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I. INTRODUCTION

What does the ministry of Martin Luther King teach us about today’s struggles against continuing references and demands to restore principles of European empire and extend American racism? How does King’s continuing global authority and all who are touched by it appraise and act on the heavy American and European impacts—across most human value categories—of the consequences against human dignity of the last several years, as symbolized by the global reach of President Trump’s election in 2016? In light of the racially discriminatory communications, encouragements, and consequences arising from this phenomenon—which may be called Trumpism, to be developed herein—what normative wisdom can King’s ministry and global authority bring to us about vanquishing this new wave of racism, so publicly revealed in European and American demands for new, but reminiscent, prejudicial public orders of governance, dominance, and culture?1

When we reflect on Martin Luther King Jr. on his national holiday, we must ask how to most appropriately do so. For many, it has become a “day of service” in King’s name, with reference to King’s humility, his dedication to giving to others, and his empowerment of vulnerable people.2 This national holiday has further become a day of recognition of King’s importance to the country as its major civil rights leader, encompassing television and other public testimonials, many of which
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1 This Article will explore these and related questions.

refer to his soaring “I Have a Dream” oration at the historic 1963 March on Washington.³

But no matter how we choose to reflect on his importance, we must ask whether the national King narrative of celebration has become so commodified as to shield from our sight the complex depths of King’s true greatness. I submit this commodification and shielding have indeed happened. We are nationally unaware, and some of us may not wish to know, that King was a more radically transformative leader by his philosophy and actions than we have come to embrace.⁴ He was so in his Pan-Africanism, his battles against global European and American colonialism and racial subordination, his defiance of Cold War condemnation of Black internationally-oriented thinking and action, and his insistence that the American Civil Rights Movement incorporate international human rights and international peace narratives.⁵ He was transformative in intending that his profound vision of the Beloved Community should become a non-utopian, nonviolent, realized system of both domestic and international governance and that it should define his ministry early as a global ministry.⁶ His global authority had become—even before his assassination in 1968—widespread in the international community, notwithstanding American government attempts to discount it.⁷

Finally, the current commodification of King—in a narrow niche of a known former civil rights leader not really now identified with the tragedies of sophisticated, systemic, intentional racial subordination—has shielded the historical fact that King is a contemporary bulwark of the

⁴ See, e.g., discussion infra Parts IV–V (describing King’s human rights ministry as a global movement and its international impact).
⁶ See infra Part IV (describing King’s Beloved Community as a vision for future communities built upon and structured around agape love).
⁷ See Sims, supra note 5 (noting one administration’s attempt to discount King’s March on Washington).
“Black International Tradition.” That Tradition comprises the continuous historic thread of Black resistance by leaders from slavery up to the present, incorporating international events, narratives, freedom norms, and law as defining vital elements into the American struggle for Black liberation.

This Article first discusses the exigency of this study of King, King’s early confrontation with the “roots of Trumpism,” and King’s vision of the Beloved Community. I will then turn to a first look at King’s global authority, which emerged during the American Civil Rights Movement. Next, I discuss King, the Beloved Community, and the expression of his presence and authority in Europe prior to the formal declarations of Euro-Trumpism. This is followed by demonstrating that King’s global authority and the influence of the Beloved Community were already established in Europe and awaiting the formal declarations of Euro-Trumpism, including Trump’s American election victory in 2016. Last, I discuss European invocations of King’s principles, including their expressed need for his Dream, his nonviolence, and agape love in current anti-Trumpism struggles.

II. EXIGENCE, KING’S EARLY BATTLE, AND THE BELOVED COMMUNITY

I open this discussion by noting why this study of King is important and timely. The discussion then focuses on how King confronted what I call the “roots of Trumpism” and their inherent racial subordination, beginning in 1955 in Montgomery with his leadership of the American Civil Rights Movement and the emergence of his vision of the Beloved Community.

---

9 See id. at 172 (clarifying part of the historical narrative of the Black International Tradition).
10 See infra Part II.
11 King’s award of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964 and his great 1967 Riverside Church speech against the Vietnam War confirmed that his Beloved Community was projected as a goal of both domestic and global governance, and also that King’s great public documents, such as “Letter from a Birmingham Jail,” must be revisited for their global interpretations. See infra Part III.
12 See infra Part IV.
13 See infra Part IV (exploring race and Euro-Trumpism, including the continuation in different words of the White Atlantic ideology in white identity politics by Trumpists, as they represent a yearning for a return to European Empire regarding immigrants and European communities of color).
14 See infra Part V.
15 During the early Movement, King was also acting and speaking from his Pan-Africanist and anti-colonial perspectives, especially after 1957. Prominent during this period were
A. The Importance and Timeliness of this Inquiry

Martin Luther King’s anti-colonial and Pan-Africanist perspectives arose early on in his ministry. They arose out of King’s study in seminary of Mohandas Gandhi, his principles and leadership through a commitment to nonviolence, first in South Africa in the early twentieth century as a committed young lawyer against white racism, and then in India as the key nonviolent leader of its successful struggle for independence from the British Empire in 1948. King likely imbibed the beginnings of these perspectives while studying at Morehouse College under Dr. Benjamin Mays, a key mentor and its legendary president. Several years earlier, Mays had traveled with three other civil rights leaders to consult with, and be encouraged by, Gandhi in India on building the emerging American Civil Rights Movement around nonviolence. Further, Jeremy Levitt has noted, even before King’s invitation to Accra for the 1957 Ghanaian Independence celebrations of sovereign liberation from British Empire colonialism, in several sermons King had expressed pan-African, anti-colonial perspectives, and had placed the American Civil Rights Movement in the context of the global struggle against white racism and European colonialism.

King’s participation and reflections in Ghana moved him to tears and drew him even more to parallels regarding race, rights, and struggle between the American Movement and the global anti-colonial movement, which parallels he referred to in Ghana in a passing greeting to Vice President Nixon who was officially representing the United States. King’s Ghanaian visit, which extended to Britain, was also an early contribution to building King’s global influence, even at a relatively young age. In this connection, as early as 1957, when to do so in the United

---

17 Id. at 170–71.
19 See Richardson, Global Authority, supra note 16, at 173.
21 See Richardson, Global Authority, supra note 16, at 170–71 (describing King’s emotional reaction to the Ghanaian independence celebration and his encounter with Vice President Nixon).
22 Id. at 171.
States was considered too sensitive—including for the Black middle class, except by dedicated Pan-Africanists—King began to publicly denounce South African apartheid as the worst form of racism, to some federal government discomfort.23 This brought him to the attention of South African anti-apartheid movement leaders, who came to revere his work and further enhanced his global influence.24

Thus, even while thrust into the spotlight by the Montgomery Bus Boycott in 1955 to begin his American Movement leadership, King was confronting the racial dominance of European empires and the global tentacles of South African apartheid.25 Simultaneously facing down southern U.S. apartheid and conservatives violently against Black civil rights, King was confronting in America the European-originated ideology of the White Atlantic—an ideology born from reverence for South African apartheid as an organizing principle for white, European-dominated, global civilization.26 This movement was then crossing the Atlantic through scholars, conferences, and the exchanges of ideas on racial subordination aimed—with visible success—at influential, white American conservatives.

Here lies the importance of asking how Martin Luther King, his governance vision of the Beloved Community, and his global authority confronted the policy inheritances of European empire and the racial doctrines inherent in European Trumpism.27 In this inheritance and recent history, there have arisen resentful, threatening appeals and implementing strategies for white populist, identity politics to demand such governmental ownership in pluralistic European states. This history mirrors the white backlash electoral shift in the United States, with alt-right, neo-Nazi, neo-fascist, anti-immigrant, and anti-pluralist party attempts to capture national governments with goals of a white-dominated return to the global control of colonial Empire, regarding immigrants and people of color.

We are now at a critical moment of strident value choices and tests of public accountability in the American community. There is a bitter

---

23 See id. at 172–77 (noting King’s public denouncement for South African apartheid).
24 See id. at 172.
25 See id. at 172–75 (elaborating on the intersection between international movements).
national division of basic public values and criteria for knowledge as basic as, for instance, “facts,” “science,” and “news.”28 There is the threatened breakdown of the social contract, between elders and active younger citizens, between those enjoying the means to good health and those needing that enjoyment. Class issues of obscene income disparity versus the protection of the economic rights of vulnerable people illuminate a threatened but resistant rollback of sexual equality and gender rights and officially invite the return of several large narratives of public, open racism against African Americans, Muslims, Latinos, other people of color, and Jews.29 All of the above are justified in the names of national security, America First, white nostalgic cultural dominance, and political advantage to Trumpist and party conservatism.30 Thus, it is now imperative for people who would protect the critical progress of Enlightenment thinking to preserve and act on the humanistic and justice narratives in public discourse, nationally and globally. This includes bringing the vision and principles of Martin Luther King and the Beloved Community to become, once again, anchors of the American conversation about the best that this country must be.

Notwithstanding hopeful examples of process and resistance in current resistance movements, no answers have emerged from governments or citizens’ groups to the cycles of local and global violence, nor to the question of how to ensure the primacy of public justice over injustice.31 No such answers are to be found in the major political parties, with their leadership intent on political survival and convenient deal-making to dilute or abrogate basic rights and sacred dignity issues.

particularly regarding people of color and other vulnerable people.\textsuperscript{32}

There is a national bankruptcy widely spread among American officials about the normality of sacrificing basic justice. King’s prescience in repeatedly warning about this emptiness, and creating pathways of humanistic love to fill the void, including through his Beloved Community, was an integral lesson of his ministry and now of his global authority.\textsuperscript{33}

Now, in 2018, it is imperative for us to recall the necessity of a public community based on love as the foundation of a saving humanism. And for King, Christian humanism extended to all people, including enemies.\textsuperscript{34}

King saw this not only as a path of righteousness leading to justice but also as the only route to ultimate human survival—by breaking the cycle of personal and militaristic violence that perpetuates violent retaliation.\textsuperscript{35}

A new moral direction, as originally taught by King in light of contemporary American exclusions and divisions, is as “new” today as it was in 1955, even as today’s national exclusions and permissive public prejudices are reminiscent of 1955.\textsuperscript{36}

In sum, the intersections between the Beloved Community and the forces of value rejection, white domination, abuse of community, and constitutional values mandate at this time that we revisit the profound option of love for the human and global community represented by King’s life, ministry, and global authority. The necessity of the public consideration of this option, including marshalling the best of our resources to fight and prevail through the current fog of claims and counterclaims of “fake news,” “realism,” and “utopia,” frames the immediate importance of this discussion.


\textsuperscript{35} Id.

B. King, the American Civil Rights Movement, and the Roots of Trumpism

I will not cover the history of King’s American Civil Rights Movement leadership that has been covered many times elsewhere. But I will discuss how King during that period was forced to battle against what I will call “the roots of Trumpism.” These “roots” refer to the inherent racism embedded in Trumpism as it coalesced over a half-century later around Trump’s presidential candidacy and election in 2016. Other elements have also contributed to Trumpism’s emergence, but my focus here—relative to both American and European Trumpism—is their commonality of racial exclusion of African-heritage and “othered” people of color.

In part, such racial exclusion rests on the Trumpists’ stringent opposition in ideology and strategy to pluralism and pluralistic governance, as Jan Werner Mueller has recently argued, in favor of white populism, identity politics through electoral and coercive fear-mongering toward attempts to control the state. But in America, the history of state-organized racism against African-Americans, as we know, extends back to the origins of slavery, through the Constitutional Convention, the Constitution, the sinister historical energy of American federalism, the Civil War, Reconstruction, the white legitimation of the Ku Klux Klan (then and now), the lynching of Blacks, the rise of Southern state apartheid segregation, and the pathological white governmental struggle to maintain that system by ideology and terror—and all of this state-organized racism was confronted by a rising local and national Civil Rights Movement built on three centuries of rights’ struggles. This is only a bare sketch of American state-controlled racism, but it clearly suggests that the racism integral to Trumpism could only have its roots buried deep in the history and continuation of American racism. Martin Luther King Jr.’s American ministry was defined by his non-violent leadership of the Civil Rights Movement.

See, e.g., Taylor Branch, The King Years: Historic Moments in the Civil Rights Movement (2013).

---


39 See The King Philosophy, supra note 34. See also Taylor Branch, The King Years: Historic Moments in the Civil Rights Movement (2013); John Hope Franklin, From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans (8th ed. 1967).
contemporary roots of Trumpism, including from Montgomery through Washington, Selma, Lowndes County, and tragically to Memphis.41

We can illustrate this conjunction by briefly looking at King’s numerous battles with George Wallace, arch-segregationist Governor of Alabama.42 In his 1963 inaugural address, Wallace pledged, “Segregation now! Segregation tomorrow! Segregation forever!”43 This was written by his speechwriter, a member of the Ku Klux Klan.44 In response to Wallace’s inaugural address, which was delivered from the exact place where Jefferson Davis was sworn in as president of the Confederacy, King gave a series of speeches in 1963 in sixteen different cities on the need to take action against the injustices of segregation.45 In June 1963, Wallace met a campaign promise to stand in the door to bar Black students James Hood and Vivian Malone from entering the University of Alabama, yielding when President Kennedy federalized the Alabama National Guard and ordered their entrance.46

Three months later, violence erupted and four young girls were killed in the bombing of the 16th St. Baptist Church in Birmingham.47 King believed Wallace’s actions contributed to their deaths and so wrote President Kennedy in September 1963.48 He accused Wallace of a reign of terror in defying federal orders and stated the imminence of a race riot without Presidential action.49 Similar violent confrontations on voting

---


47 See Martin Luther King, Jr., September 15, 1963 Telegram, JOHN F. KENNEDY PRESIDENTIAL LIBR. & MUSEUM, http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/-crU2bLgN0CcGkys8dkuHg.aspx [https://perma.cc/7UEM-VQKC].

48 Id.

49 Id.
rights perpetuated by Alabama authorities occurred in other cities, including Selma.\textsuperscript{50}

In 1963, King gave his “I Have a Dream” speech in Washington.\textsuperscript{51} The only person identified in that speech, though not by name, was George Wallace:

\begin{quote}
I have a dream that one day down in Alabama, with its vicious racists, with its governor having his lips dripping with the words of “interposition” and “nullification,” one day right there in Alabama little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls as sisters and brothers.\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

King reinforced the message in a 1965 speech in front of the Alabama State Capitol, declaring, “[S]egregation is on its deathbed in Alabama, and the only thing uncertain about it is how costly the segregationists and Wallace will make the funeral.”\textsuperscript{53}

Thus, King’s leadership in directly confronting Wallace and state racism in Alabama saw some of the fiercest violent opposition to the Civil Rights Movement.\textsuperscript{54} He confronted the “roots of Trumpism” here as he did in many other venues.\textsuperscript{55}

Let us continue briefly with Wallace as a precursor of Trumpism. As reported, in 1964, Wallace was a candidate in several Democratic presidential primaries, scoring surprising vote totals in states like


\textsuperscript{52} Id.


Maryland and Wisconsin. In 1968, he ran on his own American Independent Party ticket, winning 13% of the total votes and vilifying blacks, students, and people calling for an end to the Vietnam War. He carried five southern states and won forty-six electoral votes with 9.9 million popular votes—the highest popular vote of any third party candidate in American history. Worthington notes, “His old campaign slogan ‘Stand Up For Alabama’ was revised to ‘Stand Up For America.’”

Wallace’s candidacy was taken seriously by many audiences, notwithstanding his generally being seen as a bigot and a “politician who sought the Presidency by questionable means.” His accusations frequently targeted “pointy-headed intellectuals, government pussy-footing, and sissy britches welfare people.” As Marianne Worthington noted in analyzing his rhetoric, voters formed around Wallace “a counter-movement known as the ‘white backlash.’” He took up the cause of common white citizens who had been estranged from their government, centering mainly around segregation; law and order; patriotism; cleaning out Washington; federal interference in local schools, including busing and racial balance; the liberal Supreme Court; federal restrictions over the sale of private homes; states’ rights; and heavy federal taxation. His target audiences were primarily white, middle- or low-income citizens, especially regarding his call for “law and order,” using common language and often absurd proof and reasoning, and blatant denials, but becoming increasingly nuanced in his own racism by invoking constitutional freedoms. He ran a similar campaign in 1972, which effectively ended when an attempted assassination confined him to a wheelchair. But he won primaries in North Carolina, Michigan, Maryland, Florida, and Tennessee, thus confirming him as a national candidate.

Today, more than one commentator sees Wallace as having written the political playbook on racial exclusion and fear for the “Southern

---

57 Id.
58 Id.
59 Worthington, supra note 43.
60 Id.
61 Id. (quotations omitted).
62 Id.
63 Id.
64 Id.
65 Pearson, supra note 56.
66 Id.
strategy” of Nixon, Reagan, and Bush, and the wider strategy for Trump.

Fear, racial code words, anti-establishment mixes of “economic protectionism and blunt nativism,” violence at campaign rallies approved by the candidate, overwhelming white support, and appeals to a silent majority were all featured. The manager of Wallace’s 1968 campaign, now a civil rights activist, has assigned the same motivation to Trump and Wallace: fear. Dan Carter agrees in his book The Politics of Rage, drawing analogies between treatment of Mexicans now and of Blacks then. Trump is clearly the heir of Wallace.

In battling against Wallace and his roots of contemporary and historical racism, we now can confirm that King was simultaneously battling, fiercely, the “roots of Trumpism” with its embedded racism in its manifold forms from the Wallace playbook.

C. King and the Beloved Community

The term “Beloved Community” was first used in the early twentieth century by the philosopher-theologian Josiah Royce, who founded the Fellowship of Reconciliation, of which King was also a member. King adopted the term as a framework for projecting into a future of organized justice much of his philosophy and constitutive strategies of nonviolence and governance based on social action through agape love.

In 1967, King pronounced that “[t]he Triple Evils of poverty, racism[,] and militarism are forms of violence that exist in a vicious cycle. They are interrelated, all-inclusive, and stand as barriers to our living in the Beloved Community.” King’s “Six Principles of Non-Violence” included the message “[t]he purpose of non-violence is the creation of the Beloved Community.” From these Six Principles and King’s civil rights campaigns are derived “Six Steps for Non-Violent Social Change,” conceived of as cycles of a campaign, of which the last step is that of

68 Id.
69 Id.
70 See id. (citing Dan Carter’s book and discussing how Donald Trump uses Wallace’s tactics to garner the white, working-class vote, although Trump targets Mexicans as opposed to African-Americans).
71 Compare Pearson, supra note 56 and accompanying text (explaining that Wallace’s racist campaign was surprisingly successful), with Barrow, supra note 67 (indicating agreement on the similarities between the campaigns of Trump and Wallace).
72 See The King Philosophy, supra note 34.
73 Id.
74 Id. (emphasis omitted).
75 Id.
reconciliation: each act of reconciliation is one step closer to the Beloved Community.\footnote{Id.} As early as 1956, King spoke in Montgomery of the Beloved Community as the end goal of nonviolent boycotts: “the end is reconciliation; the end is redemption; the end is the creation of the Beloved Community.”\footnote{Id.}

King’s vision of the Beloved Community stems not only from Royce but also from his own Christian faith and his Pan-Africanism, as well as from the existential struggles of the Civil Rights Movement in nonviolent opposition to embedded racism.\footnote{See Richardson, Global Authority, supra note 16, at 174.} His Pan-Africanist ideals arose concurrently with this vision. Early on, he saw the Black struggle for rights in America as part of the same global struggle of African peoples against racism, apartheid, colonialism, and other oppression, even prior to his 1957 trip to Ghana at the invitation of its first president, Kwame Nkrumah, for its independence celebration.\footnote{See id. at 170.}

For King, the Beloved Community was “a realistic achievable goal that could be attained by a critical mass of people committed to and trained in the philosophy and methods of nonviolence.”\footnote{The King Philosophy, supra note 34.} It is:

a global vision, in which all people can share in the wealth of the earth. In the Beloved Community, poverty, hunger and homelessness will not be tolerated because international standards of human decency will not allow it. Racism and all forms of discrimination, bigotry and prejudice will be replaced by an all-inclusive spirit of sisterhood and brotherhood.\footnote{Id.}

As Vincent Harding writes, the Community will provide space for everyone to seek out the best in themselves and make that possible for each other, beyond “merely a tolerant integrated society.”\footnote{See Vincent Harding, Is America Possible?, ONBEING.ORG (Nov. 7, 2016), https://onbeing.org/blog/is-america-possible/ [https://perma.cc/L5SW-2VQ8] (arguing that King’s Beloved Community is about making people better). See also Vincent Harding, Is America Possible?, ONBEING.ORG (Nov. 10, 2016), https://onbeing.org/programs/vincent-harding-is-america-possible/ [https://perma.cc/H3Q2-YRC7].} It will foster regenerative love toward our best human and communal development,
beyond achieving equality and minority rights. This regeneration arrives only if we are willing to work hard with each other and work with the universe to develop it, driven by the dreams of poetry, speech, and songs to meet each decade.

King’s Beloved Community and his Pan-Africanism were grounded on opposition to what he called the “Triple Evils of Poverty, Racism, and Militarism.” Jeremy Levitt has perceptively noted that the notion of the Beloved Community appears to universalize and cross-fertilize what he denotes as King’s “Beloved Pan-Africanism” with “experiential insights from the Montgomery Bus Boycott” and King’s profound trip to Ghana soon after.

Finally there is little doubt that King’s commitment to Pan-Africanism and the Beloved Community helped shape his emerging global human rights ministry, as indicated by the 1957 letter of appreciation to King from Oliver Tambo, the President of the African National Congress, for his early public opposition to South African apartheid. As Levitt notes, King’s Pan-Africanism preceded by a decade King’s huge recognition as a global human rights leader in his 1964 award of the Nobel Peace Prize.

As the King Philosophy holds, “In the Beloved Community, international disputes will be resolved by peaceful conflict-resolution and reconciliation of adversaries, instead of military power. Love and trust will triumph over fear and hatred. Peace with justice will prevail over war and military conflict.” King “recognized that conflict was an inevitable part of human experience. But he believed that conflicts could be resolved peacefully and adversaries could be reconciled through a mutual, determined commitment to nonviolence.” King believed that no conflict need erupt in violence. He also believed that “all conflicts in The Beloved Community should end with reconciliation of adversaries cooperating together in a spirit of friendship and goodwill.”

---

83 See Vincent Harding, Is America Possible?, ONBEING.ORG (Nov. 7, 2016), https://onbeing.org/blog/is-america-possible/ [https://perma.cc/L5SW-2VQ8] (emphasizing that through dreams and hope “the path to our best personal humanity” is shown).
84 See id. (discussing how powerful King’s vision could be if embodied by society).
85 See The King Philosophy, supra note 34.
86 Levitt, supra note 20, at 313.
87 See id. at 303 (discussing how Oliver Tambo requested King’s support in fighting South African Apartheid).
88 Id. at 305.
89 The King Philosophy, supra note 34.
90 Id.
91 Id.
92 Id.
I do not think of political power as an end. Neither do I think of economic power as an end. They are ingredients in the objective that we seek in life. And I think the end of that objective is a truly brotherly society, the creation of the Beloved Community.93

One expression of agape love as the cornerstone of the Beloved Community “is justice, not for any one oppressed group, but for all people” as their birthright.94 “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.”95 In his reported 1959 Sermon on Gandhi, King spoke to the after effects of choosing nonviolence over violence: “[t]he aftermath of nonviolence is the creation of the Beloved Community, so that when the battle’s over, a new relationship comes into being between the oppressed and the oppressor.”96 And he contrasted violent versus nonviolent resistance to oppression: “[t]he way of acquiescence leads to moral and spiritual suicide. The way of violence leads to bitterness in the survivors and brutality in the destroyers. But, the way of non-violence leads to redemption and the creation of the beloved community.”97

It must be understood that King—who was knowledgeable in world affairs—never saw his Beloved Community as a utopian construct, designed only for abstract futurists destined only to dream of a different human condition.98 Rather, for him, the Beloved Community encompassed a basic political construct—a constitutive process—based on love that King intended would supplant the premises of contemporary materialist politics, which aim to support continuing office holders by any means possible.99

King’s construct is to be equally germane to international power politics in the equation between states and the continuation of Empire and its processions of realpolitik-invoked threats, wars, conquest, and subordination of peoples. As we will see shortly, its relevance has been judicially so assessed.100 It could support new narratives of global governance. King urged the Beloved Community upon the world community as a political necessity because he saw that agape love was the only alternative to the contemporary politics of racism, materialism, and militarism that did not contain the seeds of endless replication of these

93 Id.
94 Id.
95 Id.
96 Id.
97 Id.
98 Id.
99 See id. (showing that the Beloved Community was a realistic goal for King).
100 See infra Part III.D (highlighting international court cases about human rights).
“Three Evils” and the destructive status quo of injustice.\textsuperscript{101} If humans are ultimately to survive, the basis of human organization must be love and nonviolence.\textsuperscript{102}

Thus, the Beloved Community asks whether nonviolent governance is possible based on love.\textsuperscript{103} It further asks through what processes can nonviolent governance succeed contemporary governance based ultimately on violence, especially race-based violence, dominance, and exclusion.\textsuperscript{104} The Beloved Community prescribes conflict-resolution through committed approaches based on love and faith in nonviolence by its adherents.\textsuperscript{105} These include principled, nonviolent confrontations with initially intractable opponents, including use of economic sanctions, and the imperative to separate acts of injustice from the love flowing to the persons committing such acts.\textsuperscript{106}

And so, as we will see, with King’s global ministry reaching deep into Europe, the Beloved Community will confront European Trumpism, not only to eliminate its racism and anti-humanist doctrines nor to be confined as a utopian out-of-reach model, but with its aim to supplant it and other pertinent aspects of European politics with new, inclusive politics of love. States and peoples would be evolving to govern themselves under principles of the highest nonviolent inclusion and justice for all residents and peoples incoming to the continent.

III. KING’S GLOBAL MINISTRY COMBATTING DOCTRINES OF THE WHITE ATLANTIC

Let us now carry King and the Beloved Community even deeper into the international community, with King having to confront the Empire-driven ideology of a White Atlantic, which was designed in the name of “civilization” to globally subordinate post-colonial peoples of color.\textsuperscript{107} This ideology emerged as a foundation stone of European Trumpism. Further, contemporaneously with the Civil Rights Movement, White Atlantic doctrine traveled in deliberate and organized narratives across the Atlantic to America to inspire many influential white conservatives, such as William Buckley, to oppose equal rights for Black people based on

\textsuperscript{101} See \textit{The King Philosophy}, supra note 34 (stressing the importance of nonviolence and love in overcoming hatred).
\textsuperscript{102} Id.
\textsuperscript{103} Id.
\textsuperscript{104} Id.
\textsuperscript{105} See id. (offering King’s principles of nonviolence).
\textsuperscript{106} See id. (endorsing the idea that loving the aggressor avoids creating violence and contempt).
\textsuperscript{107} See Slobodian, supra note 26, at 68 (examining the White Atlantic doctrine’s influence over white conservatives).
doctrinal arguments consistent with notions of white-dominated civilization. Blacks did not and could not deserve equal rights. In his necessity for the Movement to confront white conservative opponents of equal rights, King was simultaneously confronting the destructive American narratives of the White Atlantic.

A. Doctrines of the White Atlantic

In discussing the aggression of the White Atlantic ideology, I follow the excellent work and pertinent interpretations of Professor Quinn Slobodian, writing on “The World Economy and the Color Line: Wilhelm Röpke, Apartheid, and the White Atlantic.” Röpke was an economist revered as an intellectual father of the West German social market economy and a key figure in defining neoliberalism as an international movement from the 1930s onward. In 1964, in what he called an “attempt at a positive appraisal” of South Africa, even as the country’s racist policies were being attacked by the expanding African and Asian membership in the United Nations, Röpke wrote, “[T]he South African Negro is not only a man of an utterly different race but, at the same time, stems from a completely different type and level of civilization.” He praised “the extraordinary qualities of its white population . . . [who] possess a pioneering spirit that can be compared only with that found in the United States.” The policy of apartheid was not oppressive, instead it was “the specific form in which South Africa pursues the policy of ‘decolonializing’ and ‘development aid’ which corresponds to this country’s needs.” And “[t]o prevent it from turning into ‘another Congo or Indonesia,’ [Röpke] called for the maintenance of ‘a Zambezi line’ in Africa ‘to divide the black-controlled northern part of the continent from the white-controlled south.’” In other words, “[f]or reasons of racial superiority, economics, and Realpolitik, [Röpke] believed that white supremacy had to persist in South Africa.”

As Slobodian significantly notes, “Röpke found his primary allies on the apartheid question not in his European milieu but in the U.S. New Right, a community that was frequently willing to defend the principle of
He developed “ever closer contact with this group,” including Stanford economist Karl Brandt and National Review publisher William Buckley, until his death in 1966. Slobodian notes that “the questions of race and empire that the case of Röpke and South Africa raises remain largely unanswered” in histories of the rise of a “Neoliberal International.” Röpke emerged as a leader in a “proposed reconstruction of a lost liberal international economic order,” as U.S. conservatives greatly feared what they saw as “the expansion of New Deal policies outward to the decolonizing world.” And he “was an active advocate of an alternative Atlanticism, linking like-minded individuals across the North Atlantic in Central Europe and the U.S., as well as across the South Atlantic in Latin America and South Africa.” He “helped form a front against the policies of the formal Atlantic Community and the doctrines of social democracy and developmentalism . . . .”

Slobodian rightly argues that “[t]his Atlantic was ‘white’ because of its assumptions of cultural superiority in societies that maintained varying levels of colonialism and segregation, and because it often drew on racialized notions of a common ‘Anglo-American’ or ‘Judeo-Christian’ heritage.” The rise of the United Nations and the decolonization movement saw ideologies of pluralism gradually displace biological racism, like those expressed by Röpke in 1964. Race and racism were subordinated (in theory) in the Atlantic Community to gestures of European statesmen courting postcolonial leaders and addressing racial injustice at home.

As Slobodian pertinently notes regarding American conservatives, “[a]t a time when the budding civil rights movement,” of which Martin Luther King was the primary leader, “was challenging the racial hierarchy in the U.S., the conservative attack on the ‘New Deal for the world’ was . . . a means of holding the line against what one of Röpke and Buckley’s collaborators called ‘the unholy combination of the African Negro question with U.S. Negroes.’” In other words, they feared King’s and others’ Pan-Africanist underpinnings of the U.S. Civil Rights Movement. If, said the same conservatives, “the demands of [the] non-
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white populations were becoming harder to suppress at home, perhaps they could at least be curbed in the larger world before bringing about what Röpke called the ‘suicide’ of ‘the free world.’”\footnote{Id.} This would result in “a world government where ‘non-Europeans would hold an overwhelming majority.’”\footnote{Id.}

Here, Slobodian presciently observes that “[l]ooking at the transatlantic alliances of German-speaking neoliberalism and conservatism makes it clear that world economic issues at the middle of the twentieth century were always also about race.”\footnote{Id.} And that in the 1950s, “Röpke became a steady source of information for the emerging U.S. conservative movement on issues of European integration, postwar reconstruction, and international economics,” including through the influential trans-Atlantic Mont Pelerin Society.”\footnote{Id.}

As Slobodian perceptively notes, “[t]he quandary Röpke faced in the 1950s was that shared by many other conservatives and indeed, centrists, as well: how could empire be ended without losing control of the non-white world?”\footnote{Id.} Röpke wrote that the “free world” could not be “expected to commit suicide.”\footnote{Id.} He proposed a form of global federalism that would give nations “formal political sovereignty but a diminished economic autonomy,” whereby mass popular expectations “would be regulated by the free flow of capital and investment over borders.”\footnote{Id.} Such a proposal calls up many elements of the current global North-South economy, as well as classic British imperial policy. Röpke asserted:

“[T]he spiritual and political integration of Europe . . . only makes sense as part and parcel of a higher combination and organization of the resistance potential of the entire western world on both sides of the Atlantic.” A morally strengthened Fortress Occident would arise as a necessary defense against the emboldened populations of the non-West, unanchored as they were from a genuine sense of community.\footnote{Id.}

Röpke’s concerns were accelerated by his perception that the U.S., as leader of the free world, was doing all it could to further the disintegration
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of world order, beginning with the New Deal, as it empowered working populations. Roosevelt had “let the genie of what Röpke called ‘equalitarianism’ out of the bottle to win the war, and it would be difficult to put back in.” Kennedy’s New Frontier came in for similar treatment, as literally a global New Deal. As Röpke articulated, “[T]he right to equality encapsulated in the ethos of the welfare state was as unworkable and unwise on the global scale as it was on the national. Inequality was to be understood as an unavoidable characteristic of capitalist society.”

Röpke was an economic adviser to Senator Barry Goldwater in his 1964 Presidential bid, a symbol of his influence in national Republican policymaking circles. That same year the Mont Pelerin Society met in the U.S. for the first time at Princeton. He subsequently continued his influential leadership among U.S. conservatives until his death.

As Slobodian discusses, “[T]he intersection of questions of race and economic order were at the forefront of Röpke’s concerns in this period as well.” He became one of the most vocal apologists for apartheid “and revealed, in the process, the cultural and economic geographies he shared with much of the New Right,” to whom he turned for allies, not least William Buckley’s National Review. There, Buckley in a 1957 editorial—two years following the start of the Montgomery Bus Boycott led by King—opposed desegregation because “whites were ‘the advanced race’ and that science proved ‘the median cultural superiority of White over Negro.’” Here Slobodian notes that historians rarely realize that Buckley’s editorial “is couched in a defense of European colonialism in Africa,” which he cited as an example to the American South on the importance of “civilized standards” superseding democracy anywhere in the world. As the South must prevail, “whites had to prevail in the global South.”

As Slobodian continues, “Röpke’s name continued to add European intellectual luster to the political campaigns of apartheid” and apologists of anti-civil rights after his death. For example, Republican

Slobodian further importantly observes, “[w]hat states’ rights were to desegregation in the U.S. South, economic stability was to decolonization and racial equality in the global South. In both cases, they were arguments conservative intellectuals could use to address white racial anxieties without using racist language as such.” Slobodian notes that more common for Röpke “was his translation of race into economics.” He “distilled the question of membership in ‘the West’ down to the quantifiable figure of how much interest the nation would have to pay to borrow money. The most pertinent criterion was not cultural, ideological, or geographic, but lay in investor confidence.” By “sanction[ing] industrialization projects in the postcolonial world through low-interest loans and state-to-state financing, [the United Nations] tampered with the pure operations of the market” and therefore was destroying the international order.

In Slobodian’s words, “This economic definition of the free world—the translation of ‘the West’ into a financial category—underwrote Röpke’s public treatment of South Africa.” And a deeply racialized worldview informed the philosophy of society and economy of Röpke and his disciples. As Slobodian discusses, they:

always viewed opposition to the global New Deal and the attack on the Bretton Woods system through the lens of a potentially global race war. For Röpke, the financial translation of the West into a question of interest rates was underwritten by a defiant adherence to racial particularism and an opposition to racial equality.

I have spent some time discussing the foregoing issues because their narratives of White Atlantic ideology defined critical elements of Martin Luther King’s American battlefield, especially to shape new national equality norms. As such, these issues display transnational systematic philosophy and doctrine of the normative correctness of persistently
subordinating people of color, as a constitutive requirement of intersecting national and global lawmakering and governance, which purports to lead to a desirable capitalist future. This and similar ideologies are available for global synergies to deploy against the welfare, rights, and influence of peoples of color globally. The White Atlantic and its actual and potential dominance synergies pose a threat to the human rights of people of color that is directly reminiscent — differing only in their greater combined resources and strategies of nuanced and crude subordination — of the continuing Ku Klux Klan, founded during American Reconstruction to terrorize and govern black people back into slavery under whites from whom they had been so recently liberated.155 Such a threat emphasizes the importance of expanding the scope of the Black International Tradition to organize global resources and norms to surpass White Atlantic-type transnational racist coordination.

Here, relative to the White Atlantic, the roots of American Trumpism came out to meet the constitutive transatlantic underpinnings of European Trumpism in America. The Beloved Community came face to face with Empire and colonialism in several guises in the United States, even as its influence and King himself were making their way to Europe to await the subsequent formal declarations of European Trumpism.

B. King and Europe

In 1934, Rev. Michael King—a notable young Black pastor of Ebeneezer Baptist Church in Atlanta and the father of Michael King Jr. — travelled to the Holy Land and Europe, including to Berlin for the Fifth Baptist World Alliance Congress, with ten other Baptist ministers.156 The Nazis had come to power, but a church commission on “Racialism” firmly denounced anti-Semitism and exclusion based on color.157 This was in the face of Nazi propaganda that the Alliance welcomed the delegation of black Baptists and their churches.158

Rev. King, inspired by the journey and by Reformationist Martin Luther, resolved to change his name and his son’s name upon returning to Atlanta.159 It was a gradual process from “Mike” and “M.L.,” and Michael King Jr.’s birth certificate did not read “Martin Luther King Jr.”
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until July of 1957.\textsuperscript{160} Thus, his father’s journey created this European connection that became part of King’s birthright. This would subsequently be confirmed by European commemorations of King in Lutheran church celebrations of Martin Luther.\textsuperscript{161}

In 1961, Willy Brandt, the progressive mayor of Cold War Berlin, visited the U.S., met with King and invited him to Berlin.\textsuperscript{162} Also during this period, Provost Heinrich Gruber, the former pastor at East Berlin’s St. Mary’s Church, began a U.S. tour sponsored by U.S. churches.\textsuperscript{163} He became familiar with the civil rights struggle, which he perceived as similar to his resistance of fascism, began a correspondence with King, and in 1963 invited him to Berlin.\textsuperscript{164} On September 12, 1964, at Willy Brandt’s invitation, King arrived in West Berlin to speak at a commemoration of President John F. Kennedy who had also visited West Germany the year before.\textsuperscript{165} The day after his arrival, a young East Berliner was shot by border guards trying to escape over the three-year-old Berlin Wall, only to be pulled to safety by an American soldier.\textsuperscript{166} King heard of the incident and hurried to witness the rescue scene.\textsuperscript{167} In September 2010, to commemorate King’s visit, a memorial plaque was placed at the site.\textsuperscript{168}

Later on September 13, 1964, following the Kennedy ceremony, King addressed an audience of over 20,000 in an amphitheater.\textsuperscript{169} Following the speech, King insisted on visiting East Berlin—despite the efforts of the U.S. government.\textsuperscript{170} The government confiscated King’s passport and detained his interpreter.\textsuperscript{171} Nevertheless, King arrived at his checkpoint and presented his American Express card as identification, which was accepted.\textsuperscript{172} Then, they drove a short distance to historic St. Mary’s Church in East Berlin, where King preached to an overflow crowd.\textsuperscript{173}
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But this audience, who had only heard of King’s arrival by word of mouth, had a dramatically different reaction to his call for freedom and civil disobedience.\(^\text{174}\) His appearance served as major support for the East Berlin clergy, including the pastor of St. Mary’s who opposed, and in some cases had been imprisoned by, the GDR regime.\(^\text{175}\) After being mobbed by autograph seekers, King spoke with black students attending East Berlin’s Humboldt University nearby.\(^\text{176}\) Then, because of the overflow audience at St. Mary’s, a second King appearance was arranged at another nearby church, where King gave essentially the same sermon to another overflow crowd.\(^\text{177}\)

In the evening, East German clergyman Gerhard Schmitt invited King to a Lutheran hospice, where King met with other clergymen and signed the guestbook.\(^\text{178}\) A memorial plaque to King would be installed on the building in May 2010.\(^\text{179}\) Around midnight King, exhausted, returned to West Berlin.\(^\text{180}\) No mention of his epic visit to East Berlin appeared in East German media.\(^\text{181}\) The next day King flew from West Berlin to Munich and eventually had a private audience with the pope before returning to Atlanta.\(^\text{182}\) In December, he would receive his Nobel Peace Prize.\(^\text{183}\)

In his sermon, *East or West – God’s Children*, King brought to Cold War Berlin the foundational principles of the Beloved Community and its vision of global authority.\(^\text{184}\) He conveyed the American struggle to eliminate segregation and achieve freedom based on Christian principles as part of one great fellowship of love throughout the whole world.\(^\text{185}\)

“Therefore, we struggle with non-violence and love as the basic elements of our struggle. I solicit your continuous support and backing as we continue to go on in our efforts to make brotherhood a reality all over that
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country and over the world.”

He confronted the concrete segregation of Berlin:

May I say that it is indeed an honor to be in this city, which stands as a symbol of the divisions of men on the face of the earth. For here on either side of the wall are God’s children, and no man-made barrier can obliterate that fact. . . . Regardless of the barriers of race, creed, ideology, or nationality, there is an inescapable destiny which binds us together.

. . .

With this faith, we will be able to transform the jangling discords of the nations into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. With this faith, we will be able to . . . struggle together, to suffer together, to stand up for freedom together, knowing that we will be free one day.

Professor Stefan Appelius, at the University of Oldenburg, Germany, has written that King’s visit produced additional effects over time, including resistance to communist rule beyond East Germany.

King’s “call to have courage, to resist peacefully . . . gave many people the strength to protest against the crushing of the ‘Prague Spring’—the uprising against Communist rule in Czechoslovakia—four years later.”

Let us recall that, since early in the Cold War, right-wing constituencies in the United States—including J. Edgar Hoover, then-Director of the FBI—accused civil rights groups and leaders of being infiltrated by communists. The threat of these accusations was seen as a grave risk by many civil rights leaders, particularly regarding international issues and black people. In 1948, this was a prime factor
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in the NAACP leadership expelling W.E.B. DuBois, one of its founders, from membership.\(^{192}\) King was similarly accused by Hoover and others of having communist advisers and even being a communist sympathizer.\(^{193}\)

But here we see King deliberately traveling to the very epicenter of the Cold War, squarely between the two superpowers, overcoming the attempted suppression by the U.S. government to prevent his preaching in East Germany about civil rights and freedom.\(^{194}\) We see him bringing forth the Beloved Community to demonstrate the ultimate insignificance of the concrete division of the Berlin Wall and its Cold War norms of militarism and suppression of rights on both sides when faced with the necessity of a global community of love founded on nonviolence.\(^{195}\) We see him quenching the thirst for his voice among Berliners—including in churches, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, beneath the Cold War architecture—and defining his ministry around the commitment to do so.\(^{196}\) Later, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev mentioned that Martin Luther King was a major influence in his decision to tear down the Berlin Wall.\(^{197}\) We see, finally, more confirmation in September 1964 of King’s substantial global authority in Europe and elsewhere.\(^{198}\) This was prior to his Nobel Peace Prize, to which I now turn.

C. The Nobel Peace Prize

Martin Luther King and his wife Coretta—herself an emerging civil rights icon—arrived in Oslo on December 8, 1964, so King could accept the Nobel Peace Prize and deliver his Acceptance Speech and formal Nobel Lecture at the University of Oslo.\(^{199}\) King was speaking to the entire
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world from one of its highest stages, and he was quite conscious of stepping into the opportunity. 200

In his speech, King questioned why the Nobel Prize was being awarded to a movement that remained unsuccessful and interpreted the Prize as being “a profound recognition that nonviolence is the answer to the crucial political and moral question of our time—the need for man to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to violence and oppression.” 201 He credited the people of India, “whom the Negroes of the United States followed, for demonstrating that ‘nonviolence is not sterile passivity, but a powerful moral force . . . for social transformation.’” 202 Grounding nonviolence in love, King asserted its necessity for all human conflict, and on the route from Montgomery to Oslo, it led “to a new sense of dignity for Negroes,” and he projected increasing alliance between Blacks and white men to overcome their common problems. 203 On this basis, he accepted the award “with an abiding faith in America and an audacious faith in the future of mankind.” 204

Next, King projected nonviolence into modern international relations as an answer greater than current power politics, even regarding nuclear weapons: “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.” 205

King then turned to international human rights, and particularly economic, social, and cultural rights, which at that time many Western academics and officials were rejecting on doctrinal and Cold War ideological grounds. 206 But here King was reflecting his emerging basic shift of normative direction regarding the Movement: “that constitutional and political rights to sit at lunch counters and vote were not sufficient for freedom without the economic resources to eat, secure an education, and build communities.” 207 And so King asserted: “I have the audacity to believe that peoples everywhere can have three meals a day for their bodies, education and culture for their minds, and dignity, equality and freedom for their spirits.” 208
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King closed his Speech by accepting the Nobel Peace Prize as a trustee, not solely for the American Civil Rights Movement, but indeed for the International Freedom Movement comprising the entire global struggle against racial oppression and colonialism, of which he saw the American Movement as an important part.\footnote{See id. (analyzing the way in which King accepted his Nobel Prize).}

King receiving the Nobel Prize as the recognized leader of the American Civil Rights Movement was significant. Since slavery, white American power has spent enormous energies, not least in the twentieth century, to confine the struggle for Black freedom to American law and American permissions about rights and to suppress Black folks from creating international claims and options to perfect their rights in the United States.\footnote{See id. (discussing the suppression of black freedom by white American power).} However, the Nobel Prize Committee pulled the American Civil Rights Movement into the international community by certifying its \textit{global authority} “as a world beacon to all peoples for non-violent rights struggle.”\footnote{Id.} Thus, the Committee directly refuted the attempted American suppression of the Black International Tradition.\footnote{Id.} King, as a modern leader of that Tradition, preached his awareness of this shift from one of the highest global platforms.\footnote{See id. (delineating King’s awareness of his global platform afforded by winning the Nobel Prize).} In doing so, King clarified and led the conjoining of the American civil rights narrative to the international human rights narrative.\footnote{Id. at 183.} He did that through his affirmation of Ghandian nonviolence philosophy to appraise the most encrusted assumptions about international power politics and national policies of war and violence.\footnote{Id.} By being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, King linked the international peace narrative into the conjoined rights narratives through his recognition and leadership.\footnote{Id.} King’s linkage here helped shape the future direction of his own ministry internationally and in America.

In his Nobel Lecture the following night, King began with a discussion of a human “poverty of the spirit which stands in glaring contrast to our scientific and technological abundance,” and our “allowing the means by which we live to outdistance the ends for which we live.”\footnote{Id.} Then King meditated on racial injustice, poverty, and war as three major problems
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“which grow out of man’s ethical infantilism.” He underscored the American Negro as part of a global Zeitgeist moving with urgency toward racial justice and returned to Gandhi for the necessity and achievability of nonviolence as the only path to resolve racial injustice, poverty, and war. King called for a world war against poverty because the poor majority and the rich minority are tied together in a “single garment of destiny.”

King called for the philosophy and strategy of nonviolence to become a subject for study and experimentation in every national and international field of conflict. He did not underestimate the problems of such conversions, including that of political will. But he asserted his faith that mankind would rise to the occasion, citing Arnold Toynbee that “love is going to have the last word,” even though those struggling for freedom will continue to be threatened by death and battered by persecution.

The award of the Nobel Peace Prize enabled King to gird the Beloved Community for international challenges to its basic precepts of love, justice, and nonviolence, including in Europe moving toward forthcoming declarations of Trumpism. As we saw for King in Berlin, the Prize reflected King’s prior global authority already flowing into Europe, notwithstanding the Cold War, and it created wide new expectations of global and European expansion of his authority. It induced King increasingly to redefine his ministry as global, both outside and within the American Movement, not least regarding his opposition to the Vietnam War. When coupled with many other European manifestations, memorials, influences, and recognitions of his contemporary and his posthumous authority, we see that King and the Beloved Community held a normative and recognized presence in Europe and thus awaited the forthcoming formal declarations of European Trumpism.

D. King and Human Rights in Europe

The power of King’s moral authority, including through principles of the Beloved Community, was such as to be reflected by citation and
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references in the laws of the communities of his ministry. This was the case in the U.S., as I have written elsewhere, and similarly in the European Union through the European Court of Human Rights. International human rights invocations were frequent during King’s ministry, even prior to his global reach becoming fully apparent. From 1957, when he invoked the rights of Ghanaians and other Africans to be free of colonialism, and when he began to invoke publicly the rights of Black South Africans to be free of apartheid and the duty of everyone to support the struggle, King publicly incorporated international human rights into his dream of freedom in the Beloved Community.

These invocations were grounded on King’s seminary studies of Ghandian nonviolence and his implicit claim of an international right of all people to the benefits of nonviolence, as nonviolence led to freedom of subordinated people from colonial oppression. King framed the early U.S. Civil Rights Movement in terms of the rights of Blacks and all Americans to political and civil rights vis-à-vis states and private persons. And after the Movement’s partial achievement of those aims through federal legislation, King’s commitment to fighting poverty became more apparent. He constructed a human rights frame to push the Movement toward economic justice for Blacks and poor people. He did so by invoking their economic, social, and cultural rights to a fulfilled life, as against actions of states and private persons. He was organizing a major Poor Peoples March against Poverty in 1968 when he died in Memphis while defending the economic rights of Black sanitation workers.

As seen above, his Nobel Peace Prize provided a global forum for King to harmonize civil rights, international human rights, and international peace narratives, and to insist that the American Civil Rights Movement incorporate these combined narratives. Moreover, King emphasized in his Nobel Acceptance Speech his interpretation of the
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international human rights narrative as clearly including economic justice through economic, social, and cultural rights for all people as a priority outcome of freedom.

King would, in his Riverside Church speech against the Vietnam War in 1967, define the wrongs of the United States heavily in terms of its violation of the rights of the Vietnamese people, especially the children, by its war against them. Human rights narratives infused much of King’s ministry. This was apparent as he invoked violation of those rights as a moral assessment of U.S. domestic and international policies, as well as of colonialism, apartheid, and oppression.

King’s global authority in Europe was reflected in several decisions of the European Court of Human Rights. Prominent issues were admissibility, freedom of expression, freedom of the press, and pacifism. The important case of Arrowsmith v. United Kingdom featured British criminal charges against Arrowsmith for distributing pacifist leaflets encouraging British soldiers to desert or refuse to obey orders if stationed in Northern Ireland. She was convicted but granted leave to appeal to the European Commission of Human Rights, alleging various violations under the European Convention of Human Rights, including British statutory discrimination against pacifists. The question went to the admissibility of Arrowsmith’s appeal to the European Court of Human Rights. A key issue was the definition of pacifism as protected speech.

The British government defined pacifism “as a belief based on thought and conscience” that potentially enjoyed Convention protection. The relevant pamphlet made no specific reference to pacifism but rather addressed political and military policy relative to Northern Ireland. Arrowsmith opposed Britain’s position, arguing for a more expansive definition of pacifism that aligned with the work of Mohandas Gandhi and Martin Luther King, namely an integrated notion of “moral philosophy and practical action,” from which could flow a connection, even an imperative, between morality and political action. In this connection, any claim that the British Army was engaged in peacekeeping activities in Northern Ireland was invalid and could be rebutted on the
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The Commission found the matter admissible and appropriate for a hearing on the merits. The decision on the merits did not include a reference to King.

Thus, on the question of whether to practice and act on nonviolent speech among military troops is encompassed by committed pacifism as defined in the Beloved Community, *Arrowsmith* raises an admissible issue against government claims of superior military command authority, as the Commission held in the affirmative. This illustrates King’s global authority as a resource for those pacifists using protected speech to oppose British military action in Northern Ireland, especially Gandhi and King’s lessons that the moral principles of nonviolence must be accompanied by strategic nonviolent action to lead to the Beloved Community. King’s global authority in Europe was prescriptive, through the human rights narrative, to define pacifism as protected speech in a military situation.

Two other instances of King’s global authority relative to clarifying standards of rights and justice can be noted. In the First Report on Hungary by the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (1997), its bibliography references “The Martin Luther King Organization”—a group “formed by Third World students . . . to help victims of racial attacks and lobby for greater racial understanding in post-Communist Hungary” as providing information for the Report. The Report was on the status of racial and ethnic relations in Hungary and considered issues related to the treatment of the Roma/Gypsy community, as well as the relatively new phenomenon of immigration to Hungary. Here, King’s name and legacy were appropriated by a group oriented toward increased racial and ethnic equality for these groups in Hungary.

The second instance arises out of a 2017 case in the European Court of Human Rights, *Güzelyurtlu v. Cyprus & Turkey*. The complex facts concern the kidnapping and murder of a family, all of whom were Cypriot
nationals of Turkish Cypriot origin, near the border of the Turkish zone on Cyprus.\textsuperscript{249} They concern the shared and disputed legal responsibilities of Turkish, Turkish zone, and Cypriot officials for the police investigations, arrests, trials, and convictions of suspects; further, the facts involved the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus, all of which generally halted the investigations and trials of suspects.\textsuperscript{250} Family relatives complained to the European Court against both Turkey and Cyprus for violation of the right to life, stemming from Turkey’s refusal to recognize Cyprus and Cyprus’s refusal to recognize the Turkish Zone, and leaving them without a remedy.\textsuperscript{251} The European Court of Human Rights ultimately found that both countries violated the Convention and levied fines.\textsuperscript{252}

In his partly dissenting opinion, Judge Serghides wrote:

\begin{quote}
I am not prepared to follow any approach which does not oppose the injustice caused to the applicants—in the present case exclusively by Turkey—whose case was not brought ultimately before any court in Cyprus, and, at the same time, I am not prepared to follow any approach which puts the very existence of a State, in the present case the Republic of Cyprus, at stake, in terms of public international law, as has been explained. What Martin Luther King, Jr, said, “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere” (letter from Birmingham Jail, April 16, 1963), has, in my view, full relevance in the present case.\textsuperscript{253}
\end{quote}

This opinion not only confirms the present continuation of King’s global authority on human rights within the European Court, but it specifically carries his famous “Injustice/justice everywhere” quote into relations and recognition issues between states under international law to obligate that states, as well as private persons, be treated with justice. In doing so, it addresses our earlier question of King’s intent and interpretation of the norms of the Beloved Community, applying from the beginning, to international relations and constructing international peace.\textsuperscript{254} It is consistent with King’s continuing belief of right principles of international law and human rights helping to build the Beloved Community.
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We have thus confirmed King’s global authority and principles of the Beloved Community flowing into the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights in specific cases over the last forty years. This authority and its impact on human rights law is an important part of the tapestry of King’s wider posthumous authority that, since the 1960s, has been memorialized, invoked, and incorporated into European narratives.

To a visible degree, his authority has paralleled the contemporary evolution of the roots of European Trumpism regarding white identity politics, denials of national pluralism, attempted uses of national elections to secure state power, rejection and subordination in status, and treatment of immigrants from the South. All of these Trumpist narratives are standing on claims to racial superiority and yearning for a return to the white privileges of Empire. As I will discuss, King and the Beloved Community had been long in Europe waiting to confront the formal declarations of European Trumpism circa 2014 to the present day.


Around the U.S. election of President Trump, European Trumpist declarations carried the historical baggage of several trends: (1) lower middle-class white dislocations from globalization; (2) the perceived failure of the ideals and processes of the European Community; and (3) a comparison with fascism in the rise of white populist leaders and parties through fear-driven elections, coupled with denials of pluralistic norms. But should we understand Euro-Trumpism through its racist underpinnings or its anti-globalization demands? Its racist underpinnings are central because King continually fought and mobilized the Beloved Community against racism, including American white identity politics, and against the roots of American Trumpism confronting the civil rights movement. The historical and continuing American fissures on race reached across the Atlantic to mirror European post-colonial fissures on race, as in the doctrine of the White Atlantic. Both Trumpist narratives fundamentally rejected equality and its implications for peoples of color.

There are, indeed, mixed global and national economic trends in the rise of Euro-Trumpist populism, nationalism, and white identity politics. But underneath these economic factors, commentators have
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recognized a bedrock of “cultural” factors heavily featuring racism: against immigrants; against Muslims synonymous with terrorism; and against people of color of colonial and postcolonial origins in European communities whose presence challenges traditional white privileges and violates white working class sentiments of “our nation.”\textsuperscript{258} In turn, such peoples of color are then demanded to be subordinated to the necessary white identity-control of the State through fearful, anti-pluralistic national elections.\textsuperscript{259}

The racism in the cultural questions is the constant drumbeat of both European and American Trumpism. Trumpists purposefully invented racially code-worded, more electorally acceptable public language. Such invention expresses their continuing need to subordinate peoples of color, rather than using their previous crude, racial denunciations and diatribes from Nazism, neo-Nazism, segregation, and Reconstruction Klan racism. For example, an apparent heartfelt aim of many followers in the German alt-right is to distinguish themselves from neo-Nazis, but they do so while admitting the racial subordination of their new language.\textsuperscript{260} Similar trends have previously arisen among American Trumpists, like many in the Republican Party and the George Wallace presidential campaign as discussed above, attempting to distance themselves personally from the Klan even as they expressed policies and public permissions, as in Charlottesville, to give the Klan more community influence.\textsuperscript{261}

The defeat of this deliberately created, hydra-headed racism is central to King’s national and global ministry and to realizing the Beloved Community. In the global authority of his ministry during his life, and posthumously, King was very much present in Europe to challenge—with the Civil Rights Movement and Pan-Africanist principles of love—both the directly expressed and code-worded roots of Euro-Trumpism well before the latter’s formal electoral declarations from 2014 forward.\textsuperscript{262}
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I focus here on the formal declarations of Euro-Trumpism in 2015–16 and the formal election victory of Trump in America in 2016. I do so fully aware of long postwar trends, not least Nazism and neo-Nazism, the alienation of white sovereignty identity politics by European Union politics, and the apartheid of American segregation that had formal Trumpist declarations as present-day historical outcomes. This brief focus on formalism enables us to understand King’s own post-WWII historical runway, shaped by his global authority and his earlier actions in Europe. These composite elements of King’s continuing European ministry were antithetical to Trumpist trends in Europe. By 2015–16, they were available to be invoked against formal Trumpist declarations, including those by European alt-right leaders, and indeed against the loud European image of Trump himself—for example relative to Brexit, following his formal American electoral victory.

Let me share a few examples of this availability. In EUROPp, a blog on European politics and policy out of the London School of Economics, Sonja Avlijas, in 2016, critically examined societal reactions to political anger through the lens of American philosopher Martha Nussbaum’s book *Anger and Forgiveness*. Avlijas warns against the contemporary impulse to restrict the range of human emotion in pursuit of some utopian ideal because “that strips people of their humanity.” Without proper expression, an emotion such as anger can become “bloodthirsty” and “self-destructive” when it is “expressed through democratic procedures such as referendums and elections, as the only public platforms where it has a chance to be heard.” The rise of the extreme right across Europe, including Brexit, is one example. Avlijas thus asks whether we have reverted to the Furies of revenge because modern political institutions fail to account for righteous anger in the face of unjust conditions.

Nussbaum decries the notion that political change and justice must necessarily flow from rage. She cites Martin Luther King Jr., who “saw anger as an impediment to the pursuit of justice because it blocked the empathy and generosity needed to build justice.”

---
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King’s authority and principles as a guide to transitional political understanding and strategy in Europe, from alt-right anger toward Beloved Community justice and generosity, invoked in prominent European political discourse. Avlijas takes King’s principle a step further: by “transform[ing] anger into generosity and concern for the welfare of all... democracy can be re-legitimised and redeemed.”

Nussbaum further explicitly lauds King for his insight that anger must be properly recognized before it can be channeled into meaningful change.

On February 6, 2015, a protest was held outside of the Hackney Picturehouse in London, England, which was coordinated to coincide with the release of the film *Selma*. Protestors rallied in support of a living wage for underpaid theater employees and held identical signs quoting Martin Luther King Jr. that “A Living Wage should be the Right of All.” King’s global authority in Europe encompasses his previous American Movement shift in emphasis from political and civil rights to the importance of economic rights—and the fair distribution of economic resources through the Beloved Community—for vulnerable peoples.

On January 31, 2017, the London *Daily Mail* covered the sweeping protests in all major British cities immediately following President Trump’s inauguration and the announcement of his highly controversial travel ban. Many photographs accompanied this coverage, documenting the thousands who took to the streets, including political figures and celebrities, opposing the travel ban and demanding that Britain’s invitation to President Trump for a state visit be rescinded, which Prime Minister Theresa May refused to do. Protestors raised signs and banners against Trump, supporting the targets of his discrimination. One such protestors displayed a sign with Martin Luther King Jr.’s picture under his iconic declaration from his “Letter from a Birmingham Jail” that “[i]njustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere,” which captured both the narrative of the protests and the Universalist goals of the Beloved Community.

---
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We must be aware that in European political discourse, Trumpist critics and others attempt to misappropriate King’s principles for their contrary purposes. For example, Geert Wilders, leader of the Trumpist Netherlands’s Party for Freedom, quoted King as saying, “There is nothing greater in all the world than freedom. It’s worth going to jail for. It’s worth dying for.”\(^{279}\) Wilders did so after declaring that “he did want ‘fewer Moroccans’ and ‘less Islam’ in the Netherlands and that he would not allow himself to be silenced.”\(^{280}\) In doing so, these Trumpist embezzlers only confirm King’s current European authority by admitting that they are forced to invoke it to try to justify the impact on vulnerable peoples of their own racist programs.

The power of the Beloved Community, as it speaks to international governance, is further illustrated by Marvin Rees, the first Afro-Caribbean mayor of Bristol, England.\(^{281}\) He invoked King in reaching across the Atlantic to touch and name the white supremacy of Charlottesville as an international problem for Europe.\(^{282}\) He then met with his twin city counterpart in Hanover, Germany, to reflect on British-German reconciliations following World War II and to link them to the frustration surrounding the implementation of Brexit and subsequent threats to democracy in the Netherlands and Austria.\(^{283}\) He said, “Martin Luther King famously warned of those who lazily believe that ‘progress’ rolled on with the inevitability of time . . . [but] progress was not actually inevitable, and that people of ill will had historically made better use of time than people of good will.”\(^{284}\) This British mayor identified the American Trumpist danger from Charlottesville and its threat to anti-racist and anti-Trumpist forces in Europe, and he found no other language to warn of this danger than that of King and the Beloved Community.\(^{285}\)

---
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V. DREAMING A DREAM ON KINGIAN AUTHORITY

King’s soaring demand in 1963 for an immediate and coherent dream of liberation from oppression and the arrival of demonstrable freedom for children and vulnerable peoples is prescriptive in Europe. This notion of a Kingian Dream has expanded beyond the needs of vulnerable peoples. It has extended to the needs of Europe for a new collective realization of a Kingian Dream to restore its humanistic political path, including to uplift the post-Brexit European Union. Invocations of a Kingian Dream are among the most prominent, contemporary expressions of King’s European authority.

In 2006, the European Court of Human Rights decided the case of Çapan v. Turkey in favor of the Applicant, a Turkish newspaper editor convicted and sentenced in Turkish courts for generally supporting the Kurdish PKK as a terrorist group. The European Court found Applicant’s case to be admissible regarding his conviction for publishing two articles, one of which rested on Kingian authority. In a chronicle entitled “Our Dreams,” its author, R. Guney, spelled out the Kurdish necessity of a Kingian Dream in the following excerpt:

The Kurds, white but in truth the “black skins of the Middle East,” who have the same dream that Martin Luther King and the blacks [had], are still without identity and forbidden. Sometimes they were exterminated while they were [about to] succeed, sometimes the fire of revolt spread everywhere. . . . The struggle, which has evolved and enlarged, prevented history from repeating itself by uniting science, reason and courage, while worry[ed] about whether “Kurds were going to be the object of the same tragedy.” However, we can see that hard days await the Kurds, when we know that fate and history are not their friends, although the situation is different today.

If we remember that we are the heirs of previous generations, it is indisputable that the war and the weapons are not unknown to us. . . . But now the Kurds are forced to continue their way with other methods and means. And the difficulty [starts] there. This is a new

---
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situation. . . . [W]e have some questions that we are afraid to ask ourselves, but we ask ourselves.

“Will not we have dreams? Will it remain in the dream state the idea of a free country that gave us the strength to resist and kept us standing, despite all the pains and oppressions suffered? This dream, shared by millions of Kurds, will [it] stay in the memory like a bloody fantasy?” Since no one can realize the dream of the other, others cannot realize the dream of the Kurdish people. . . . But as is the case for a child’s dreams, our dreams also take a form closer to reality and [become] more achievable as we grow up.

It is not enough to be right to realize one’s dreams. First, we learned to fight for our dreams. It is [how] we opened the doors of our dreams. Later, we learned that fighting alone was not enough. To realize them, we saw that it was necessary to extend the fight to all the domains. The path of their realization, for the Kurds, [is to] use all the opportunities and tools of the world today. We have seen that if we have not used it until today, the fault lies with us.

It is more important than ever now to use science, art and politics for our benefit. As Kurds, we should not be the subject of this, but of their users. This is the only way to keep and improve our rights and achievements. This is the key to our dreams.

This is how we can keep our promise to thousands of martyrs who have entrusted us with their dreams. We Kurds, who have missed the train during history, we have more luck this time. . . . [L]et us not forget that unity is the greatest force.288

The European Court quashed Turkey’s conviction of the newspaper publisher for printing this article, finding that while:

some particularly harsh sections of the articles paint a picture of [the] more negative of the Turkish State, and
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thus give the narrative a hostile connotation, they do not exhort for the use of violence, armed resistance or uprising, and it is not a question of hate speech . . . . 

Therefore, the Court concludes that the applicant’s conviction is disproportionate to the aims pursued and therefore not “necessary in a democratic society.” There is therefore [a] violat[ion of] Article 10 of the Convention.289

The Guney article reflects the power of King’s global authority, not least from his 1963 “I Have a Dream” speech, in prescribing the evolution of a Kingian Dream to shape the active struggle of the Kurdish people and to provide a necessary pathway to their liberation from Turkish (and implicitly other) oppression and danger. For Guney, King’s Dream is a profound vision that leaps with its people over oppression and over all forces that would normalize it.

Guney has gently moved King’s Dream off its Christian foundations, adapting its commitment to nonviolence to rest on historical obligations to past martyrs and on secular analysis of pragmatic Kurdish situations and goals, rather than all-encompassing love. We see his adaptation of strategies leading to the Beloved Community and of strategies of nonviolent, self-initiative demanded beyond establishing the normative rightness of the Kurdish cause, which must extend to developing the mobilization of all available resources and taking all possible opportunities toward freedom. Further, we see his references to children’s dreams and their Kingian realization as necessary to achieve Kurdish freedom in the future.

Lastly, the holding of the European Court of Human Rights here is that Guney’s demand for a Kingian Dream for the Kurdish people is embedded in the right to freedom of expression in a democratic society, notwithstanding state accusations against the Kurds.290 When this case is compared to the King-related facts and holding of the above Arrowsmith case, King’s global authority regarding human rights law in Europe is underscored.291

On May 6, 2016, Pope Francis gave his acceptance speech upon receiving the Charlemagne Prize.292 It was pointedly addressed to
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European Union leaders, to rekindle a “new humanism based on three capacities: the capacity to integrate, the capacity for dialogue and the capacity to generate.” He warned against the danger of exclusion and raised the bar even higher, beyond an effort to settle individuals geographically, in demanding “profound cultural integration” in order to ward off the tendency to “fall[] back on the unilateral paradigms . . . of ‘ideological colonization,’” and to reveal the true face of Europe marked by openness.

Pope Francis continued that Europe will enjoy lasting peace proportionate to the degree to which “we arm our children with the weapons of dialogue” by deliberative planning and building. Young people have a critical role, and “[e]ven now, with their dreams and their lives they are forging the spirit of Europe,” as participants and protagonists in a renewed dream for Europe. In this dream, Europe “cares for children,” is attentive to the elderly and infirm, does not criminalize being a migrant, and commits to the “dignity of every human being.” As he articulated his dream for Europe, Pope Francis repeated the phrase “I dream of a Europe” again and again, including his final two dreams: “I dream of a Europe that promotes and protects the rights of everyone, without neglecting its duties towards all. I dream of a Europe of which it will not be said that its commitment to human rights was its last utopia.”

Pope Francis has a well-known admiration for King. Here he voices major concepts of the Beloved Community, including the critical role of children for the future of its norms, and directs these concepts as a moral response to rising Euro-Trumpism. Here, those concepts include: profound cultural integration as ending racism; arming children with the weapons of dialogue to equip them for nonviolent conflict resolution and reconciliation of adversaries; more inclusive and equitable economic models aimed at not serving the few, but at benefiting ordinary people and society as a whole; and creating the Beloved Community’s intolerance of poverty, hunger, and homelessness, resting on international standards
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of human decency.\textsuperscript{301} The Pope is doing no less than marshalling the power of the Kingian Dream for Europe to liberate its humanism away from “ideological colonization.”\textsuperscript{302} He further agrees with King that, while it has an important role in fostering the Dream, the Church does not have an exclusive one, because the Dream must encompass those lacking faith.\textsuperscript{303}

And then there is the dream of Oliver Junk, the mayor of Goslar, Germany.\textsuperscript{304} As reported in January 2015 by Tony Patterson, “Oliver Junk may not yet be recognised as the Teutonic equivalent of Martin Luther King but he has a dream all the same.”\textsuperscript{305} Junk’s dream, like King’s, is one that would help end racism.\textsuperscript{306} The mayor of UNESCO World Heritage site Goslar, Germany, boldly proposes opening the town’s vacant accommodations to Germany’s rising influx of foreign asylum seekers, “which was said to have reached more than 200,000 by the end of 2014.”\textsuperscript{307} He sees doing so as “an investment in our future,” with the integration of refugees helping to offset the effects of Germany’s aging population and strikingly low birth rate.\textsuperscript{308} They would provide an economic boost to the national economy, while utilizing resources that would otherwise languish.\textsuperscript{309} Facing criticism and controversy, Junk remains committed to implementing his proposal gradually, even with an eye on the next mayoral election in 2022. The Kingian Dream on this flashpoint question of European Trumpism is to be implemented by political strategies of inclusive love led by committed leaders such as Mayor Oliver Junk.

In Hungary, the ten-year authoritarian administration of Prime Minister Viktor Orban has recently required NGO’s receiving more than 24,000 euros to register as foreign-supported organizations or risk closure.\textsuperscript{310} The Hungarian Civil Liberties Union and Amnesty
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International have refused. Orban has strongly prohibited civil disobedience and protesters.

The Common Country Movement advocates electoral reform in Hungary and has spent months planning nonviolent civil disobedience. As a symbol of its strategy, its Facebook page displays a picture of Martin Luther King Jr. At a recent Movement meeting, the rules were "keep focused, listen to others, no violence, no photos or videos," and it declared, "If the current regime continues to stand in the way of justice, and doesn't help with change, we can't just put our hands up and give in."

King had spoken out supporting Hungarians in their failed, heroic anti-Soviet Revolution of 1956. Invoking his name bridges the nonviolence resistance narratives from the past into the future of evolving global rights protection, including in Euro-Trumpist Hungary. His invocation by Common Country symbolizes the goal of successful voting rights initiatives within prominent protest narratives of Hungarians opposing Viktor Orban for a decade. More protests are planned for 2018.

Finally, in his November 2017 article Poland of My Dreams, theologian, historian, and cultural anthropologist Stanislaw Obirek warns of the rise of the right-wing conservative Law and Justice Party, currently in power in Poland. He opens his reflections by joining King’s iconic Dream: "I believe in the power of dreams that can truly change the reality—just as Martin Luther King did, when in 1963, he delivered in Washington his famous speech: I Have a Dream." He notes King’s ability to unite people around “their common origins rooted in the U.S. Constitution,” while contrasting the dangerous lack of consensus among the Polish people.

Obirek warns against politicians exploiting the rise of fundamentalist Catholic sects in public life. He warns against the media’s complicit role in fracturing Polish society by disseminating the divisive messages of the Law and Justice Party, as well as the politicizing of the education system. These perils could lead to Poland “being marginalized on an
international stage and [retreating] several centuries in our civilizational development.”

Obirek is “strongly convinced that the liberal intelligentsia in Poland is capable of putting forward an attractive and effective alternative to the pernicious vision of a state imposed by the government.” He further warns against permitting the nation’s archives, particularly in the Institute of National Remembrance, to fall into the hands of those who wish “to create a new, ‘original’ account of Polish history.” Like King, Obirek believes that shared history can unite and provide a necessary safeguard against ideologues, who wish to draw power from the past so they can exert it on the Polish people going forward. He closes with the hope, shared with King in the Beloved Community and Pope Francis, that civic engagement might help eradicate from public space all extreme voices that destroy the structure of a democratic state.

VI. CONCLUSION

Martin Luther King’s global authority and the Beloved Community in Europe are grounded on King’s transcendence in confronting the racist roots of Trumpism in America, through the fires and love of the Civil Rights Movement. King began his ministry amidst so many competing demands by also fighting the international racism of Empire. His European authority perseveres to battle the alt-right Trumpist demands for the post-colonial racial subordination of vulnerable peoples, which seek a White Atlantic public order to recall the dominance of Empire.

King’s Beloved Community has lodged itself in European freedom narratives since the Cold War. Its norms were indeed available to be invoked for meeting this new surge of racism with wise and strategic love, in resistance struggles arising upon the formal declarations of European Trumpism’s leaders in 2015 and 2016.

And out of the Beloved Community came collective realizations that a Kingian Dream was essential to those resistance struggles, for both vulnerable peoples and the European Union to be liberated from the stifling suppression of human values trailing in the wake of Trumpism. The Kingian Dream tangibly promises the sunshine of love and freedom for people to infuse European governance, and even that of Near Eastern peoples, to roll back the hostile divisions of European Trumpism. The warmth of the Kingian Dream through the Beloved Community is part of

322 Id.
323 Id.
324 Id.
the gift in love to humankind, which the global authority of Martin Luther King continues to embody.