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Don’t Call King a “Civil Rights” Leader:
Toward abolishing poverty and war by correcting our fatally inadequate remembering of MLK Jr.

Theodore Walker Jr.

Abstract-
Remembering Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.—primarily as a domestic “civil rights” leader—is inadequate, and sometimes harmful. The term “civil rights” fails to embrace King’s abolitionist movements toward the global abolition of poverty and war. Moreover, King was a Baptist preacher called by God. He advanced an optimistic realism (including a “realistic pacifism”) that improves upon pessimistic-cynical versions of political realism. And King went beyond advancing “civil rights” to advancing economic justice, economic rights, and human rights. He prescribed adding a social and economic bill of rights to the US Constitution, plus full-employment supplemented by “guaranteed income,” and US-supported international efforts to achieve the total “abolition of poverty” and war throughout “the world house” (King 1967).

Prelude

I am conspiring to produce an illustrated version of this lecture. The illustrations will be mostly images of many various government postage stamps honoring Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. The “sumitography” [postage-stamp-o-graphy - from Latin “sumit” means postage stamp] (Lillie Jenkins: 10 April 2018 [previously February 2018]) listing postage stamps honoring King will include USA Black Heritage postage stamps, and postage stamps from other nations, including: the “I have a dream” postage stamp from Cuba, the Swedish Nobel Peace Prize stamp, the Human Rights Year stamp from Ghana, the Human Rights stamp from the Turks & Caicos Islands, and the “Free at Last, Free at Last” postage stamp from Liberia. Also included will be postage stamps honoring King associates Mohandas K. Gandhi, Rosa Parks, and A. Philip Randolph.

The title will be Don’t Call Me a Civil Rights Leader, and the subtitle will explain—God called me to lead beyond civil rights to human rights, including economic rights. Each page will feature one or more postage stamp images placed above quotes from King’s writings, and footnotes from this lecture. And the footnotes will indicate that economists and economic policy makers should be led by King. King’s leadership will be emphasized by footnote headings: “King says, ‘This is not a civil right program …,” “Marching toward Justice” [and “Peripatetic Friendships” (Justin Barringer: May 2016)], “March on Washington,” “Poor Peoples Campaign,” “March against Fear: King over Stokely Carmichael: Economics over Politics,” and “King’s Ultimate Realism.”

[]()
For the sake of rightly remembering Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., it is important to recognize that by 1967 King had come to resist being called “a civil rights leader.” And he resisted having his public policy prescriptions described as “a civil rights program.” In addition to his call to church ministry, King had two other reasons for resisting the “civil rights” label. One reason concerned the scope of his philosophy of nonviolent resistance to evil, and the other concerned the content and scope of his prescriptions for abolishing poverty.

**Nonviolent Resistance to Evil**

In his 1967 anti-war sermon—“Beyond Vietnam”—delivered at Riverside Church in New York, King resisted the label—“civil rights leader.” King noted that an affirmative answer to the question—“‘Aren’t you a civil rights leader?’”—would be used by his critics to indicate he should say nothing against war among nations (4 April 1967: 143-44). King’s critics argued that war among nations is not a civil rights issue because civil rights are constitutionally protected political rights (including voting rights) of US citizens. Noncitizens and foreign nations do not have “civil rights” protected by the US Constitution and its amendments. Accordingly, if King had answered—“Yes, I am ‘a civil rights leader,’” this would have implied obligation to restrict his philosophy of nonviolence to domestic relations among US citizens. King complained about critics “who ask the question, ‘Aren’t you a civil rights leader?’ and [who] thereby mean to exclude me from the movement for peace” (4 April 1967:143-44). So King declined identifying himself as a civil rights leader.

Instead, King identified himself as a “citizen of the world” joining with “the great Buddhist leaders of Vietnam” in prescribing an immediate end to “war against the people of Vietnam” (4 April 1967: 153-154). Even more fundamentally, King identified himself as a preacher, a Baptist preacher committed to “the ministry of Jesus Christ” and obedient to “the one who loved his enemies so fully that he died for them” (4 April 1967: 144-45).

Rather than restricting himself to domestic civil rights, King argued that “the philosophy and strategy of nonviolence” is “by no means” excluded from addressing “relations between nations” (2010 [June 1967]: 194). And instead of restricting himself to calling for nonviolence between black and white US citizens, King called for “an end to war and violence between nations” (2010 [June 1967]: 195).

Ending violence and war among nations is directly related to King’s economic goal: ending poverty. For King, ending war and ending poverty go together.

King predicted that we would never invest adequately in ending poverty for so long as we were being drained by military budgets and military adventures. He said:

… America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Vietnam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demonic,
destructive suction tube. So I was increasingly compelled to see the war as an enemy of the poor and to attack it as such.

(King 4 April 1967: 142)

King saw militarism and war as enemies of the effort to abolish poverty. Furthermore, King was convinced that violence yields more violence and more chaos, not community. Unlike the “aftermath” of violence, the “aftermath” of nonviolent resistance to evil is “beloved community” (King 2010 [1958]: 90-91, 215; also 2010 [1964/c1963]: 44).

With regard to the scope of King’s philosophy of nonviolence, describing King as a civil rights leader is fatally inadequate. Similarly, King’s prescriptions for abolishing poverty are not adequately described as a civil rights program.

Abolishing Poverty

Abolishing poverty is a major theme in King’s 1967 book—Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community? Here, King insisted that his proposed program for the “abolition of poverty” was “not a ‘civil rights’ program, in the sense that that term is currently used” (2010 [June 1967]: 170, 174, italics added). In that - still currently used - sense, constitutionally protected “civil rights” did not include “economic rights” (Trimiew 1997). Hence, King prescribed adding a bill of rights to the US Constitution. He called for a “social and economic Bill of Rights, to supplement the Constitution’s political Bill of Rights” (King 2010 [June 1967]: 211; also, Greene 2014: 35-48).

[For a historical, critical, and constructive account of “economic rights,” with particular attention to President Carter’s support for economic rights, and including ethical and theological contributions to debate about economic rights, see God Bless the Child That’s Got Its Own: The Economic Rights Debate (c1997) by Darryl M. Trimiew.]

[Gratitude to Mark Grafenreed for teaching me to distinguish “supplement” (King) from amendment.]

Until such supplements were in place, King recognized that, in calling for economic rights, he was going beyond constitutional rights, and hence, beyond our sense of the term “civil rights.” King wrote, “We have left the realm of constitutional rights and we are entering the area of human rights” (2010 [June 1967]: 138).

And for King, human rights include economic rights. Economic rights are essential to the human right to be free from poverty, and essential to rightly supplemented civil rights. Hence, King called for abolishing poverty domestically and throughout “the world house” (2010 [June 1967]: 170, 177).

An economist studies King’s prescriptions for abolishing poverty

Not many economists have wrestled with King’s prescriptions for abolishing poverty. In part, this is because many economists don’t know that King had anything to say about economic policies. And this is because King’s economic prescriptions for the domestic and global abolition of poverty have been eclipsed by our re-membering of King as a civil rights leader.
There is, however, one PhD economist, with a second PhD in religious ethics, who has studied King’s economic prescriptions.

Economist-ethicist Michael Greene argues in his book—*A Way Out of No Way: The Economic Prerequisites of the Beloved Community* (2014)—that economic advances toward beloved community are possible. And compared to the costs of increasing chaos, advancing toward community by abolishing poverty is much more affordable. Also, like King, Greene finds that actualizing this possibility requires finding alternatives to sheer economic growth.

King rejected the economic philosophy of growth-solves-all-problems. Herman Daly labels this rejected economic philosophy as “growthism” [See “Trump’s Growthism: Its Roots in Neoclassical Economic Theory” (Daly 8 February 2017; also Daly 1996)]. Sheer economic growth does not guarantee economic progress toward more widely shared prosperity (Tim Jackson 2011 [2009]). Clearly, the economic pie cannot expand infinitely. Meanwhile, an economy can grow in ways that render the rich richer and the poor poorer. Even while growing, the economy has, King observed, “often left a gulf between superfluous wealth and abject poverty” and “created conditions permitting necessities to be taken from the many to give luxuries to the few” (2010 [June 1967]: 197). King said “no matter how dynamically the economy develops and expands, it does not eliminate all poverty” (2010 [June 1967]: 172; also 207).

To eliminate all poverty, rather than depending upon sheer economic growth, King prescribed that we “create incomes” through full employment by creating new forms of work, including new forms of work “that enhance the social good” (2010 [June 1967]: 172). A “progressive full-employment/right-to-work agenda” is central to “King’s proposed economic bill of rights,” says Michael Greene (2014: 38). And where full-employment is not possible (some people are not able to work), we must provide other forms of “guaranteed income.” King wrote:

> In addition to the absence of coordination and sufficiency, the [antipoverty] programs of the past all have another common failing—they are indirect. Each seeks to solve poverty by first solving something else.
> I am now convinced that the simplest approach will prove to be the most effective—the solution to poverty is to abolish it directly by a now widely discussed measure: the guaranteed income.
> (King 2010 [June 1967]: 171)

It is important to note that when King spoke of “guaranteed income,” he did not mean guaranteed poor income. Instead, King prescribed a guaranteed income that is adequate to human flourishing. Domestically and globally, through full-employment policies and creation of new forms of work and guaranteed incomes, King prescribed abolishing all poverty. King wrote:

> The curse of poverty has no justification in our age. … The time has come for us to civilize ourselves by the total, direct and immediate abolition of poverty.
There is nothing new about poverty. What is new, however, is that we now have the resources to get rid of it.

Hopefully, other economists will join Michael Greene in critical and constructive thinking about King’s economic prescriptions.

There is much for economists to think about. For example, economic theorists should analyze King’s appreciation of an 1879 book—Progress and Poverty by Henry George. Also, some of King’s economic prescriptions are specific enough for quantitative analysis.

For instance, King observed that the economic costs of abolishing Jim Crow (and protecting voting rights) were very small compared to the “real cost” (possibly “a trillion dollars”) of abolishing poverty (2010 [June 1967]: 5-6). Also, King followed John Kenneth Galbraith’s estimate that “$20 billion a year would effect a guaranteed income” domestically (2010 [June 1967]: 174). And with regard to the global abolition of poverty, King called for “a massive sustained Marshall Plan” financed by wealthy nations allocating “2 percent of their gross national product annually for a period of ten or twenty years” (2010 [June 1967]: 188-89). Were these estimates adequate to abolishing poverty if we had started in 1967? And if we start today, what estimates are appropriate to abolishing poverty?

Economists can help with answering these and other questions about King’s prescriptions for abolishing poverty. And, of course, economists can help with formulating an economic bill of rights.

**Stokely Carmichael and Floyd McKissick**

Please remember Stokely Carmichael [Kwame Ture] and Floyd McKissick. And please recall King’s June 1967 book—Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community? Here, King reports that his 1967 deliberations emerged—in significant part—from his June 1966 collaborations, conversations, and debates with Stokely Carmichael (and others from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee [SNCC]) and Floyd McKissick (and others from the Congress of Racial Equality [CORE]). These conversations and debates occurred while King, Stokely Carmichael, and Floyd McKissick were continuing James Meredith’s march through Mississippi. Indeed, while Meredith was in the hospital recovering from a sniper’s gunshot, the march he initiated continued under the tripartite leadership of late-comers: McKissick, Carmichael, and King.

“Floyd, Stokely and I,” wrote King, “agreed that the march would be jointly sponsored by CORE, SNCC … and SCLC …” (2010 [June 1967]: 25). After the Meredith march, each of the three leaders wrote deliberations that continued their June 1966 conversations and debates. Their mutually influential conversations and debates become obvious when we study each of their almost-immediately-after-the-1966-Meredith-march books: [1] Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community? (June 1967) by Martin Luther King Jr.; [2] Black Power: The Politics of
The three books (emerging from the tripartite leadership of King, Carmichael, and McKissick) should be studied together. In these books, the Baptist preacher (King), the political black power advocate (Carmichael), the political scientist (Hamilton), and the constitutional lawyer (McKissick) are so much in conversation and debate with each other that fully appreciating any one of these three books requires fully appreciating the other two.

Also, along with study of Malcolm X (el-Hajj Malik el-Shabazz), fully appreciating this literature is essential to understanding the origin of the philosophy of black power. Here we see King’s distinction between denotative and connotative meanings of black power, his favorable contribution to the denotative meanings, and his critical rejection of the connotative meanings, in his second chapter—“Black Power”—in Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community? (June 1967). And fully appreciating this literature is essential to understanding the origin of “Black Theology,” including especially the “Black Theology” that appreciated “Black Power” in Black Theology and Black Power (1969) by James H. Cone. [And see Martin and Malcolm and America: A Dream or a Nightmare (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1991) by James H. Cone.]

Studying these three books reveals that the ‘civil rights’ label is appropriate to the Carmichael-Hamilton emphasis, and appropriate to much of McKissick’s emphasis, but not appropriate to King’s emphasis. The ‘civil rights’ label is fully appropriate to the Carmichael-Hamilton emphasis upon domestic political voting rights. Carmichael and Hamilton prescribed that black US-citizen-voters should organize a separate black political party and exercise their domestic civil-voting rights. And ‘civil rights’ is an appropriate label for Floyd McKissick’s emphasis upon rights protected by the US Constitution (violations of which could justify a black declaration of independence and a separate black nation). In contrast, the ‘civil rights’ label is not appropriate to King’s emphasis upon nonviolence among nations, and not appropriate to his emphasis upon abolishing poverty throughout “the world house.” Moreover, in calling for the “total, direct, and immediate abolition of poverty” (2010 [1967]: 175), King was far more radical and revolutionary than Carmichael. [See The Radical King (2014) edited by Cornel West.] Hence, contrary to our popular rememberings of Stokely Carmichael as radical revolutionary, and of Martin Luther King Jr. as civil rights leader; their 1967 books show that Carmichael was the civil rights leader, and King was the radical revolutionary.

Revolution of Values and Ecumenical Loyalties

Going beyond civil rights, and beyond Hamilton-Carmichael’s Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in America (where “in America” = in USA); King called for a global “revolution of values” (2010 [June 1967]: 196-202). And in “Beyond Vietnam,” where King speaks “as a citizen of the world” joining with “the great Buddhist leaders of Vietnam” in prescribing an immediate end to “war against the people of Vietnam” (4 April 1967: 153-154), King says a “genuine revolution of values” entails “ecumenical loyalties” that transcend the national interest. King said:

A genuine revolution of values means in the final analysis that our loyalties must become ecumenical rather than sectional.
Every nation must now develop an overriding loyalty to mankind as a whole in order to preserve the best in their individual societies. This call for a *worldwide fellowship that lifts neighborly concern beyond one’s tribe, race, class, and nation* is in reality a call for an all-embracing and unconditional love for all mankind. (King 4 April 1967: 160-61) [Italics added.]

Unconditional love and ecumenical loyalty to all (including our enemies) is genuinely revolutionary.

Prophetically, as if writing about contemporary unease with the poverty-wealth contrast, King wrote:

> A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth. With righteous indignation, it will look at thousands of working people displaced from their jobs with reduced incomes as a result of automation while the profits of the employers remain intact, and say: “This is not just.” It will look across the oceans and see individual capitalists of the West investing huge sums of money in Asia, Africa and South America, only to take the profits out with no concern for the social betterment of the [198/199] countries, and say: “This is not just.” It will look at our alliance with the landed gentry of Latin America and say: “This is not just.” … A true revolution of values will lay hands on the world order and say of war: “This way of settling differences is not just.”

(King 2010 [June 1967]: 198-199)

And King envisioned the possibility of the USA leading the way in this revolution of values. He wrote:

> America, the richest and most powerful nation in the world, can well lead the way in this revolution of values. … There is nothing but a lack of social vision to prevent us from paying an adequate wage to every American citizen … There is nothing except shortsightedness to prevent us from guaranteeing an annual minimum—and *livable*—income for every American family. …

(King 2010 [June 1967]: 199)

According to King, it is only “lack of social vision” that prohibits us from “guaranteeing an annual minimum—and *livable*—income to every American family” (King 2010 [June 1967]: 199). Then, King extended his social vision beyond the United States to embrace everyone in “the world house” (King 2010 [June 1967]: 177).

**Worldwide Neighborhood**

Decades before the worldwide web, King was announcing the emergence of our “worldwide neighborhood.” He wrote:
However deeply American Negroes are caught in the struggle to be at last at home in our homeland of the United States, we cannot ignore the larger world house in which we are also dwellers. Equality with whites will not solve the problems of either whites or Negroes if it means equality in a world society stricken by poverty and … doomed to extinction by war.

All inhabitants of the globe are now neighbors. This worldwide neighborhood has been brought into being largely as a result of the modern scientific and technological revolutions. The world today is vastly different …

(King 2010 [June 1967]: 177) [Italics added.]

King prescribed recognizing that we are all neighbors in an increasingly interrelated worldwide neighborhood.

Civilization

In Stride Toward Freedom (2010 [1958]) King describes nonviolent resistance as injecting “new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization” (51-52), and he follows Arnold Toynbee in saying “it may be the Negro who will give the new spiritual dynamic to Western civilization that it so desperately needs to survive” (220).

In Why We Can’t Wait (2010 [1964/c1963]) King says, “Civilization, particularly in the United States, has long possessed the material wealth and resources to feed, clothe and shelter all of its citizens” (152), and that (instead of waiting) we should do so immediately.

In his “Acceptance Address for the Nobel Peace Prize” (10 December 1964) [printed in A Call to Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (2001) edited by Clayborne Carson and Kris Shepard] King says:

Civilization and violence are antithetical concepts. … Sooner or later, all the peoples of the world will have to discover a way to live together in peace, and thereby transform this pending cosmic elegy into a creative psalm of brotherhood. …

(King 2001 [10 December 1964]: 106) [Italics added.]

In Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community? (2010 [June 1967]) King identifies many of the immoral and uncivilized features of our contemporary world, including violence, materialism, war, racism, and poverty (68-74); and he prescribes that we “civilize ourselves by the total, direct and immediate abolition of poverty” (175). Domestically and globally, abolishing poverty immediately [can’t wait] is essential to the process of civilizing ourselves. King says Alfred North Whitehead says “civilization is shifting its basic outlook” and approaching “a major turning point in history where the pre-suppositions on which society is structured are being analyzed, sharply challenged, and profoundly changed” (179). King says we are seeing “a freedom explosion” (179), that morality and spirituality lag behind the scientific progress of
Western civilization (182-83), that racism “dogs the tracks of our civilization” and “is no mere American phenomenon” (183), that racism “can well be that corrosive evil that will bring down the curtain on Western civilization” (186), that racism, materialism, and militarism are “the giant triplets” (196-97), and that prevailing “moral and spiritual bankruptcy” makes civilization impossible (197). Concerning military violence; we must choose between “violent coannihilation” and “nonviolent coexistence” (202), between “chaos” and “community.” And beloved community is occasioned only by nonviolent resistance to evil (2010 [1958]: 90-91, 215; also 2010 [1964/c1963]: 44). King judged that materialism, racism, violence, militarism, war, and poverty are incompatible with a civilized world house.

King was doing “global ethics” (Hak Joon Lee 2011). Our domestic USA ‘civil rights’ box is much too small to contain King’s “world house.” Nevertheless, according to Michael Greene, by constantly focusing almost exclusively upon ‘civil rights’ and the 1963 ‘I Have a Dream Speech,’ we have “ended up with an utterly domesticated King—a King stripped of his radicalness and rendered harmless” (Greene 2014: 21). Remembering King as only a ‘civil rights leader’ wrongly domesticates and secularizes King’s global ethics. And such wrongful remembering eclipses King’s prophetic vision of a civilized “world house” (1967).

Audacious Faith

During his 1964 acceptance address in Oslo for the Nobel Peace Prize, King spoke of “an audacious faith” in the future of humanity. He said:

I accept this award today with an abiding faith in America and an audacious faith in the future of mankind. I refuse to accept despair as the final response the ambiguities of history. I refuse to accept the idea that the ‘is-ness’ of man’s present nature makes him morally incapable of reaching up for the eternal ‘ought-ness’ that forever confronts him. I refuse to accept the idea that man is mere flotsam and jetsam in the river of life, unable to influence the unfolding events which surround him. I refuse to accept the view that mankind is so tragically bound to the starless midnight of racism and war that the bright daybreak of peace and brotherhood can never become a reality. I refuse to accept the cynical notion that nation after nation must spiral down a militaristic stairway into the hell of nuclear annihilation. I believe that unarmed truth and unconditional love will have the final word in reality. This is why right, temporarily defeated, is stronger than evil triumphant. …

I still believe we shall overcome.

This faith can give us courage to face the uncertainties of the future. It will give our tired feet new strength as we continue our forward stride toward the city of freedom. When our days
become dreary with low-hovering clouds and our nights become
darker than a thousand midnights, we will know that we are living
in the creative turmoil of a genuine civilization struggling to be
born.

... (King 10 December 1964: 106-108) [Italics added.]

Prophetically, in 1964 King perceived that “we are living in the creative turmoil of a genuine
civilization struggling to be born” (10 December 1964: 108), and he encouraged “audacious faith” that we can give birth to a genuine global civilization.

Similarly, in a 1967 speech—“Where Do We Go from Here?”—King spoke of “an audacious faith in the future.” King said:

But difficult and painful as it is, we must walk on in the days ahead with an audacious faith in the future. (Well [listeners responding]) And as we continue our charted course, we may gain consolation from the words so nobly left by that great black bard, who was also a great freedom fighter of yesterday, James Weldon Johnson (Yes): Stony the road we trod (Yes), Bitter the chastening rod ... Yet with a steady beat, Have not our weary feet Come to the place For which our fathers sighed? ... Let us realize that the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice. Let us realize that William Cullen Bryant is right: ‘Truth, crushed to earth, will rise again.’ ...

(King 16 August 1967: 197)

**Reality-based Optimism**

Audacious faith is not a blind faith. Audacious faith is reality-based.

The Christian ethical imperative—that we should love our neighbors and our enemies as we should love ourselves (Matthew 5:43-48; 22:34-40) is founded upon ultimate reality, upon the reality of God. God is “the one all-inclusive whole of reality” (Ogden 1984: 21, also Hartshorne 1973 [1967]: 7, 12, 16). Conformity to reality (not missing the mark [reality] = not sinning) requires recognizing that, in reality, neighbors, enemies, and selves are all parts of the all-inclusive divine whole of reality. We should love our neighbors and our enemies as we should love ourselves because they really are as we are: parts among parts of the divine whole of reality.

Realism without Chronic Pessimism

Reinhold Niebuhr

Unlike King, most of us are very pessimistic about our capacity to abolish war and poverty. We regard King’s prescriptions for abolishing militarism, war, and poverty as unrealistic.

Our habit of identifying pessimism with realism was greatly strengthened by our appreciation (and mis-appreciation) of Reinhold Niebuhr’s *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics* (1932). Here Niebuhr drew a sharp distinction between ethics and politics. The ethical ideal of love (loving neighbors and enemies as we love our selves, including sacrificial love) is possible for individuals and small groups (moral man), but not possible for large social groups such as states and nations (immoral society). Thus, it is unrealistic to apply Christian ethics to the immoral social realm of politics. Instead of advocating unrealistic “religious idealism,” Reinhold Niebuhr argues that we should accept a “frank dualism” (1932: 270-71). This way of sharply distinguishing Christian ethics from politics is sometimes called “Christian realism” (Niebuhr 1953 [also McCann 1981, Lovin 1995, Lovin 2008]).

King wrestled with Niebuhr’s critique of pacifism. In chapter VI—“Pilgrimage to Nonviolence”—of *Stride Toward Freedom: The Montgomery Story* (1958; 2010 reprint) King concluded that Niebuhr was wrong in judging pacifism/nonviolence to be unrealistic. King wrote:

> True pacifism is not unrealistic submission to evil power, as Niebuhr contends. It is rather a courageous confrontation of evil by the power of love, in the faith that it is better to be the recipient of violence than the inflicter of it …
> (King 2010 [1958]: 86).

> After reading Niebuhr, I tried to arrive at a realistic pacifism.
> (King 2010 [1958]: 87).

Some of us believe Niebuhr’s frank dualism was based upon an overly pessimistic estimate of human social possibilities [overly pessimistic and perhaps cynical, despite Niebuhr’s *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic* (1929)]. Contrary to any pessimistic realism, King advanced an optimistic Christian realism including a “realistic pacifism” (2010 [1958]: 87).

King’s optimism was not a naïvely idealistic optimism that whistles past graveyards and denies the reality of crucifixion and death. Instead, as demonstrated in his “I’ve been to the Mountaintop” sermon (delivered by King at Bishop Charles Mason Temple, Memphis, Tennessee, 3 April 1968), King appreciated the full cost of discipleship while nonetheless affirming [Unitarian abolitionist Theodore Parker’s conviction] that the long arc of the moral universe “bends toward justice” (16 August 1967: 198-99 [also, Hak Joon Lee 2011: 59]). With audacious faith rooted in ultimate reality, King refused to identify realism with chronic
pessimism about possible ethical achievements in political, economic, national, international, and global relations.

Mohandas K. Gandhi

King’s optimism about applying Christian ethics to international politics and global relations was strongly influenced by studying the life and works of Mohandas K. Gandhi. Prior to studying Gandhi, King had almost accepted Niebuhr’s dualistic distinction between Christian ethics (for individuals) and realistic politics (for large social groups and nations). In chapter six—“Pilgrimage to Nonviolence”—of Stride toward Freedom (1958), King wrote:

... Prior to reading Gandhi, I had about concluded that the ethics of Jesus were only effective in individual relationships. The ‘turn the other cheek’ philosophy and the ‘love your enemies’ philosophy were only valid, I felt, when individuals were in conflict with other individuals; when racial groups and nations were in conflict a more realistic approach seemed necessary. But after reading Gandhi, I saw how utterly mistaken I was. Gandhi was probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful and effective social force on a large scale. Love for Gandhi was a potent instrument for social and collective transformation. It was in this Gandhian emphasis on love and nonviolence that I discovered the method for social reform that I had been seeking ...

(King 2010 [1958]: 84-85) [Italics added.]

And in his 10 December 1964 “Acceptance Address for the Nobel Peace Prize” King said, “Negroes in the United States, following the people of India, have demonstrated that nonviolence is not sterile passivity, but a powerful moral force which makes for social transformation” (106 [italics added]).

Tenzin Gyatso, His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama

In A Call to Conscience (2001), the text of King’s 1964 Nobel Peace Prize acceptance address is introduced by the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize winner—Tenzin Gyatso, His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama. Here, His Holiness the Fourteenth Dalai Lama says:

Despite their quite different backgrounds, Dr. King has joined Mahatma Gandhi as a continuing beacon of inspiration to further peaceful revolutions in recent years that, in turn, offer future generations a wonderful example of successful, nonviolent change.

(2001: 101-02)
Gandhi followed by King demonstrated that nonviolence resistance to oppression can yield liberation, even in national and international affairs (Tenzin Gyatso 2001; Burrow Jr. 2009; Grim 2014: 16).

The If/Then Structure of King’s Prophetic Predictions -

More than fifty years ago, in Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community? (June 1967) Martin Luther King Jr. predicted that if we failed to abolish war and poverty, then our future would be marked by increasing “chaos.” We failed. Chaos is increasing. Alternatively, if we had committed to nonviolent resistance to evil and “worldwide war against poverty” (2010 [June 1967]: 188), we could have made significant progress toward achieving “community.”

Perhaps we can still make significant progress (Greene 2014). Perhaps it is not too late. Certainly the structure of King’s 1967 predictions indicates that repentance may yet yield an alternative future; a future movement toward increasing “community” (if we repent) instead of increasing “chaos” (if we fail to repent).

Distinguishing Prophet from Oracle

The if/then structure of King’s prophetic predictions is distinct from the fated structure of oracular predictions, such as the oracular predictions offered by the witches in Shakespeare’s Tragedy of Macbeth. Given a distinction between if/then-prophetic predictions and fated-oracular predictions; instead of being “prophetic sisters,” the witches were merely fated-oracular sisters (“fatidicas sorores”). Oracles, including oracles making correct predictions, should be distinguished from prophets. Rather than correctly predicting an inevitable tragic fate (“Birnam wood to Dunsinane hill shall come against him”); a prophet predicts contingent tragedy (“chaos”) and prescribes that we act differently/repent and thereby actualize an alternative possibility (“community”).

Don’t Call King a ‘Civil Rights Leader.’

Remembering Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. –primarily as a domestic civil rights leader—is inadequate, and sometimes harmful. The term “civil rights” fails to embrace King’s abolitionist movements toward the global abolition of poverty and war. Calling King a “civil rights leader” tends to eclipse King’s calling/vocation to be a Baptist preacher and prophet committed to love of God and neighbors (including enemies) throughout the “world-wide neighborhood” (King 2010 [June 1967]: 177). With audacious faith, King wrestled with Reinhold Niebuhr and advanced an optimistic realism (including a “realistic pacifism”) that improves upon pessimistic-cynical versions of political realism. And King went beyond advancing civil rights to advancing economic rights and human rights. King prescribed adding an economic bill of rights to the US Constitution, plus full-employment supplemented by “guaranteed income,” and US-supported international efforts to achieve the total “abolition of poverty” and war throughout “the world house” (King 1967).

World House as Precursor to Global Ecology
The visionary idea of a world house is a prophetic precursor to the contemporary idea of a global ecology. The very word *ecology* derives from the Greek word οἶκος, meaning “house” or “household.” And so does the word *economic*. Hence, world house or global household οἶκος implies global ecology, global economics, and global ethics.

When we repent of our wrongfully restrictive habit of falsely remembering King (re-membering King) as only a domestic ‘civil rights’ leader; we can better recognize that his conception of our “world house” (King 1967) is fully resonant with contemporary ecological thinking about our “common home” (Pope Francis 2015).


We may safely speculate that if King had lived even a little beyond 4 April 1968 (perhaps until the first Earth Day in 1970) he would have made fully explicit the clearly implicit connections between world *house*, global *economy*, and global *ecology*.

**MLK Jr. Day and Earth Day: Abolishing Poverty and War, and Protecting Nature**

King-inspired visions of a civilized “world house,” and Pope Francis-inspired visions of our “common home,” can help us advance toward the widely shared prosperity characteristic of an ecological civilization. Appreciating King’s global ethics (including his prescriptions for the global abolition of racism, materialism, militarism, war, and poverty) can be especially helpful during USA Martin Luther King Jr. Day celebrations when the wrongly restrictive “civil rights” label is most strongly applied (Walker 6 June 2015).

MLK Jr. Day celebrations are ideal occasions for advancing King’s neglected prescriptions for abolishing poverty (locally and globally), for advancing King’s neglected call to supplement the US Constitution by adding a social and economic Bill of Rights, and for emphasizing that, throughout any genuinely civilized world house, human rights include economic rights.

Moreover, both MLK Jr. Day celebrations and Earth Day celebrations are ideal occasions for recognizing that struggles to abolish war and poverty among human creatures and struggles to protect nonhuman creatures and creations (all loved by the universal Creator) are mutually supportive struggles. Abolishing war, abolishing poverty, and protecting the Earth go together.

Attending to this mutuality of struggles suggests the need for mutually reinforcing laws and legal systems. In addition to a “Bill of Rights for the Disadvantaged” (King 2010 [1964/c1963]: 163) and a “social and economic Bill of Rights to supplement the Constitution’s political Bill of Rights” (King 2010 [June 1967]: 211); we may also need an environmental and *ecological* Bill of Rights, plus new legal systems that protect the natural environments of disadvantaged nonhuman creatures and creations (such as, for example, pando populous). See *Should Trees Have Standing? And Other Essays on Law, Morals and the Environment* (1996) by Christopher D. Stone; and see *The Ecology of Law: Toward a Legal System in Tune with Nature and Community* (2015) by Fritjof Capra and Ugo Mattei.
Julian Bond and Bill McKibben: One Complex Struggle says Pope Francis

When National Public Radio reported the death of Julian Bond (born 14 January 1940, died 15 August 2015); the report referred to Bill McKibben’s thrill with being handcuffed in the same paddy wagon with Bond. [See McKibben’s account in his book *Oil and Honey* (2013: 252-53).] Like King, Julian Bond did not restrict himself to civil rights. To be sure, Bond was among the first to oppose US military activity in Vietnam. The image of Bond and McKibben handcuffed in the same paddy wagon witnesses to the truth of Pope Francis’s claim that “combating poverty” and “protecting nature” are not two separate struggles, but rather one complex struggle (Francis 2015: paragraph 139; also 175).

Following King Today - among researchers and scholars

In addition to political actors and political scientists (Carmichael and political scientist Charles V. Hamilton) and constitutional lawyers and judges (McKissick and Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas [Douglas authored the Foreword to McKissick’s 1969 book]); economic policy makers should be led by King. Economists should follow King.

Today, following King requires doing the following research:
- research on developing a domestic social and economic bill of rights,
- research on the idea of a domestic (and a global) guaranteed income,
- research on the idea of full-employment and creating new forms of work that advance the social good,
- research on the idea of economic justice and economic rights as a human right, and
- research on the idea of a universal guaranteed income (Stern and Kravitz 2016: Bregman 2017 [2014]) instructed by King.

Moreover, we require research connecting various abolitionist movements, including the abolition of slavery, the abolition of racism, the abolition of poverty, the abolition of militarism and war, and “the abolition of dirty energy” (Griffin 2015).
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King, Jr., Martin Luther 1968. MONTSERRAT, 1 EC$ - East Caribbean dollar. Horizontal, head-only black-and-white portrait of MLK Jr. on purple background, human rights flame emblem in center right of stamp frame. Caption: "Dr. Martin Luther King, Human Rights Year 1968".
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King, Jr., Martin Luther 1977. MALI, 700 MAF - Malian franc. Vertical, head-only, left-facing portrait in middle of frame, US flag above and Swedish flag below. Caption: “REPUBLIC DU MALI, Martin Luther King - Lutte Contre Le Racisme, Prix Nobel de la Paix”.
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Mi: SE 1416, Sn: SE 1621, Yt: SE 1398, Sg: SE 1320, AFA: SE 1392


King, Jr., Martin Luther 2012. INDIA, 20 p Indian paisa. Vertical, black-and-white, head-only portrait on left two-thirds of frame. Caption: “Dr. Martin Luther King, 1929 - 1968”. http://coolglobalbiz.typepad.com/a/6a01116837a6c2970c0147e2c72d7b970b-pi/ 16 March 2018. MiIN 470, SnIN 486, YtIN 270, SgIN 584
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