Alain Locke's "Moral Imperatives for World Order" Revisited

CHRISTOPHER BUCK

Abstract

History offers a review of past events in a quest for contemporary relevance, where hindsight can serve as a source of insight into present-day social paradoxes and dilemmas. The present essay revisits three public speeches by distinguished Bahá'í philosopher, Alain Locke, presented at the Institute of International Relations' Tenth Annual Session in 1944, and argues that he articulated a three-part message: (1) racism, although an American problem, is not purely a domestic issue; (2) racism has bilateral and multilateral consequences (especially economic) in the international context; and (3) three "moral imperatives"—of promoting the unity of races, religions, and nations, both locally and globally—are primary objectives in the quest for world peace.

Résumé

L'histoire permet de revoir des événements du passé dans une quête de pertinence pour aujourd'hui, une rétrospective pouvant alors être une source de compréhension de paradoxes et dilemmes sociaux actuels. Cet essai reprend trois discours publics prononcés par l'éminent philosophe bahá'í Alain Locke lors de la dixième session annuelle de l'Institut des relations internationales, en 1944. Il fait valoir que Locke a articulé un message en trois volets: 1) le racisme, bien qu'il s'agisse d'un enjeu américain, n'est pas un problème propre à ce pays; 2) le racisme a des conséquences bilatérales et multilatérales (notamment économiques) au niveau international, et 3) trois « impératifs moraux » — promouvoir l'unité des races, des religions et des nations, tant aux niveaux local que mondial — sont des objectifs primordiaux dans la recherche de la paix mondiale.

Resumen

La historia ofrece una revisión de eventos pasados en una búsqueda por la relevancia contemporánea, donde la comprensión retrospectiva puede servir como una fuente de percepción de paradojas sociales y dilemas del presente día. Este ensayo revisa tres charlas públicas por el distinguido filosofo bahá'í, Alain Locke, presentadas en la Décima Sesión Anual del Instituto de Relaciones Internacionales en 1944, y argumenta que él articuló un mensaje con tres partes: (1) el racismo, aunque un problema Americano, no es puramente un asunto doméstico; (2) el racismo tiene consecuencias bilaterales y multilaterales (especialmente económicas) en el contexto internacional; y (3) tres "imperativos morales"—de promocionar la unidad de las razas, las religiones y las naciones, tanto local y globalmente—son objetivos primarios en la búsqueda de la paz mundial.

Winner of the National Book Award 2018 for Nonfiction and of the 2019 Pulitzer Prize in the biography category, *The New Negro: The Life of*

Alain Locke, is sure to rekindle scholarly and popular interest in Alain Leroy Locke (1885–1954). The author, Jeffrey C. Stewart—professor of Black Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara—asserts:

> Locke's vision remains a curious blend of pragmatism ("psalms will be more effective than sermons") in converting the heart of the oppressor to empathize with the oppressed, religious consciousness (a blend of Christianity and his Bahá'í faith), mild Afrocentrism (a return to an African past as a non-Western basis of a Black modernism), and philosophical idealism. (542)

Interestingly, "Stewart downplays Locke's involvement with the Bahá'í Faith, giving it only a few paragraphs of attention in a 944-page book" (Smith). Such short-shrift given to Locke's Bahá'í identity and discourses is part of an ongoing reluctance on the part of many Locke scholars to adequately acknowledge, accept, address, and integrate the Bahá'í dimension of Locke's life and thought.

Stewart's cursory treatment of the Bahá'í dimension of Locke's life and thought is similar to that of Locke's biography by Leonard Harris and Charles Molesworth (although not to the same degree), who rightly distinguish Locke's historical significance overall as "the most influential African American intellectual born between W.E.B. Du Bois and Martin Luther King, Jr." (Harris and Molesworth 1). Dr. King himself, at the Poor People's Campaign Rally in Clarksdale, Mississippi, on March 19, 1968, declared: "We're going to let our children know that the only philosophers that lived were not Plato and Aristotle, but W.E.B. Du Bois and Alain Locke came through the universe" (7). Alain Locke was a public figure of some stature and consequence who is once again—or still—influencing the discourse on race.

To his credit, however, Professor Harris has been vocal about, and appreciative of, Alain Locke's Bahá'í identity, both in public lectures as well as in print. For instance, he includes two of Alain Locke's essays originally contributed to the *Bahá'í World* volumes,[1] whereas Charles Molesworth's anthology of Locke's oeuvre is bereft of any mention whatsoever of his Bahá'í essays. The present writer has tried to fill this void in Locke scholarship, yet the Bahá'í dimension of Locke's life and thought remain marginalized and undervalued. Therefore, throughout the remarks and analysis that follow, occasional references to Locke's Bahá'í context will be offered as an added dimension in an overarching framework of analysis.

Locke's framing of the American racial crisis—and the wide range of problems that racism precipitates and perpetuates—is still relevant today, as such problems have not been resolved and persist, albeit in reconfigured ways. When the Institute of International

1 See Works Cited, infra

Relations held its Tenth Annual Session from June 18–28, 1944, in Oakland, California, World War II had set the world aflame, and the conflagration was still raging. World peace was but a dream, and seemed as elusive as ever. Thinkers, academics, educators, and others concerned with this issue would meet, from time to time, in *ad hoc*, confabulatory "think tanks," to examine possible ways of bringing about a lasting global peace.

This conference was one such event—a place to confer—yet it achieved no definitive consensus or notable outcome. Although high-profile back then, the Institute of International Relations' "Tenth Annual Session" is now a mere footnote in history. So why is it valuable to revisit this event today? Because the message of one of its outstanding presenters—Bahá'í philosopher Alain Locke—is as relevant as ever.

Over the course of two days (June 20–21), Alain Locke presented three papers: "Race: American Paradox and Dilemma;" "Race in the Present World Crisis;" and "Moral Imperatives for World Order." Summaries of these three papers were published in a proceedings volume.[2] "Moral Imperatives for World Order," however, was reprinted by Leonard Harris in his edited volume, *The Philosophy of Alain Locke: Harlem Renaissance and Beyond.*

At this prestigious event, which attracted elites from the world over, Locke's series of presentations appear to have been well-planned and executed. After all, this was a golden opportunity to convey a key social message, by way of formal public discourse, to this assemblage of prominent individuals and leaders of thought. In so doing, Locke presented a three-part message, to wit: (1) racism, although an American problem, is not purely a domestic issue; (2) racism has bilateral and multilateral consequences in the international context; and (3) three "moral imperatives"—of promoting the unity of races, religions, and nations, both locally and globally—are primary objectives in the quest for world peace. Not only does Locke present racism as an American problem domestically, but as an issue with global ramifications. Doubtlessly influenced by his beliefs as a Bahá'í, Locke contends that establishing world peace is contingent on race unity by eliminating racial prejudice and the establishment of race unity, interracial harmony (i.e. ideal race relations) goes beyond eradicating prejudice, which is only the first step.

Little is known about the specific circumstances that drew Locke to this conference; presumably he was invited as a guest speaker. No doubt he enjoyed lecturing on topics that he considered important. As a public intellectual—and particularly as a prominent "race man" (a common catchphrase at

2 *Summary of Proceedings: Institute of International Relations, Mills College, Oakland, California, June 18 to 28, 1944.* (Courtesy of Janice Braun, Library Director & Special Collections Librarian Milhaud Archivist, and Director, Center for the Book, Mills College, October 1, 2018.)

the time) or spokesperson for African Americans—Locke took every opportunity to promote minority rights, especially those of the oppressed "Negro" race. While he pursued a lifelong interest and vocation in promoting African American art as a cultural ambassador of what was called the "New Negro Movement," whose mission it was to eradicate negative racial stereotypes,[3] Alain Locke spoke far and wide on these issues of the widest social concern—issues that were (and still are) both domestic and international in scope.

Locke can be credited with internationalizing the race "problem"—reframing it as not simply a domestic issue, but one with repercussions in the international arena—and strategically connecting it with the issue of democracy. His recasting of the race issue was a key strategy, inasmuch as America has always seen itself as a champion for democracy. In appealing to democracy, Locke sought to broaden its definition and scope, in order to more fully democratize democracy and "Americanize Americans," as Locke wrote (Buck, *Alain Locke* 239). In so doing, he developed a complex theory of democracy with at least nine dimensions: (1) Local; (2) Moral; (3) Political; (4) Economic; (5) Cultural (Carter 117–19); (6) Racial; (7) Social; (8) Spiritual; and (9) World Democracy (Buck, "Alain Locke's Philosophy" 30–41)—to which other forms of democracy may be added, such as "Intellectual Democracy."[4] By expanding, even universalizing, the concept of democracy, Alain Locke adroitly linked race relations and minority rights with America's professed ideals of equality. He, moreover, forged dynamic connections between racial, social, and world democracy.

So it comes as no surprise that Locke's three conference presentations were equally interconnected and expansive. The Institute operated under the auspices of the American Friends Service Committee (a Quaker organization) and the Oakland Institute of International Relations committee as well. Although these conferences were annual events, the 1944 session is the only one that Locke himself is known to have attended and presented at ("Institute of International Relations Holds 10th Meeting"). Alain Locke was one of nineteen featured speakers—listed as "The Faculty"—with short biographical notices. The impressive credentials of Locke are stated as follows:

> Professor of Philosophy at Howard University, vice-president Association of Adult Education, 1934–36; president editor "Plays of Negro Life"; co-editor "When

3 For a more detailed treatment, please refer to my article, "New Negro Movement" in the *Encyclopedia of African American History*, edited by Leslie Alexander and Walter Rucker.

4 Personal communication, Janice Braun, Library Director & Special Collections Librarian Milhaud Archivist, and Director, Center for the Book, Mills College, October 2, 2018.

> Peoples Meet"; Rhodes Scholar at Oxford 1907–10; Ph.D. Harvard University 1918; member: Anthropological Society, Ethnological Society, Negro Academy, Phi Beta Kappa, Academie des Sciences Coloniales, Negro Society for Historical Research. ("Final Program")

On the morning of Tuesday, June 20, Alain Locke presented his formal lecture, "Race: American Paradox and Dilemma." Locke's other two presentations were featured as "Evening Lectures" ("Final Program"). No information is available on how many attended. According to the conference brochure ("Final Program"), there were twelve "Round Table" sessions as well, in addition to the individual presentations. This session of the Institute of International Relations should be seen within its American historical context. The year 1944, when World War II was raging in full force, was also part of the "Jim Crow" era of legally enforced segregation in the United States. So this prestigious event was all the more significant for publicly featuring a "Negro" speaker. Boldly announcing its special guest speaker, Alain Locke's photograph appeared in the Institute's brochure ("Final Program").

Whether as abstracts or complete texts, the conference presentations were published in a *Summary of Proceedings*. This slender volume appears to have been privately published by Mills College, but no information is available as to how many copies were actually published.

Of Alain Locke's three lectures, "Moral Imperatives for World Order" was subsequently republished by Temple University Press (*Philosophy of Alain Locke* 151–52) and then again by Oxford University Press (*Works of Alain Locke* 555–56). The latter volume, however, does not credit the source. Locke's two other lectures are published here for the very first time, courtesy of Mills College.[5] As for the *Proceedings* volume itself, this appears to have been printed from a typescript, rather than a typeset original, indicating that this proceedings volume was more of a souvenir than an academic publication for wide distribution. The editors of this volume were Clarice Hubert and Cynthia Reynolds. Tom Hunt, Executive Secretary of the local "Institute Committee" in Oakland, contributed the one-page "Preface." Hunt states, in part:

> In presenting this report of the proceedings of the 10th annual Institute of International Relations, we must again apologize for the extended delay in its appearance.
>
> Each lecture and Roundtable report, with a few exceptions, has been read, corrected,

5 Permission granted, courtesy of Mills College. (Courtesy of Janice Braun, Library Director & Special Collections Librarian Milhaud Archivist, and Director, Center for the Book, Mills College, October 12, 2018.)

> and approved by the lecturer or roundtable leader concerned. Editorial form and exact choice of words, however, remain an Institute responsibility. . . .
>
> The Institute hereby expresses formal thanks to the editors, note-takers, typists, and proofreaders, many of whom volunteered long hours to make the Summary possible. (Hunt)

Additional copies of the *Summary of Proceedings* were offered for sale (Hunt). This *Proceedings* volume is a primary source of information for what took place within the Tenth Annual Session itself, including Locke's three presentations.

In "Race: American Paradox and Dilemma," Alain Locke was the sole speaker in the venue. That evening, for "Race in the Present World Crisis," Alain Locke's lecture was followed by Ernest Price's. For his Wednesday evening lecture, the title, "Moral Imperatives for World Order," was shared by four presenters: Alain Locke, Leslie Schaefer, Rabbi William Stern, and Harry Silcock (*Summary* 19–22).

Alain Locke's three lectures (as presented in summary form in *Proceedings*) were not his most rhetorically eloquent, but they were nonetheless directly representative of Locke's essential message to America and the world. Locke was a significant public figure who had something meaningful to say. He was a deep thinker. Although, by some accounts, he appeared to be somewhat aloof (Stewart 301, 314, 381), the truth of the matter is that Locke was fully engaged with the pressing issues of his day and age. Locke's talks themselves appear to have had a certain logical order and progression. The first one, "Race: American Paradox and Dilemma" (*Summary* 9–10), presents the domestic problem in America itself. "Race in the Present World Crisis" (*Summary* 13–15) expands the issue, extending the ramifications of racism to the level of international relations and trade, thereby adding an economic dimension and incentive for the resolution of this problem. The last, "Moral Imperatives For World Order" (*Summary* 19–20) offers solutions at the level of principle. What follows are descriptions, with highlights, of each of Locke's three presentations.

"Race: American Paradox and Dilemma"

In this lecture, Alain Locke describes the problem of racism in America as a "paradox," a polite euphemism for what really was a flagrant contradiction between professed American ideals and lived social reality, which was a far cry from fulfilling those ideals. In developing a stark contrast between social precept and practice—mapping the considerable social distance between the ideal and the real—Locke represents the problem of racism as a national issue for America at large, not simply a regional problem intrinsic to the American South. He uses the

metaphor of a "growing cancer" that has "spread to all parts of the country." This cancer of racism has metastasized and threatens the body politic of America. Characterizing racism as a "cancer" draws attention to the urgency of the problem at hand. Racism contradicts the fundamental American value of "equality" and is, therefore, a threat to American society.

Alain Locke speaks directly to his audience in "California and on the West Coast" in declaring that the problem of racial and ethnic prejudice affects "Orientals as well as Jews and others" and is a social crisis of "increasing force" in that part of America. This is a "major national issue both morally and socially." In other words, the problem is both individual and national, not just regional in nature.

In 1944, American forces abroad, fighting in World War II, represented a cross-section of the country's demographics, including "black and white, Jew and Gentile," which is to say virtually all Americans. Seeing necessity as the mother of social progress, Locke anticipates a significant social change after the war effort is over. "Millions of young men" will return, he declares, and this signal demographic fact is expected to have a great impact on American society. It is well known that the experience of travel abroad often broadens the outlook of the traveler, as Mark Twain famously said: "Travel is fatal to prejudice, bigotry and narrow-mindedness, and many of our people need it sorely on these accounts" (Twain 650).

American soldiers abroad had seen the world, fought together, protected each other, and eventually achieved an internationally and socially significant victory when World War II ended. Locke knew that America would never be the same after the war was over. Even though slow to come, such change was inevitable. At home, he notes the array of "certain concessionary steps in improved race relations"—"changes" that were "made mainly the interest of the war."

Looking ahead, Alain Locke predicts that if the problem of racial prejudice is not solved, or at least significantly mitigated, then America "will have the race problem intensified not only nationally but with an international spotlight upon it." In other words, the whole world will be watching America—and its reputation will be tarnished in the arena of international opinion unless and until America resolves its longstanding racial crisis. Thus the racial problem no longer stands in splendid isolation. Locke represents African Americans as not only "the largest minority group," but also the "oldest minority in terms of residence." It would appear that in consideration of his audience and of the topic at hand, Locke chose, on this occasion, to disregard the pre-Columbian Indigenous peoples who are the original inhabitants of the Americas, decimated to minority status due to colonialism.

Throughout this lecture, Locke uses the words "paradox," "dilemma," and "problem" more or less synonymously.

A problem obviously demands a solution. After framing the problem, the solution that Locke offers is primarily social in nature, recognizing the limitations of legislation: "The solution needs more than an even-handed enforcement of the Constitution. There must be added equality and economic opportunity; the White [*sic*] population must experience changed attitudes and practices which are outside the Constitutional provisions set up for equality." In other words, in order to effect social reform, "public opinion" must be seen as a key social dynamic, and therefore must be addressed.

When Alain Locke talks about the "education of public opinion," he knows full well that he is speaking to influential educators who, if persuaded by his message, can then do their part in progressively informing the American public of both the racial problem and its solution, and of the necessity to go beyond the status quo, which will not foreseeably remain the same, but will only get worse if the situation is not proactively improved. This moral imperative is also a social imperative. Without saying so explicitly, Alain Locke appears to be telling his audience that the present racial crisis, if it persists and remains unchecked, will eventually lead to "bloody" outcomes, unless counter-measures are taken—that is, "if strife is to be averted" and "conflict" avoided. It is almost as if he is predicting what is foreseeable, if not inevitable—outbreaks of race riots, in which the streets of American cities would run with blood.

That evening, Locke did, in fact, talk about the problem of race riots in America. He referred to the Detroit Race Riot of 1943—exactly one year earlier, June 20–21, 1943—when two days of rioting by both blacks and whites left thirty-four dead (twenty-five African Americans and nine whites), and nearly 700 injured, wreaking such havoc as to cause an estimated two million dollars-worth of damages in property destroyed or looted, before federal troops—some 6,000 servicemen, in tanks, armed with automatic weapons—were called to the scene to restore order (Capeci, Jr., and Wilkerson 16). Locke matter-of-factly declares: "It took less than forty-eight hours for news of race riots in Detroit to reach the radios of the enemy." The Detroit race riots not only shocked America, but drew international attention, including condemnation in the form of anti-American propaganda. Locke could just as readily have also cited the Los Angeles "Zoot Suit Riots" that broke out in Los Angeles, California, on June 3, 1943 (Chiodo 1–14), nearly a year prior to Locke's talk, which perhaps may have been more vivid in the minds of his largely Californian audience. Locke's audience was left with a clear sense of the problem, but with no stated solution, except that the measures to be taken needed to affect social change beyond legislation itself, which is of limited effect.

This necessity is illustrated by the fact that Locke lived to see the landmark Supreme Court decision, *Brown v. Board of Education* (decided May

17, 1954), shortly before his death on June 9, 1954. *Brown v. Board of Education* was limited in scope, in that it only struck down school segregation; it did not end the wider problem of racial segregation and its inherent inequality. While the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 did fill some of the gaps in public accommodations, yet interracial marriage was not guaranteed as a right until 1967 and housing discrimination remained legal until 1968—with consequences that affect the present day. So *Brown v. Board of Education* was a beginning, not an ending, in the ongoing—and seemingly never-ending—quest for racial equality in America.

What Locke told his audience was all too true: Federal anti-discrimination laws, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, can only go so far. Laws, at most, may have some effect in prohibiting and/or redressing instances of actionable racial discrimination. But for the prevalence of racism in American society, such laws would theoretically not have been necessary in the first place. Yet, such laws, though stopgap measures at best, were slow in coming. Laws do not change hearts. Legislation alone, cannot bring about the sea-change necessary to eradicate the "cancer" of racism in American society. That was Alain Locke's message back then—and is his message today.

"Race in the Present World Crisis"

The evening session, in a thematic sense, was a continuation of the morning session. In this lecture, Alain Locke turns his audience's attention to the global situation in his opening statement:

> There is no panacea or worldwide solution for the American race problem. But whatever solutions we can make will undoubtedly contribute to the further integration of the nations of the world, will tend to make us world citizens, or in other words, brothers, in addition to making our democracy more consistent and effective. (*Summary* 13)

Clearly, Locke does not mean to imply that no solutions exist. It is for this reason that Locke speaks of "solutions" in the plural, and reminds his audience: "In this hemisphere slavery came first, and then followed labor slavery." Locke cites one instance, the "bracero" question, which was newsworthy at that time (although he does not use this specific term).

Braceros were legally contracted Mexican seasonal laborers, or migrant workers, who crossed the US-Mexico border to work in Texas—primarily on farms and railroads—and in other Southwestern border states as well. In these states, exploitatively low wages and deplorably poor working conditions were the norm, rather than the exception. During World War II—and under pressure by Mexico, seeking better treatment for its citizens—efforts to regulate the influx and employment of braceros led to

bilateral agreements that permitted migrant workers to be employed in the United States on a contract basis. Despite its ups and downs, the bilateral U.S.-Mexico Bracero Program lasted from 1942 to 1964.

Locke was keenly aware of discrimination suffered by the braceros, and alluded to their plight to prove his point that racism entailed serious ramifications for international relations, especially US–Mexico relations, in which prejudice had immediate economic and political consequences, triggering a diplomatic crisis that had to be resolved, however imperfectly. To characterize the problem that Locke was referring to, historian Johnny McCain summarizes a note, dated September 8, 1943, submitted by the Mexican Foreign Office to the American Embassy, outlining major grievances by braceros employed by the Texas and Pacific Railway at Monahans and at Midland, Texas. In McCain's words:

> The braceros in question complained bitterly of discrimination. They contended that they were denied entrance to public places of entertainment, were not permitted to sit at tables in refreshment parlors or to purchase items there except by using the service entrance, and could not patronize barbershops or other places of service except in areas almost inaccessible to them. On the matter of unequal treatment, they complained that they had straw mattresses while the Americans had cotton ones; they had no first-aid kits; they had inadequate bathing facilities, inadequate sanitation, and overcrowded conditions; and they were charged one dollar every two weeks for lodgings, which the employer refused to show on the payroll slips. (59; see also Guglielmo 1212–37)

These charges were brought before the Texas Good Neighbor Commission. With this background in mind, this is what Locke had to say about the bracero question generally:

> Such international pressure can and will come. Texas and the Southwestern states have set their behavior on the most reactionary of Southern racial practices in their handling of the Mexicans who come across the border to do seasonal work. The Mexican government took this as an insult, and is, today, insisting that unless better treatment be given to the Mexican laborers by the states and assurance given through the State Department that they be decently received, that they will not be allowed to come across the borders. (*Summary* 14)

By internationalizing the problem of racism, Alain Locke could persuade his audience that eliminating prejudice in favor of practicing equality not only was the way to resolve the American "paradox" mentioned earlier, but was also a necessary step in bolstering

America's declining "moral authority" in terms of "social democracy." As Professor Guy Mount has observed, "Locke's reference to Russia's social policy, which he characterized as a 'clearer moral appeal in the matter of her policies and practices of race,' was a telling observation." Mount further notes:

> Locke clearly saw "labor slavery" as having replaced chattel slavery as the ideal means of production for the American capitalist class. Locke's observation was uncanny and largely true to fact: at that time in history, the Soviet Union did have a "clearer moral appeal in the matter of her policies and practices of race" when compared to the United States, by any objective standard. The Leninist party line on race, in fact, attracted many African American intellectuals, including Locke, to socialism in general and to the Communist Party's social platform in particular, and was a primary reason why so many people of color around the world were drawn to communism and formed revolutionary anti-colonial struggles along these lines. (Mount)

That is why the Bahá'í emphasis on promoting racial equality and harmonious race relations was so progressive, as Professor Cornel West has publicly stated:

> I have come to have a profound admiration for brothers and sisters of the Bahá'í Faith. I've actually met Dizzy Gillespie and he, of course, one of the great artists of the 20th century, was of Bahá'í Faith, and talked over and over again about what it meant to him. Alain Locke, of course, probably one of the greatest philosophic minds of the middle part of the 20th century, was also of Bahá'í Faith, the first Black Rhodes scholar and chairman of the philosophy department at Howard University, for over 42 years. What I've always been taken by is the very genuine universalism of the Bahá'í Faith, one of the first religious groups to really hit racism and white supremacy head on, decades ago. By decades, I mean many decades ago and remain consistent about it. …
>
> When you think about it, I mean, Bahá'í was integrated before the YMCA and the YWCA . . . , even prior to the Community Party, which is the first secular institution to integrate with blacks and whites and reds. . . .
>
> When you talk about race and the legacy of white supremacy, there's no doubt that when the history is written, the true history is written, the history of this country, the Bahá'í Faith will be one of the leaven in the American loaf that allowed the democratic loaf to expand because of the anti-racist witness of those of

> Bahá'í Faith. So that there is a real sense in which a Christian like myself is profoundly humbled before Bahá'í brothers and sisters and the Dizzy Gillespies and the Alain Lockes and so forth." (West)

Having framed America's racial crisis not only as regional, but national and international in scope, Locke then proposes some solutions in his third and final presentation.

"Moral Imperatives For World Order"

Throughout his three lectures, Locke consistently refers to World War II as "today's world crisis." In the opening paragraph of his third lecture, he implies a dynamic linkage between "universal human brotherhood" and world peace, based upon the widest possible "loyalty." Loyalty, in fact, is one of Alain Locke's most important social and philosophical terms of reference. In this lecture, Locke speaks of three "corporate" ideas and entities: the nation, race, and religion (which Locke refers to as "sect"). On nationalism, taken to its extreme, Alain Locke comments: "Nationality now means irresponsible national sovereignty." Indeed, the "politically expansive nation," as Locke puts it, was one of the major causes of World War II.

Alain Locke then speaks of social evolution, which he describes as a "process of evolution by progressive enlargement of values." Values were extremely important to Locke. After all, his 1918 Harvard dissertation was focused on the philosophy of values.

As an instance of this social evolution in the religious context, Locke offers an example from the Bible. His reference to human sacrifice ("reported Biblically when sacrifice to God meant the sacrifice of a human being") probably harks back to Exodus: "And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, "Sanctify unto me all the firstborn, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is mine" (13:1). Alain Locke's subsequent reference to the substitution of an animal for the firstborn son probably has in mind Exodus 13:13, in which a father could "redeem" his "firstborn" son by substituting an animal in the son's stead. However, the parallel commandment in Exodus 22:29 provides for no animal substitution whatsoever: "Thou shalt not delay to offer the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors: the firstborn of thy sons shalt thou give unto me."

The "next stage" of the Jewish practice and understanding of the meaning of sacrifice, according to Locke, was "an offering of a pure and contrite heart," a reference to the biblical passage: "For thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise" (Psalm 51:16–17). It would seem that Locke used the analogy of religious evolution as a metaphor for social evolution, more broadly.

True to his earlier thinking, Locke redefines race, "not in the fascist, blood-clan sense," but as "a common culture and brotherhood." He then states: "Cultural superiority of one race is only an expression of arbitrary loyalty to that which is our own. Confraternity of culture will have to be put forward as what race can mean, and [as] an ideal of the parity of races and cultures." Here, the word "parity" is another favorite term frequently found in Locke's essays and speeches, by which he meant equality, eliminating evaluations of inferior or superior status.

Returning to his religious references, Locke then takes Christianity to task for paradoxically professing the inclusivist doctrine of "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," while insisting on an exclusivist doctrine that holds that "only one true way of salvation with all other ways leading to damnation." This shows Locke to be a religious universalist, as well as a cultural pluralist, cosmopolitan and internationalist—all of which were perfectly consonant and resonant with his Bahá'í identity. Locke famously concludes: "The moral imperatives of a new world order are an internationally limited idea of national sovereignty, a non-monopolistic and culturally tolerant concept of race and religious loyalties freed of sectarian bigotry." This statement is as profound as it is formulaic—operating as a categorical imperative, global in scope, universal in its humanity, and socially progressive in nature.

Here, Alain Locke's professed Bahá'í ideals are in evidence, although indirectly so. At this time in American history, while the world was still in the throes of a global conflagration, it was probably not expedient to directly cite the relevant Bahá'í principles and corresponding Bahá'í scriptures. In my previous works, I have suggested that there is a certain synergy between Locke's faith and his philosophy (Buck, *Alain Locke: Faith and Philosophy* 2 and *passim*). Such synergy may also be in evidence here, and will be further demonstrated later in this paper.

Publicity

On Sunday, June 18, 1944, the *Oakland Tribune* published an article announcing the event, "Decisions Now Shape Peace Theme of Lecture Series," which states, in part:

> "Race in the Present World Crisis" is the topic for the opening lecture tomorrow evening at 8 o'clock when Alain Locke, professor of philosophy at Howard University in Washington D.C., will be the speaker. Poet, Rhodes scholar at Oxford and a Ph.D. from Harvard, Dr. Locke is also co-editor of "When Peoples Meet." (38)

On Wednesday, June 21, 1944, Nancy Barr Mavity, a reporter for the same newspaper, quoted Locke in her story, "Relocation Japs Split on U.S. Loyalty, Official Says." She writes:

RACIAL DILEMMA

Alain Locke, professor of philosophy at Howard University, presented the problem of racial minorities as at once "the paradox and the dilemma of America."

"The paradox of America is that we profess the democratic equality of men, which in practice we flagrantly deny," he said. "The problem is no longer sectional, intensified by wartime shifts in population with accompanying changed group relationships.

"The war, it is true, has also brought certain concessions, such as enlarged employment opportunities for Negroes, increased unionization, and advanced technical training and education. But no thinking Negro can feel secure that these concessions will be permanent.

"Unless racial equality is recognized as basis [*sic*: basic] and important in post-war planning, the [race] problem will be intensified not only nationally but with an international spotlight upon it."

This evening's program on "Moral Imperatives for a World Order" will include as speakers, in addition to Shaffer, Prof. James Muilenberg of the Pacific School of Religion and Prof. Alain Locke at Howard University. (12)

Locke did not view racism primarily as a set of individualized personal failings caused by ignorant thoughts. As Mount notes, "Locke showed himself to be a much more sophisticated theorist who saw racism as a set of institutions and state-based practices rooted in a deep set of global historical processes, and not as fundamentally a problem of the heart." Mount concludes that Locke, "saw racism as multifaceted (and thus inclusive of personal biases) yet rooted, first and foremost, in deep structural problems that, as he points out, are beyond the bounds of the Constitution to correct and remedy. Locke is not simply talking about changing hearts, but changing the very structures of society that were protected by the Constitution."

Conclusion

These three speeches represent Locke at a critical moment in American and world history and in his own intellectual development. In "Race: American Paradox and Dilemma," Locke speaks not only of "true democracy," but of "equality and economic opportunity"—something he elsewhere refers to as "economic democracy" (Buck, "Alain Locke's Philosophy" 34–35). Here, Locke's notions of economic opportunity and economic democracy (leading, in due course, to equality) contemplate actual democracy in the workplace: "Locke argues that the economy should be run democratically—and not dominated and dictated by those endowed with capital" (Mount). In "Race in the Present World Crisis," Locke speaks more definitively of democracy in three dimensions—racial, social, and world democracy. In

"Moral Imperatives for World Order," Locke also advocates "moral and spiritual brotherhood," which he elsewhere characterizes as "moral democracy" and as "spiritual democracy." For Locke, "democracy" is basically synonymous with such terms as "equality," "parity," and "reciprocity."

Alain Locke was a leading African-American "race man," as well as a champion of American democracy, and a "world citizen" above and beyond all else. His cosmopolitan outlook is not so lofty an ideal as to be remote and inert, but is grounded in practical realism. His immediate attention is focused on the problem of race, which was then—and is now—the most pressing issue at hand. At the same time, Alain Locke operates on higher intellectual levels without losing touch with what was happening "on the ground." In his three speeches, taken together, presented at the Institute of International Relations' Tenth Annual Session that took place at Mills College in Oakland, California (18–28 June 1944), Alain Locke pragmatically proposes that any real solution to the racial crisis implicates three "moral imperatives"—promoting the unity of races, religions, and nations—which are prerequisite objectives in the quest for world peace. These three moral imperatives, if faithfully and effectively pursued, can achieve a significant degree of social transformation, both locally and globally, by advancing the unity of races, religions, and nations. There is no doubt that Locke's "moral imperatives for world order" are still relevant today.

In a most useful overview of Locke's contribution at this conference, Professor Derik Smith affirms, "Perhaps most noteworthy are Locke's keen efforts to internationalize domestic race issues of the United States. Locke's impulse to speak about race in transnational terms—amplified by the venue of his presentation—represents a significant contrast to mainstream contemporary race discourse in the United States, especially as it pertains to African Americans" (Smith). Revisiting Locke's three presentations at the Institute of International Relations' conference will repay the effort, as his message remains as relevant to social discourse as ever.

Alain Locke discovered the Bahá'í Faith, which he joined in 1918, because its principles validated all that he stood for. Locke had been a Rhodes Scholar at the University of Oxford between 1907–1910, where he was an active member of the Oxford Cosmopolitan Club. Understandably, the Bahá'í principles regarding racial equality and universalism crystallized what Locke had already come to realize in his own thinking. This dynamic interplay between his personal perspectives and his discovery of the Bahá'í teachings brought forth a synergy that confirmed, nurtured, and sustained his personal philosophical and public academic endeavors henceforth.

APPENDIX I

Synergy between Locke's Faith and Philosophy

The synergy between Locke's faith and philosophy becomes apparent after a close comparison between Locke's public discourse and the Bahá'í texts themselves, as the following parallels between Alain Locke's "Moral Imperatives for World Order" (1944) and open letters by Shoghi Effendi, compiled in *The World Order of Bahá'u'lláh* (1938), amply illustrate:

> Realism and idealism should be combined in striking [sic: striving] for a World Order. Skeletal ideals of universal human brotherhood have been in the world for a long time and we are further from tribal savagery and its tribalisms because of these ideals. But they are but partial expressions of what we hope to make them mean and what today's world crisis demands. (Locke 19)

> The principle of the Oneness of Mankind—the pivot round which all the teachings of Bahá'u'lláh revolve—is no mere outburst of ignorant emotionalism or an expression of vague and pious hope. Its appeal is not to be merely identified with a reawakening of the spirit of brotherhood and good-will among men, nor does it aim solely at the fostering of harmonious cöoperation among individual peoples and nations. . . .
>
> It constitutes a challenge, at once bold and universal, to outworn shibboleths of national creeds—creeds that have had their day and which must, in the ordinary course of events as shaped and controlled by Providence, give way to a new gospel, fundamentally different from, and infinitely superior to, what the world has already conceived. . . .
>
> It represents the consummation of human evolution—an evolution that has had its earliest beginnings in the birth of family life, its subsequent development in the achievement of tribal solidarity, leading in turn to the constitution of the city-state, and expanding later into the institution of independent and sovereign nations. (Shoghi Effendi 42–43)

Both Alain Locke and Shoghi Effendi demonstrate that time-honored ideas and ideals of human oneness have a long history. We began as tribal in origin, national in evolution, and global in nature, leading to what both thinkers refer to as a "world order." Thus, Alain Locke and Shoghi Effendi both view the concept of human oneness as an ever-widening ideal, as a function of social evolution.

> Loyalty to corporate unity is a necessary loyalty to something larger than the individual in order to unite men. However, the traditional ideas and values associated

> with human group loyalties are now hopelessly inadequate as a foundation for a larger society and impose limitations on a more comprehensive human society. In the transformation of these values we need something bigger and more understanding. (Locke 19–20)

> The Faith of Bahá'u'lláh has assimilated, by virtue of its creative, its regulative and ennobling energies, the varied races, nationalities, creeds and classes that have sought its shadow, and have pledged unswerving fealty to its cause. It has changed the hearts of its adherents, burned away their prejudices, stilled their passions, exalted their conceptions, ennobled their motives, cöordinated their efforts, and transformed their outlook. (Shoghi Effendi 197)

The concept of loyalty—especially of "loyalty to loyalty" (based on pragmatist philosopher, Josiah Royce)—is central to Locke's philosophy. Both writers speak of the "transformation"—i.e. expansion and universalization—of formerly limited outlooks and allegiances.

> These basic corporate ideas concern (1) the nation as a political corporate idea, (2) the race as a cultural corporate idea, and (3) the sect as a spiritual corporate idea. These larger loyalties, however, are and have been seeds of conflict and division among men everywhere—loyalties that were originally meant to bring people together. How can we give them up? One great and fundamental way of giving up something that is vital is to find a way to transform or enlarge it. (Locke 20)

> While preserving their patriotism and safeguarding their lesser loyalties, it has made them lovers of mankind, and the determined upholders of its best and truest interests. While maintaining intact their belief in the Divine origin of their respective religions, it has enabled them to visualize the underlying purpose of these religions, to discover their merits, to recognize their sequence, their interdependence, their wholeness and unity, and to acknowledge the bond that vitally links them to itself. This universal, this transcending love which the followers of the Bahá'í Faith feel for their fellow-men, of whatever race, creed, class or nation, is neither mysterious nor can it be said to have been artificially stimulated. It is both spontaneous and genuine. (Shoghi Effendi 197)

Here, Locke speaks of "larger loyalties," while Shoghi Effendi comments on "lesser loyalties." "Larger loyalties" and "lesser loyalties" are complementary. They can either coexist, or conflict. Taking both statements by Alain

Locke and Shoghi Effendi together, it is clear that "larger loyalties" are transformations of "lesser loyalties," when political and parochial interests spiritually mature to become cosmopolitan in nature and function. Broadly speaking, both writers view loyalties as corporate in nature—whether national, racial, or religious (or other). Such loyalties will be limited in scope, unless and until they are universalized:

> Nationality now means irresponsible national sovereignty. We must give up some of this arbitrary sovereignty in order to prevent war, to get fellowship among nations, to erase conflict boundaries which are potential battle-lines. We must work for enlargement of all our loyalties, but most particularly this one,—of the sovereign selfjudging [*sic*] politically expansive nation. . . . We must consider race not in the fascist, blood-clan sense, which also is tribal and fetishist, but consider race as a common culture and brotherhood. Cultural superiority of one race is only an expression of arbitrary loyalty to that which is our own. Confraternity of culture will have to be put forward as what race can mean, and [as] an ideal of the parity of races and cultures. (Locke 20)

> Unification of the whole of mankind is the hall-mark of the stage which human society is now approaching. Unity of family, of tribe, of city-state, and nation have been successively attempted and fully established. World unity is the goal towards which a harassed humanity is striving. Nation-building has come to an end. The anarchy inherent in state sovereignty is moving towards a climax. A world, growing to maturity, must abandon this fetish, recognize the oneness and wholeness of human relationships, and establish once for all the machinery that can best incarnate this fundamental principle of its life. (Shoghi Effendi 202)

"Nationality"—by which Locke means "national sovereignty"—is "arbitrary" and "irresponsible"—parallel to Shoghi Effendi's characterizations of "state sovereignty" as a "fetish" due to its inherent "anarchy" with respect to the demands and requirements of international relations, which are far beyond those of the era of "nation-building," which "has come to an end."

> This process of evolution by progressive enlargement of values can be illustrated by the stages reported Biblically when sacrifice to God meant the sacrifice of a human being. This was changed to the substitution of an animal in the place of a man. Fundamentalists must have said if we give this up, that will be the end of sacrifices; but instead, there was more meaning to the act and when [sic:

"then"] the next stage took sacrifice to the still more meaningful level of "an offering of a pure and contrite heart." . . .
We must in the third place consider religion as having many ways leading to salvation. The idea that there is only one true way of salvation with all other ways leading to damnation is a tragic limitation to a Christianity which professes the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. How foolish in the eyes of foreigners are our competitive blind, sectarian missionaries! If the Confucian expression of a Commandment means the same as the Christian expression, then it is the truth also and should so be recognized. It is in this way alone that Christianity or any other enlightened religion can indicate [sic: vindicate] its claims to Universality; and so bring about moral and spiritual brotherhood. (Locke 20)

Incontrovertible as is this truth, its challenging character should never be allowed to obscure the purpose, or distort the principle, underlying the utterances of Bahá'u'lláh—utterances that have established for all time the absolute oneness of all the Prophets, Himself included, whether belonging to the past or to the future. Though the mission of the Prophets preceding Bahá'u'lláh may be viewed in that light, though the measure of Divine Revelation with which each has been entrusted must, as a result of this process of evolution, necessarily differ, their common origin, their essential unity, their identity of purpose, should at no time and under no circumstances be misapprehended or denied. That all the Messengers of God should be regarded as "abiding in the same Tabernacle, soaring in the same Heaven, seated upon the same Throne, uttering the same Speech, and proclaiming the same Faith" must, however much we may extol the measure of Divine Revelation vouchsafed to mankind at this crowning stage of its evolution, remain the unalterable foundation and central tenet of Bahá'í belief. Any variations in the splendor which each of these Manifestations of the Light of God has shed upon the world should be ascribed not to any inherent superiority involved in the essential character of any one of them, but rather to the progressive capacity, the ever-increasing spiritual receptiveness, which mankind, in its progress towards maturity, has invariably manifested. (Shoghi Effendi 166)

In the above passages, both Alain Locke and Shoghi Effendi speak of religion in progressive, evolutionary terms. Locke gives two examples from the history of religion: the evolution of the notion and practice of sacrifice from human sacrifice, to

animal sacrifice, to spiritual sacrifice by means of "an offering of a pure and contrite heart" (Psalm 51:17 and Matthew 9:13); and the functional equivalence of Christian and Confucian moral concepts—presumably alluding to Jesus's formulation of the "Golden Rule"[6] and Confucius's teaching on "reciprocity."[7] Similarly, Shoghi Effendi's discourse on Bahá'u'lláh's teachings on what Bahá'ís refer to as the "oneness of religion" speaks to a "process of evolution" that explains the historical distinctiveness among the world's religions—in which the Bahá'í Faith represents the "crowning stage of [humanity's spiritual] evolution," while emphasizing "their common origin, their essential unity, their identity of purpose."

> The moral imperatives of a new world order are an internationally limited idea of national sovereignty, a non-monopolistic and culturally tolerant concept of race and religious loyalties freed of sectarian bigotry. (Locke 20)

> What else could these weighty words signify if they did not point to the inevitable curtailment of unfettered national sovereignty as an indispensable preliminary to the formation of the future Commonwealth of all the nations of the world? (Shoghi Effendi 40)

Here, Locke's concept of "an internationally limited idea of national sovereignty" resonates with Shoghi Effendi's idea of "the curtailment of unfettered national sovereignty." For both men, this notion of limited national sovereignty is, in Locke's words, one of the "moral imperatives of a new world order." Shoghi Effendi describes this new order more specifically as "the formation of the future Commonwealth of all the nations of the world."

As I hope this section demonstrates, cosmopolitan and Bahá'í ideals co-habited, corresponded, and coalesced inside Alain Locke's mind and heart. Thus the synergy between Alain Locke's faith and philosophy was intensely and dynamically reinforcing, making Locke's famous statement accord with the Bahá'í teachings in both the words he chose and the meaning he intended: "The moral imperatives of a new world order are an internationally limited idea of national sovereignty, a non-monopolistic and culturally tolerant concept of race and religious loyalties freed of sectarian bigotry."

---

6 "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets" (Matthew 7:12; see also Luke 6:31).

7 "Zigong asked, "Is there a single saying that one may put into practice all one's life?" The Master said, 'That would be "reciprocity": That which you do not desire, do not do to others'" (*Analects* 15.24. See also 5.12 and 12.2).

APPENDIX II

Race: American Paradox and Dilemma

Tuesday Morning, June 20 [1944]

The paradox of America is that basically we profess a democratic equality of men wich [*sic*] in practice we so flagrantly deny. This prejudice and lack of equality is the growing cancer which threatens our American Democracy. It is no longer a sectional problem having spread to all parts of the country. It threatens our basic declarations of equality and so impedes development of true democracy.

In California and on the West Coast you would have this dilemma of minority groups treatment even if you had no Negroes here. The problem of Orientals as well as Jews and others is becoming one of increasing force. But, with the Negro issue added, the problem becomes a major national issue both morally and socially. Fortunately it has become the increasing concern of small groups throughout the country, especially since war conditions have caused such large shifts of population and this inevitably has changed group relationships.

Also as a result of the war, millions of young men, black and white, Jew and Gentile, have been taken out of our country for a great international experience—one which will have its effect when they return. The rest of the population will have to stretch the attitudes and practices in order to keep up with what I hope will be the enlightened attitudes of this younger generation from its new experiences in international groups [*sic*] relationships.

It is true that certain concessionary steps in improved race relations have been taken here at home as a result of the war. There are increased employment opportunities for Negores [*sic*], increased labor unionization, increased technical training and education. These changes have been made mainly in the interest of the war, however, and it is important that these group relationships go forward from here on and not recede to where they were when the war started.

Unless racial equality is recognized as basic and made important in the post-war planning we will have the race problem intensified not only nationally but with an international spotlight upon it. The American Negro presents the most paradoxical problem. The Negro is the largest minority group, approximately one tenth [sic: one-tenth] of the population is excluded from proper American privileges and standards of living. The oldest minority in terms of residence, it has assimilated American culture more widely in proportion to its numbers than any other group. Negroes speak the same language, have the same religion, the same mores as the White [*sic*] population. The White population must realize this paradox and reverse its attitudes and do something about it. Around the Negro centers the question of our

moral sincerity about democracy, and our basic national honesty concerning the equality of men. We will not be truly democratic unless we solve this dilemma.

The solution needs more than an even-handed enforcement of the Constitution. There must be added equality and economic opportunity; the White population must experience changed attitudes and practices which are outside the Constitutional provisions set up for equality. The education of public opinion in such respect lags greatly. There is a vicious conspiracy for example to prevent the proper reporting of progress of the minority groups especially for the Negro, so that the public is not being psychologically prepared for the progress which is inevitable nor for the choice which must be made. The choice is whether we will have a bloody or peaceful path of progress for this mass movement of minority groups which are here and here to stay. This must be understood if strife is to be averted. And so there is a choice between progressive and mutually cooperative ways of solving the dilemma or of continuing ways which irritate and cause conflict. If this generation of young people solves that problem within a reasonable time it will have paid its right tribute to democracy and will have met successfully the challenge of the present inter-group crisis. (*Summary* 9–10)

Race in the Present World Crisis

Tuesday Evening, June 20 [1944]

There is no panacea or worldwide solution for the American race problem. But whatever solutions we can make will undoubtedly contribute to the further integration of the nations of the world, will tend to make us world citizens, or in other words, brothers, in addition to making our democracy more consistent and effective. The formula of the chosen people is as old as civilization. The Chinese had it but it was different from our modern version of the idea. They preferred to be exclusive and have others let them alone. But we proceed not by being consistently exclusive, but by trying to make people over on our culture pattern [*sic*] and then, instead of sharing our society with them, boss them around. A difference exists then between the modern and the ancient ideas of a chosen people. The Anglo-Saxons have a particularly virulent case of this modern kind in their imperialistic attitude of racial superiority and dominance.

There will not be any peace or justice in the world until we get over that kind of superiority which makes us want to and insist upon making other people like ourselves. The crux of the peculiar dilemma in this type of social policy and practice is the paradox of wanting to make people over, not respecting their group individualities, while denying them real fraternity and equality in their relationships with the majority group.

The colonial world we must remember is almost 100 percent non-white. Imperialism of the white race has brought about the present temporary and unstable domination of the whites over the non-whites. Our country has many people here by virtue of such imperialism and colonialism, even though we are not supposed to practice empire building. The Negroes are not the only group of this character, but ten percent of the North American people is Negro or mulatto. The majority of the Caribbean and the greater part of South America is even more Negro or Negroid; fourteen per cent [*sic*] of the entire hemisphere. The nearer you come to the tropic zone the higher the percentage of black and mixed-blood populations. In the Caribbean, the Negroes constitute forty-six per cent. Indian and Hindu populations are there, too. Latin American views towards race are less extreme and more humane from the individual point of view, but as to economic exploitation, the Latin world is nearly as guily [sic: guilty] as the Anglo-Saxon world. The Latin is guilty of injury without insult, whereas the Anglo-Saxon world is guilty of both the injury of exploitation and the insult of racial prejudice.

In this hemisphere slavery came first, and then followed labor slavery. The status of the subjugated people must be raised. Two of the greatest obstacles in the race problem today are the lack of confidence on the part of the minority in the dominating group, and the tradition and attitude of the dominating group, who have a frozen system with vested interests in the customs of discrimination.

New perspectives can be made sufficiently real and vital in general public opinion to force enlightened change. Some of these new interests are Pan-Americanism, a policy not hatched just for the present world crisis, though accelerated by it. The Good Neighbor policy has tried quite successfully to reverse our dollar diplomacy, but we have not yet extended it with sufficient force to make it 100 per cent effective. When large numbers of Caribbean and South American populations come in increasing number to America or turn to America for guidance, the only reservation those people have to make when they look at the scene is the North American attitude towards race. Our foreign frontier of race is much more serious than the domestic. Only in terms of a disavowal and discontinuance of color prejudice can we have sound and secure relations with most of the countries to the south of us.

Our racial practices give us a bad name in the world at large and rob us of the moral authority, the confidence, cultural respect and prestige which we should command as a democratic nation. When business men [*sic*] and statesmen find that the approval and respect of these nations depends on our treatment of racial problems, we shall see racial democracy as a practical necessity for the effectiveness of the Pan-American trade programs and American economic leadership. These

conservative groups will then come to see some very grave and immediate reasons for changing American standards and practices in the matter of race.

Such international pressure can and will come. Texas and the Southwestern states have set their behavior on the most reactionary of Southern racial practices in their handling of the Mexicans who come across the border to do seasonal work. The Mexican government took this as an insult, and is, today, insisting that unless better treatment be given to the Mexican laborers by the states and assurance given through the State Department that they be decently received, that they will not be allowed to come across the borders. It took less than forty-eight hours for news of race riots in Detroit to reach the radios of the enemy.

Traditionally the American position has been for generations a great moving ideal of the world. Oppressed people have found refuge here. Now we are faced with the taunt that we are asking others to practice social democracy on a higher plane than we ourselves do. We have less moral authority to deal with England and her colonial issues because of our approach to the Negro and Jewish problems. We will eventually need to depend for world trade upon the Asiatic populations which will be raising their standards of living and then trading with us.

Russia's industrial output will be for a short time consumed internally and then she will have products to sell the rest of the world. Trade is apt to go to Russia from the Asiatic and African countries in favor to us because she is Asiatic, she is nearer, and she has clearer moral appeal in the matter of her policies and practices of race. The non-white populations in the world will become increasingly informed about Russia's thoroughgoing social and racial democracy and will force us to reform our American practices and concepts of race.

Thus the situation of race is one of the most intense and serious of present-day America with grave international consequences. Aside from these economic considerations, we must face the call to this higher more democratic patriotism, and to higher allegiance to world democracy. The real threat and competition of Russia is not, as so often thought, that of a conflict of economic systems, capitalism versus communism, but the moral threat and competition of the nation that more thoroughly and consistently pictures [sic: practices] social and racial democracy by treating all human beings as equals. (*Summary* 13–15)

Moral Imperatives for World Order

Wednesday Evening, June 21 [1944]

Realism and idealism should be combined in striking for a World Order [*sic*]. Skeletal ideals of universal human brotherhood have been in the world for a long time and we are further from tribal savagery and

its tribalisms because of these ideals. But they are but partial expressions of what we hope to make them mean and what today's world crisis demands.

Loyalty to corporate unity is a necessary loyalty to something larger than the individual in order to unite men. However, the traditional ideas and values associated with human group loyalties are now hopelessly inadequate as a foundation for a larger society and impose limitations on a more comprehensive human society. In the transformation of these values we need something bigger and more understanding.

These basic corporate ideas concern (1) the nation as a political corporate idea, (2) the race as a cultural corporate idea, and (3) the sect as a spiritual corporate idea. These larger loyalties, however, are and have been seeds of conflict and division among men everywhere—loyalties that were originally meant to bring people together. How can we give them up? One great and fundamental way of giving up something that is vital is to find a way to transform or enlarge it.

Nationality now means irresponsible national sovereignty. We must give up some of this arbitrary sovereignty in order to prevent war, to get fellowship among nations, to erase conflict boundaries which are potential battle-lines. We must work for enlargement of all our loyalties, but most particularly this one,—of the sovereign selfjudging [sic: self-judging] politically expansive nation.

This process of evolution by progressive enlargement of values can be illustrated by the stages reported Biblically when sacrifice to God meant the sacrifice of a human being. This was changed to the substitution of an animal in the place of a man. Fundamentalists must have said if we give this up, that will be the end of sacrifices; but instead, there was more meaning to the act and when [*sic*: then] the next stage took sacrifice to the still more meaningful level of "an offering of a pure and contrite heart."

We must consider race not in the fascist, blood-clan sense, which also is tribal and fetishist, but consider race as a common culture and brotherhood. Cultural superiority of one race is only an expression of arbitrary loyalty to that which is our own. Confraternity of culture will have to be put forward as what race can mean, and [as] an ideal of the parity of races and cultures.

We must in the third place consider religion as having many ways leading to salvation. The idea that there is only one true way of salvation with all other ways leading to damnation is a tragic limitation to a Christianity which professes the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. How foolish in the eyes of foreigners are our competitive blind, sectarian missionaries! If the Confucian expression of a Commandment means the same as the Christian expression, then it is the truth also and should so be recognized. It is in this way alone that Christianity or any other enlightened religion can indicate [*sic*: vindicate] its

claims to Universality [*sic*]; and so bring about moral and spiritual brotherhood.

The moral imperatives of a new world order are an internationally limited idea of national sovereignty, a non-monopolistic and culturally tolerant concept of race and religious loyalties freed of sectarian bigotry. (*Summary* 19–20)

WORKS CITED

Brown v. Board of Education. 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686 (1954).

Buck, Christopher. "Alain Locke's Philosophy of Democracy." *Studies in Bahá'í Philosophy*, vol. 4, 2015, pp. 24–45.

———. *Alain Locke: Faith and Philosophy*. Kalimat Press, 2005.

———. "New Negro Movement," *Encyclopedia of African American History*, Vol. 3, edited by Leslie Alexander and Walter Rucker. ABC-CLIO, 2010, pp. 925–27.

Capeci, Dominic J., Jr., and Martha Wilkerson. *Layered Violence: The Detroit Rioters of 1943*, UP of Mississippi, 1991.

Carter, Jacoby Adeshei. "An Inter-American Philosophy of Democracy," *African American Contributions to the Americas' Cultures: A Critical Edition of Lectures by Alain Locke*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2016, pp. 117–19.

Chiodo, John J. "The Zoot Suit Riots: Exploring Social Issues in American History." *The Social Studies*, vol. 104, no. 1, 2013, pp. 1–14.

"Decisions Now Shape Peace Theme of Lecture Series." *Oakland Tribune*, Sunday, June 18, 1944, p. 38. (Courtesy of Steven Kolins, independent researcher, October 6, 2018.)

Guglielmo, Thomas A. "Fighting for Caucasian Rights: Mexicans, Mexican Americans, and the Transnational Struggle for Civil Rights in World War II Texas." *Journal of American History*, vol. 92, no. 4, March 2006, pp. 1212–237.

Harris, Leonard and Charles Molesworth. *Alain L. Locke: The Biography of a Philosopher*, University of Chicago Press, 2008.

The Holy Bible, King James Version.

Hunt, Tom. "Preface," *Summary of Proceedings*.

Institute of International Relations, "Final Program. Tenth Annual Session. Institute of International Relations, Mills College, Oakland, California, June 18 to 28, 1944", Mills College, 1944. (Courtesy of Janice Braun, Library Director & Special Collections Librarian Milhaud Archivist, and Director, Center for the Book, Mills College, October 1, 2018.)

"Institute of International Relations Holds 10th Meeting," *Mills College Weekly*, Vol. 27, No. 17 (Wednesday, March 15, 1944) p. 1.

King, Martin Luther, Jr., "Rally Speech, Mississippi Tour, Clarksdale, Mississip-

pi, Pre-Washington Campaign," St. Paul Methodist Church, March 19, 1968. (Unpublished speech.) Manuscript Collection, No. 1083, Subseries 11.2, Martin Luther King Speaks program files, 1967–1985, Box 612, Folder 22, Manuscript 68#40C, page 7. Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library (MARBL), Emory University.

Locke, Alain. *The Philosophy of Alain Locke: Harlem Renaissance and Beyond*, edited by Leonard Harris. Temple UP, 1989.

———. (1) "Race: American Paradox and Dilemma"; (2) "Race in the Present World Crisis"; and (3) "Moral Imperatives for World Order" (including discussion of remarks by Alain Locke, Leslie Schaefer, Rabbi William Stern, and Harry Silcock). *Summary of Proceedings: Institute of International Relations*, Mills College, Oakland, California, June 18 to 28, 1944, edited by Clarice Hubert and Cynthia Reynolds, Mills College, 1944, pp. (1) 9–10; (2) 13–15; and (3) 19–20, respectively. (Courtesy of Janice Braun, Library Director & Special Collections Librarian Milhaud Archivist, and Director, Center for the Book, Mills College, October 1, 2018.) Permission to reprint the summaries of Alain Locke's three presentations granted, courtesy of Janice Braun, Library Director & Special Collections Librarian Milhaud Archivist, and Director, Center for the Book, Mills College, October 12, 2018. (Edited by Christopher Buck, based on digital scans kindly provided by Mills College.)

———. "The Moral Imperatives for World Order," *Summary of Proceedings, Institute of International Relations, Mills College, Oakland, CA, June 18–28, 1944*, 19–20. (Edited by Christopher Buck, based on digital scans kindly provided by Mills College.) Reprinted in Buck, *The Philosophy of Alain Locke*, p. 143 (Introduction) and pp. 151–52.

———. "Moral Imperatives for World Order." *The Works of Alain Locke*, edited by Charles Molesworth. Oxford UP, 2012, pp. 555–56.

———. *The Works of Alain Locke*, edited by Charles Molesworth. Oxford UP, 2012.

———. "The Orientation of Hope," *The Bahá'í World: A Biennial International Record, Volume V, 1932–1934*, Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1980 [1936], pp. 527–28.

———. "Unity through Diversity: A Bahá'í Principle," *The Bahá'í World: A Biennial International Record, Volume IV, April 1930–1932*. Bahá'í Publishing Committee, 1933.

Mavity, Nancy Barr. "Relocation Japs Split on U.S. Loyalty, Official Says." *Oakland Tribune*, Wednesday, June 21, 1944, p. 12. (Courtesy of Steven Kolins, independent researcher, October 6, 2018.)

McCain, Johnny M. "Texas and the Mexican Labor Question, 1942–1947." *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, vol. 85, no. 1, July 1981, pp. 45–64.

Mount, Guy. Personal correspondence with the Editor of *The Journal of Bahá'í Studies*. 20 November 2018.

Shoghi Effendi. *The World Order of Bahá'u'lláh*. Bahá'í Publishing Trust, 1991 [first published in 1938].

Smith, Derik. Personal correspondence with the Editor of *The Journal of Bahá'í Studies*. 2 February 2019.

Stewart, Jeffrey C. *The New Negro: The Life of Alain Locke*. Oxford UP, 2018.

Summary of Proceedings: Institute of International Relations, Mills College, Oakland, California, June 18 to 28, 1944, edited by Clarice Hubert and Cynthia Reynolds. Mills College, 1944.

Twain, Mark. *The Innocents Abroad, or, the New Pilgrims' Progress*. American Publishing Co., 1871.

West, Cornel. "Towards Oneness." www.youtube.com/watch?v=SbEDC8wAWiI.