to this view, but, I argue, the denying the reality of race ought still be the preferred position.

*Keywords:* Race, Racial ascriptions, Racialization, Identity, Eliminativism.

## 1. Introduction: Races, Witches, and Cocktail Parties

I, along with most academics who study race, reject the idea that races are biological entities that are somehow a natural part of our world, independent of racialization.<sup>1</sup> Below, I will outline some of the major arguments made around these claims. In brief, though, there is nothing biological about the populations identified in ordinary discourse as races that would pick out those populations as

<sup>1</sup> Most, but not all, opponents of this idea promote or defend scientific racism (for discussion, see e.g., Panofsky, Dasgupta, and Iturriaga 2021); Spencer is perhaps the most prominent example of a philosopher who has defended a biological interpretation of race while opposing scientific racism (see e.g., Spencer 2014).

worthy of attention, absent those populations already being socially identified as races. That is, biology does not make race.

Previously, I have argued that races are *real* but socially constructed (see e.g., 2011); race, as a way of organizing people, was invented,<sup>2</sup> and its invention and application generated socially determined facts about people (e.g., to what race they belonged or were a member). Following the work of several scholars, including prominently Hochman (see e.g., 2019, 2021, 2022) and Mavundla (2019), I now view this position as misguided.

Instead of thinking of races as socially constructed entities, it is more accurate, Hochman argues, to deny that human races exist; there are no populations that are races, but rather, populations that are *racialized*. The usual analogy here is to “witchcraft” (see e.g., Wodak 2022 for discussion). In 17<sup>th</sup> century New England, there were people *called* witches and who, tragically, suffered because they were thought to be witches. There were, however, *no witches* in 17<sup>th</sup> century New England, because witches, at least as conceived of then, *don’t exist*. “Witch” here is *not* a socially constructed category. Being *thought* a witch is a social phenomenon, of course, but being thought to be a witch doesn’t actually make one a witch. There is nothing extant that has the properties (e.g., making ‘compacts’ with the devil) that witches were thought to have, by virtue of which they were thought to be witches.

Compare this to “cocktail parties”.<sup>3</sup> While one can quibble about the historical details, I think it is safe to say that there were no cocktail parties in 17<sup>th</sup> century New England, in large part because the cocktail party wasn’t “invented” until at least late 19<sup>th</sup> century (see e.g., Felten 2007). But now, there are things that are definitely cocktail parties, and there are things that definitely aren’t, and part of what it is for something to be a cocktail party is for it to be thought of as one by people within the relevant social systems. *Cocktail parties*, unlike witches, really *are* socially constructed.

Races are more like witches than they are like cocktail parties; people may *think* that races are real entities with particular kinds of features by virtue of which they are races, but there are no things with the relevant kinds of features (more on this below).<sup>4</sup> Human populations do not ‘naturally’ form the kinds things that “race” is thought to refer to, and the populations called races have no interesting (non-trivial) properties by which they can be identified and called races, independently of being the things (mis)identified as races.

As Hochman (among others) recommends, rather than thinking in terms of socially constructed races with particular kinds of properties, it is better to think

<sup>2</sup> The “invention” of race is usually traced to the work done by the concept of race in colonialism (see e.g., Brace 2005); however, other scholars trace the conceptual roots further back, to attacks on Jews in the Middle Ages (see e.g., Heng 2011a, 2011b; Thomas 2010; Nirenberg 2009). David Livingstone Smith ties the project of racialization to “dehumanization”, arguing that the two are inexorably linked (see e.g., 2021).

<sup>3</sup> Many of those familiar with contemporary philosophy will recognize the source of this example; they will also, I hope, recognize the reasons for my unwillingness to cite its popularizer.

<sup>4</sup> A wrinkle: one might think that if by “race” one just means “the populations picked out by *racialization* and treated as ‘races’” then races would of course exist and have those features. But note our comparison: while we could redefine ‘witch’ to mean “someone who is called a witch and treated as if they were a witch” that would fail to do justice to what the term *meant* in 17<sup>th</sup> century New England.

in terms of populations *thought* to be or *treated as* races—to think that is in terms of *racial ascriptions*. That there are no races, but only racial ascriptions, makes better sense of the history of “race” as an organizing concept, the effects of racism and the legacies of racism, and the harms involved in failing to address structured human variation in e.g., biomedicine.

The only area where I worry that the language of ascription fails to do justice to the categories at issue is *self-identity*, and especially attempts to use self-identity to oppose oppressive practices. When people attempt to reclaim an identity traditionally used to oppress them, the language of construction is perhaps more apt. “African-Americans” do not exist as a race—there is nothing in the world that had the properties that e.g., black slaves were thought to share by virtue of their being black / African. However, attempts to ‘reclaim’ denigrated identities (e.g., “black pride”) can create self-identities, and perhaps even create things in the world (particular populations) that have (at least some of) the properties being attributed to them; these will not, however, be races (nor even, necessarily, racialized groups) but instead will form rather different sorts of populations. More on this below.

## 2. Why Race Isn’t Biological (Redux)

I want to be careful here—the claim that race is not biological can be easily misunderstood or misconstrued (see Kaplan 2021). Denying that race is biological does not entail that there are no biological differences between those populations that are called races (in say contemporary discourse in the U.S.), nor does it mean that one cannot use biological facts to guess, with more or less accuracy, what race someone is likely to be ascribed within a particular social context. Further, the effects of racialization include the creation of biologically relevant differences (through, for example, the stressors of racism and the legacies of past racism; see Kaplan 2010, Gravlee 2009), and to deny that race is biological is not to deny that racialization has those sometimes profound biological effects. Rather, the claim that race is not biological is motioning at the fact that there is nothing in biology that supports or would lead to the creation of the particular schemes of racialization that exist today; race is not biological in the sense that there is nothing about human population structure that makes the populations identified as races in any way special, interesting, or even particularly coherent.

The history of arguments around these issues reveals just how much confusion talk of races in humans engenders.<sup>5</sup> As I so often do, I’ll start with the classic debate between Livingstone and Dobzhansky (1962). Briefly, Livingstone argues first that there are no populations with sharp divisions between them, either phenotypic or genetic. Rather, there are *clines*—gradients along which average phenotypes and gene frequencies change. So, Livingstone concludes, there are no races. Dobzhansky responds that all *biologists* mean by “race” is populations with different gene frequencies, so if there are clines, then of course there are “races”. Further, while there are only clines, Dobzhansky argues, the gradients are steeper in some places than others, and often align with each other, which makes

<sup>5</sup> I am myself guilty of adding to the confusion around race in these areas; my 2003 paper with Massimo Pigliucci argued that ‘race’ was best thought of as a kind of ecotype, so the things called races in the human species were no such thing, but that other populations would count as races, though we shouldn’t call them that. This position is, I now think, if not confused, at least confusing!

identifying races less arbitrary than it would otherwise be. Livingston responds forcefully that populations picked on the basis of allele frequency differences are not what anyone thinks race means—race, in the human case, requires that the populations called races be relatively homogenous internally, and quite different from one another, such that knowing what race someone belonged to would be informative about a number of their important properties. Since there are no such populations, Livingston argues, there are no human races.

This debate continues today, with authors split about what it would mean for there to be biologically meaningful human races (Kaplan 2021). Some, such as Appiah, argue that race entails (or at least entailed) a particular kind of biological category—one that, like Livingston’s conception, entailed that races be internally homogenous with extensive between-race variation, and where knowing someone’s race would, by virtue of the biological facts that followed from their belonging to that race, permit one to make reasonable predictions about a number of important features (Appiah 1998). Others argue that “race” refers to something much weaker, such as presumed location of ancestry, or a particular weak cluster of phenotypic traits (Hardimon 2017, 2022 develops and defends such a “minimalist” account). Of course, if one defines biological race in a minimal enough way, there will be human races—but just as with Dobzhansky’s definition, these definitions do not do justice to the history or the current uses of the term.

Recent arguments surrounding race and biology have focused on genetic differentiation and clustering. Lewontin (1972, 1974), famously, argued that the small amount of variation associated with the kinds of large-scale continental groups called “races”, and the large amount of variation that occurred within every group, suggested that race was not a taxonomically useful category; the social importance of race, and the focus of many researchers on race, Lewontin argued, was far out of proportion to the (very limited) genetic significance of race. He writes:

The taxonomic division of the human species into races places a completely disproportionate emphasis on a very small fraction of the total of human diversity. That scientists as well as nonscientists nevertheless continue to emphasize these genetically minor differences and find new “scientific” justifications for doing so is an indication of the power of socioeconomically based ideology over the supposed objectivity of knowledge (1974: 156).

Some people interpreted Lewontin as arguing that the variation associated with continental groups was in some important sense not real, because those groups were associated with so little variation. Lewontin doesn’t make that argument, but that misunderstanding led some authors to arguing that the argument fails because modern clustering software designed to tease out population structure can identify continental-level groups such that people can be “sorted” into clusters based on population-structure (or into multiple clusters for people with “admixed” backgrounds) (at least given certain inputs; see below). Edwards (2003) dubbed the claim that the small amount of variation that occurred between populations entailed that people could not be reliably assigned to particular genomic clusters “Lewontin’s Fallacy”. Again, note well that this is not a fallacy that Lewontin himself committed (see Roseman 2021 for a spirited defense of Lewontin in this context), though it is true that some people mistakenly attributed that view to him (see Novembre 2022 for discussion).

Rosenberg et al.'s 2002 paper, "Genetic structure of human populations", inadvertently seemed to provide a kind of support of biological racial realism; given the particular genomic inputs chosen, when asked to make 5 clusters, the software returned a result that looked like major continental groups (at least a bit, if one squinted a little). Some people interpreted this result as showing that race was biologically real. Even given the results of this study, that conclusion did not follow (nor would Rosenberg himself endorse any such an interpretation of his results! See Rosenberg 2005). There is nothing special about 5 clusters—the move from 4 to 5 clusters does not capture markedly more information than moving from 3 to 4, and moving from 5 to 6 does not add substantially less information than the move from 4 to 5. There is, again, nothing special about 5 clusters—human population structure as given by the particular genomic inputs that Rosenberg et al. used does not force, or even suggest, five clusters as uniquely interesting or important.

The situation is worse, though, when one recognizes that the results of clustering software depend critically on the inputs used. There is more genetic variation in Africa than in the rest of the world combined (see e.g., Tishkoff et al. 2009) but the dataset used in Rosenberg et al. (2002) did not include samples of Africa that were sufficiently numerous or diverse to capture a substantial portion that genetic variation. When Africa is sampled more heavily, structure internal to the African sub-continent is recognized by the clustering software before  $K=5$  (five clusters) is reached (Tishkoff et al. 2009); in some samples,  $K=7$  generates 5 distinct African clusters (and only two non-African clusters) (see Carlson et al. 2022). The latter result, it should be clear, is much less amendable to racial interpretations.

But what is the right (correct) sampling regime to use? How many genomes ought one take from each part of the world / each supposed population? There is no answer to that question. There are better and worse sampling regimes for different purposes, but no general answer to the question of which sampling regime is "best".

Human population structure is complex—it does not form nicely nested groups, still less is there a single set of clusters that uniquely or even best captures the between-group variation. Denying that race is a biological concept does not entail denying the existence of population structure in humans. But it does entail denying that the social categories we identify as races are in any way biologically special; they do not for example capture a privileged amount of information about human population structure. The failure of genomic clustering techniques to identify anything unique or special about the groups that look a bit like those populations that we<sup>6</sup> identify as races in fact suggests that whatever the reason that those races we recognize were ascribed, it had little (likely nothing at all) to do with biologically informative or meaningful groups. As Winther and I noted in our (2013), biology did not force the racial categories we use upon us; the fact that one can tease out some differences in allele frequencies between the populations we call races is evidence only of the ubiquity of human population structure at every level.

<sup>6</sup> The problem of who counts as the "we" who are ascribing racial identities is fraught. Writing from a U.S. perspective, it is easy to imagine that the social ascriptions assigned here are somehow universal; they are not. What populations are ascribed what racial identities, and what those identities 'mean' is fluid across both time and space (see Davenport 2022).

### 3. Race, Racial Ascriptions, and Biomedicine

It is sometimes claimed that acknowledging the biological reality of race is important for biomedicine—different populations might be sufficiently different genetically that, on average, different medical drugs, different medical tests, etc., might be justified (see e.g., Burchard et al. 2003). It is also sometimes noted that the importance of health disparities—the fact that, for example, black Americans live on average about 5 fewer years than white Americans (see e.g., Andrasfay and Goldman 2021), and have worse health outcomes, on average, across a number of domains (see e.g., LaVeist et al. 2011)—suggests that paying attention to race might be necessary in order to address these serious problems.

But these two different biomedical problems demand different solutions, neither of which suggests that race is biologically real, nor even that race is a real but socially constructed entity.

In the first case, the focus on race has often *prevented* medical professions from seeing / studying the extant biomedically important genetic differentiation in the human species. Biomedically important genetic variation does not follow racial lines (this is not surprising, and indeed, the small amount of variation associated with such divisions suggests this result). Where a patient's ancestry is important because it suggests medically relevant genetic differences from another population, that ancestry is much more specific than "race". The classic example here is sickle cell anemia and the HbS allele; the idea that sickle cell disease is a "black" disease is misleading in both directions (see e.g., Root 2003; Bediako and Moffitt 2011). People who would be ascribed very different racial identities can suffer from sickle cell, as different populations that historically lived around mosquitos that spread malaria evolved (often independently) high frequencies of the HbS allele (Piel et al. 2010). And people who would be ascribed the same racial identity can have very different risks of suffering from sickle cell disease, if their ancestors were from areas with and without endemic malaria.

In other cases, while a particular trait of biomedical interest might be more or less common in particular populations that are "racialized" in contemporary U.S. racial organizational schemes, these traits do not vary along "racial" lines *in general*. So for example, lactase persistence (and hence lactose intolerance) does not fall along neat "racial" lines, but, rather, is distributed across a number of different populations based largely on the degree to which some ancestral populations of that group were pastoral (see e.g., Gerbault et al. 2011). But of course, some populations that are "racialized" in the contemporary U.S. racial scheme do in fact have a very low prevalence of lactase persistence, such that knowing that someone would be racialized in such and such a way would give one good information about their chances of being lactase persistent. Still, the fact remains that lactase persistence does *not* vary along "racial" lines *in general*, but, like most traits that vary between populations, varies at a number of different levels of population structure in complex and non-hierarchical ways (see e.g., Liebert et al. 2017).

If not for the focus on 'race', the particular populations in which particular risk alleles are more common might have been easier, rather than more difficult, to identify. The geographical distribution of the frequency (and local effect size) of genetic variants associated with prostate cancer risk, for example, are not well understood (see Rebbeck 2017); Brawley blames this in part on the use of race as a proxy for ancestry, and the resulting failure to take seriously the structured genetic diversity of patients racialized as "black" (2021). A focus on race can *hinder*

the investigation of relationship between disease risk and ancestry, or disease risk and particular genetic variants (see e.g., Valles 2012).

It is abundantly clear, however, that whatever the genetic differences between populations, differences in the frequencies of medically relevant alleles are not going to explain the health disparities between racialized populations (see Valles 2021). While there is no doubt value in finding genes associated with differences in responses to cancer treatments that vary in frequency between populations, and working to find ways of treating currently more recalcitrant cases, this value is *not* in markedly changing population-level health outcomes!

Here, it seems clear, the major health disparities between populations thought of as ‘races’ are the result of *racialization*—being thought of or treated as if one belonged to or had a particular ‘race’. People thought of as belonging to different ‘races’ are treated differently, both now and in the past. Contemporary racism is associated with psychosocial stress and the associated ‘weathering’ (accelerated biological aging / increased morbidity) (Forester et al. 2019; Das 2013). Intergenerational effects, both biological and social, replicate the poor health outcomes associated with racism and its legacies (Wadhwa et al. 2011; Aizer et al. 2016; Rosenthal and Lobel 2011; McEwen and McEwen 2017).

Understanding and addressing health disparities associated with ‘race’ requires understanding the effects and the history of *racialization*; it is only by understanding the ways in which racialization created racism, and the ways in which racialization resulted in the stark differences in life-prospects we see today, that health disparities along racialized lines can be effectively addressed (Gravlee 2009; Kaplan 2010).<sup>7</sup>

#### 4. Race, Racialization, and Identity<sup>8</sup>

The most important challenge to the view that race does not identify anything real in the world, and that people are *racialized* rather than belonging to a race is, perhaps, the way in which people self-identify, and the importance that self-identity along “racial” lines can have for people. How is it possible for an *ascribed* identity be central to one’s conception of oneself? And, if an ascribed identity is central to one’s conception of oneself, would recognizing that identity as an ascription (rather than a fact in the world to be discovered) necessarily be seen as denigrating that identity?

The problem is in some ways straightforward. Consider a case of someone who identifies as “black” and who considers their being “black” to be an important element of their self-identity. Does the claim that race is neither a biological nor socially constructed category, but non-existent, mean that their self-identity rests on a mistake?

<sup>7</sup> Indeed, the fact that racialization can have such profound effects on people’s health is one reason that Lorusso and Bacchini (2021) warn against a *naïve* attempt to eliminate race from biomedicine as a category; it is clear that thinking in terms of racialized populations will continue to be necessary in order to address health disparities caused by racism and its legacies.

<sup>8</sup> The following material, on the relationship between racialization and the politics of identity, is the aspect of this project in which I have the least confidence. I am confident that the topic at least is important, and I hope, perhaps naively, that other scholars will find something of use here on which to build.

The view that there are no races, but only racial ascriptions, takes discourse about races to be based on a mistake—there are, in the end, no things in the world with the properties that races were supposed to have. But this kind of “error theory” is different from the version that e.g., Mills discusses and rejects. Mills takes error theory about race to entail that race has no social reality, in the sense that races (or, critically, even racialized populations) play no part in the social organization of the world (see Mills 2000). Mills takes this position to be problematic for obvious reasons, and defends instead a “constructivist” position. But what is being constructed is *not* something with the properties that races are (or where) thought to have, and by which they were supposed to get their explanatory power (populations that are in fact relatively internally homogenous, quite different from one another, with relatively sharp boundaries, etc.). Rather, what is being constructed is a system for hierarchically organizing particular kinds of power relations—something that racialization does all too well.

Still, the idea that self-identifications of this sort are simply *mistakes* is unappealing; an important aspect of responding to a history of discrimination and abuse directed because of one’s identity (perceived or otherwise) can be “reclaiming” the identity (and, sometimes, the very slurs used to denigrate that identity). As Appiah noted, it “may even be historically, strategically necessary”, in a society in which some aspect of one’s identity is denigrated, to demand respect *as* a member of that group (1996: 128-129). Indeed, Appiah’s language of *scripting*—in this case, the attempt, in reclaiming a denigrated identity, to create new life-scripts around that identity—helps see how a group can embrace an *ascribed* identity.

One potential source of confusion is that it is the very people ascribed a “race”, and who are believed (wrongly) to have a set of characteristics because of their ascribed race, who, in order to stand in opposition to those ascribed characteristics, must appeal to a group consisting of the (roughly) the same individual people. This gives the appearance that the “black” in “black pride” or “black lives matter” is the same “black” that is being referred to when e.g., hereditarians / “scientific racists” claim that the realized performance of blacks on IQ tests is lower than that of whites *because* of the immutable characteristics of their “race”. That is, it is easy to imagine that both groups are referring to races and merely ascribing different characteristics to the “same” race. But importantly, while in the second case, hereditarians’ (mistakenly) believe the population to which they are referring is a “race”, and need the population to have a particular set of (non-existent) features to do the work required, reclaiming the terms and identity do *not* demand that the populations be (have the features thought to define) races.

Here, I think, the best course of action is to follow e.g., Blum (2010) and Hochman (2017), and argue that in these cases the populations identified on the basis of ascribed identities can (and often do) work to reclaim their identities, and can thereby become real-but-constructed identities. In these cases, the constructed identities may or may not include some beliefs similar to some of those involved in the original racial ascription. As Blum notes, some people who identify as members of a particular race might in fact believe (mistakenly) that the racialized group to which they belong has (some of) the characteristics that would make something a race, that they share “a primordial, genetically-based tie to other members of the racial group” including “deep differences from members of other groups, and deep psychological and inherent similarities with other members of one’s own group” (Blum 2010: 302). But of course, members of racialized groups can (and often do) reject those kinds of claims. In those cases, Blum suggests,



the similarities are of experience, not inherent nature, and so can be shared at least in part with those in other racial groups who have had similar experiences. It carries a sense of inheriting a certain history and a sense of peoplehood connected with that history. A racialized group identity eschews the hard and fast essentialized differentness involved in a classic racial identity for an historically contextual one (2010: 302).

While Blum (and Hochman, following Blum) suggest that these groups are best conceived of as racialized groups, I think this over-extends the notion of “racialization”. It is true that, as Blum notes, the reason that these groups exist as groups is “because of the false attributions to them [...] of innate biobehavioral tendencies” (2010: 300). Nevertheless, since (at least in some cases) none of those false attributions are affirmed by those reclaiming these identities, the populations thus picked out by that shared experience and history are not themselves necessarily racialized groups (though membership might be largely coextensive). Since the process by which the groups are maintained is no longer one of (false) attributions of racial features, the process is no longer one of racialization, but of a different form of social construction.

This explains, at least in part, why the same process of reclamation of denigrated group identities and the construction of new sorts of self-identity can underwrite both identities that align with (but stand in opposition to the denigration associated with) ascribed race as well as those identities that emerge out of e.g., sexual orientation (Appiah 1994; see e.g., Van Anders 2015 for discussion of the complex interplay of self-identity, ascriptions, and social location in sexuality).

The key element here is that a particular identity might be central to one’s self-identity, and yet be real (but constructed), *if* it does *not* involve endorsing claims about the population that are ‘racial’ in nature. The features that one hopes will be shared in a population through the process of reclaiming identity are meant to be real features. That similar processes of identity reclamation can happen in denigrated populations that are racialized, as well as in populations that are not racialized, suggests that this kind of construction does not depend on the populations being conceived of as races (nor having been subject to racialization *per se*).

There are of course exceptions to this—times when people’s self-identities are wrapped up in (mistaken) views about race. In these cases, those aspects of their attempts at self-identification ought to be resisted. Where these self-identities are problematic in other ways (e.g., “White Pride”, other forms of ethnonationalism, fears of becoming “a [racial] minority”), this resistance is of course nonproblematic—the claims in these cases are both factually mistaken and morally abhorrent. But of course, in other cases, the attempts are legitimate attempts to oppose a racist narrative, and the problematic aspects are primarily factual rather than moral. In these cases, there is reason to hope that in time, such identifications will become less important, or at the very least, less wrapped up in elements that suggest the existence of race (Appiah 1996; Blum 2010).

## 5. Racism and Racialization

In the end, while it is important not to deny people the ability to self-identify in ways that are important to them and to social/political movements demanding rights and respect, that work can be done without reifying “race”, even as a socially constructed entity. If there are populations that are social constructions

associated with racialized populations, they are not races—they lack the properties that races would have to have. Similarly, while it would be grossly irresponsible to ignore the ways in which different populations are racialized in biomedicine (and in the social sciences more generally), paying attention to the ways in which populations are racialized, and the effects this racialization (and attendant racism) has on members of that population does not require the reification of ‘race’.

The creation of the concept of race was always wrapped up with the creation and enforcement of “racial” hierarchies, with the imposition of supposedly impermeable barriers between “kinds” of people. Races were not “discovered”. Nor, however, were they invented. The supposed barriers, the kinds imagined, and the hierarchies forcefully imposed did not create “races”. Rather, these were acts of *racialization*, and they created *racialized populations*, not races. People do not in fact belong to a race, nor is anyone a member of a race. Rather, people are members of populations that are *racialized*—believed to be, and treated like, races. But in the end, there are no groups with the properties that races would have to have, to be real entities, with the properties usually attributed to them, by which they were supposed to justify those divisions.<sup>9</sup>

#### References

- Aizer, A., Stroud, L., and Buka, S., 2016. Maternal stress and child outcomes: Evidence from siblings. *Journal of human resources*, 51 (3), 523–555.
- Andrasfay, T. and Goldman, N., 2021. Reductions in 2020 US life expectancy due to COVID-19 and the disproportionate impact on the Black and Latino populations. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 118 (5), e2014746118.
- Appiah, K.A. and Gutmann, A., 1998. Race, culture, identity: misunderstood connections. In: K.A. Appiah and A. Gutmann, *Color conscious*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 30–105.
- Appiah, K.A., 1996. Race, culture, identity: misunderstood connections. *The Tanner lectures on human values*, 17.
- Bediako, S.M. and Kimberly, R.M., 2011. Race and social attitudes about sickle cell disease. *Ethnicity & health*, 16 (4-5), 423–429.
- Blum, L., 2004. Systemic and individual racism, racialization and antiracist education: a reply to Garcia, Silliman and Levinson. *Theory and research in education*, 2 (1), 49–74.
- Blum, L., 2010. Racialized groups: the sociohistorical consensus. *The monist*, 93 (2), 298–320.
- Brace, C.L., 2005. *“Race” is a four-letter word: the genesis of the concept*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brawley, O.W., 2021. Prostate cancer and the social construct of race. *Cancer*, 127 (99), 1374–1376.

<sup>9</sup> Adam Hochman provided detailed and very useful feedback on an earlier draft of this paper; all remaining confusions and mistakes are my own, but there are far fewer of them thanks to him.

- Burchard, E.G., Ziv, E., Coyle, N., Gomez, S.L., *et al.*, 2003. The importance of race and ethnic background in biomedical research and clinical practice. *New England journal of medicine*, 348 (12), 1170–1175.
- Carlson, J., Henn, B.M., Al-Hindi, D.R., *et al.*, 2022. Counter the weaponization of genetics research by extremists. *Nature*, 610, 7932, 444–447.
- Das, A., 2013. How does race get “under the skin”? Inflammation, weathering, and metabolic problems in late life. *Social science & medicine*, 77, 75–83.
- Davenport, L., 2020. The fluidity of racial classifications. *Annual review of political science*, 23, 221–240.
- Edwards, A.W.F., 2003. Human genetic diversity: Lewontin’s fallacy. *BioEssays*, 25 (8), 798–801.
- Felten, E., 2007. St. Louis - Party Central. *The Wall Street Journal*. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB119161653517750477> [Last Accessed 28 January 2023].
- Forrester, S., Jacobs, D., Zmora, R., *et al.*, 2019. Racial differences in weathering and its associations with psychosocial stress: The CARDIA study. *SSM-population health*, 7, 100319.
- Gerbault, P., Liebert, A., Itan, Y., *et al.*, 2011. Evolution of lactase persistence: an example of human niche construction. *Philosophical transactions of the royal society B: biological sciences*, 366, 1566, 863–877.
- Gravlee, C.C., 2009. How race becomes biology: embodiment of social inequality. *American journal of physical anthropology*, 139 (1), 47–57.
- Hardimon, M.O., 2017. *Rethinking race*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardimon, M.O., 2022. Why social constructionists should embrace minimalist race. *The Southern journal of philosophy*, 60, 37–53.
- Heng, G., 2011a. The invention of race in the European middle ages I: race studies, modernity, and the middle ages. *Literature compass*, 8 (5), 315–331.
- Heng, G., 2011b. The invention of race in the European middle ages II: Locations of medieval race. *Literature Compass*, 8 (5), 332–350.
- Hochman, A., 2022. Has social constructionism about race outlived its usefulness? Perspectives from a race skeptic. *Biology & philosophy*, 37 (6), 48.
- Hochman, A., 2021. Janus-faced race: is race biological, social, or mythical?. *American journal of physical anthropology*, 175 (2), 453–464.
- Hochman, A., 2019. Race and reference. *Biology & philosophy*, 34 (2), 32.
- Hochman, A., 2017. Replacing race: interactive constructionism about racialized groups. *Ergo, an Open Access Journal of Philosophy*, 4.
- Kaplan, J.M. and Winther, R.G., 2013. Prisoners of abstraction? The theory and measure of genetic variation, and the very concept of “race”. *Biological theory*, 7, 401–412.
- Kaplan, J.M., 2011. ‘Race’: what biology can tell us about a social construct. *eLS*.
- Kaplan, J.M., 2021. The biological reality of race: what is at stake?. *In: L. Lorusso and R.G. Winther, eds. Remapping race in a global context*, London: Routledge.
- Kaplan, J.M., 2010. When socially determined categories make biological realities: understanding black/white health disparities in the US. *The monist*, 93 (2), 281–297.
- LaVeist, T.A., Gaskin, D., and Richard, P., 2011. Estimating the economic burden of racial health inequalities in the United States. *International journal of health services*, 41 (2), 231–238.

- Lewontin, R.C., 1972. The apportionment of human diversity. *Evolutionary biology*, 6, 381–398.
- Lewontin, R.C., 1974. *The genetic basis of evolutionary change*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Liebert, A., López, S., Jones, B.L., *et al.*, 2017. World-wide distributions of lactase persistence alleles and the complex effects of recombination and selection. *Human genetics*, 136, 1445–1453.
- Livingstone, F.B. and Dobzhansky, T., 1962. On the non-existence of human races. *Current anthropology*, 3 (3), 279–281.
- Lorusso, L. and Bacchini, F., 2021. Race as witchcraft: an argument against indiscriminate eliminativism about race. *In*: L. Lorusso and R.G. Winther, eds. *Re-mapping race in a global context*, London: Routledge, 281–308.
- Mavundla, S.W., 2019. Interactive constructionism: a more preferable anti-realist approach to the metaphysics of race. *South African journal of philosophy*, 38 (2), 219–225.
- McEwen, C.A. and McEwen, B.S., 2017. Social structure, adversity, toxic stress, and intergenerational poverty: an early childhood model. *Annual review of sociology*, 43, 445–472.
- Mills, C.W., 2000. But what are you really? The metaphysics of race. *In*: A. Light and N. Mechtild, eds. *Race, class, and community identity: radical philosophy today*. Amherst: Humanity books, 23–51.
- Nirenberg, D., 2009. Was there race before modernity? The example of ‘Jewish’ blood in late medieval Spain. *In*: M. Eliav-Feldon, B. Isaac, and J. Ziegler, eds. *The origins of racism in the west*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Novembre, J., 2022. The background and legacy of Lewontin's apportionment of human genetic diversity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 377, 1852, 20200406.
- Panofsky, A., Dasgupta, K., and Iturriaga, N., 2021. How white nationalists mobilize genetics: from genetic ancestry and human biodiversity to counterscience and metapolitics. *American journal of physical anthropology*, 175 (2), 387–398.
- Piel, F.B., Patil, A.P., Howes, R.E., *et al.*, 2010. Global distribution of the sickle cell gene and geographical confirmation of the malaria hypothesis. *Nature communications*, 1, 104.
- Pigliucci, M. and Kaplan, J., 2003. On the concept of biological race and its applicability to humans. *Philosophy of science*, 70 (5), 1161–1172.
- Rebbeck, T.R., 2017. Prostate cancer genetics: variation by race, ethnicity, and geography. *Seminars in radiation oncology*, 27, 1, 3–10.
- Root, M., 2003. The use of race in medicine as a proxy for genetic differences. *Philosophy of science*, 70 (5), 1173–1183.
- Roseman, C.C. 2021. Lewontin did not commit Lewontin's fallacy, his critics do: Why racial taxonomy is not useful for the scientific study of human variation. *Bioessays*, 43 (12), 2100204.
- Rosenberg, N.A., Pritchard, J.K., Weber, J.L., *et al.* 2002. Genetic structure of human populations. *Science*, 298, 5602, 2381–2385.
- Rosenberg, N.A., Mahajan, S., Ramachandran, S., *et al.*, 2005. Clines, clusters, and the effect of study design on the inference of human population studies. *PLoS Genetics*, 1 (6), 0660–0671.

- Rosenthal, L. and Lobel, M., 2011. Explaining racial disparities in adverse birth outcomes: unique sources of stress for black American women. *Social science & medicine*, 72 (6), 977–983.
- Smith, D.L., 2021. *Making monsters: the uncanny power of dehumanization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spencer, Q., 2012. What ‘biological racial realism’ should mean. *Philosophical studies*, 159, 181–204.
- Thomas, J.M., 2010. The racial formation of medieval Jews: a challenge to the field. *Ethnic and racial studies*, 33, 10, 1737–1755.
- Tishkoff, S.A., Floyd A.R., Friedlaender, F.R., *et al.*, 2009. The genetic structure and history of Africans and African americans. *Science*, 324, 5930, 1035–1044.
- Valles, S. A., 2021. A pluralistic and socially responsible philosophy of epidemiology field should actively engage with social determinants of health and health disparities. *Synthese*, 198 (10), 2589–2611.
- Valles, S.A., 2012. Heterogeneity of risk within racial groups, a challenge for public health programs. *Preventive medicine*, 55 (5), 405–408.
- Van A. and Sari, M., 2015. Beyond sexual orientation: Integrating gender/sex and diverse sexualities via sexual configurations theory. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 44, 1177–1213.
- Wadhwa, P.D., Entringer, S., Buss, C., *et al.*, 2011. The contribution of maternal stress to preterm birth: issues and considerations. *Clinics in perinatology*, 38 (3), 351–384.
- Wodak, D., 2022. Of witches and white folks. *Philosophy and phenomenological research*, 104 (3), 587–605.